

Instructor's Manual
for
*The Needs of Others: Human Rights,
International Organizations and Intervention in
Rwanda, 1994*

“Reacting to the Past” Game in Development
Instructor's Manual

Kelly McFall
Department of History
Newman University

Table of Contents

Teaching the Needs of Others.....	1
What is this game about anyway? An introduction to <i>The Needs of Others</i>	1
Learning Objectives	2
Key Concepts	2
The Plausibility Corridor and the Learning Objectives of <i>The Needs of Others</i>	5
Preparing for the Game.....	7
Schedule	7
Introducing the Game and its Ideas	8
Introducing the Readings and Historical Context	9
Guidance for Discussion and Class Activities	11
Sample Reading Quiz Questions	18
Managing the Game.....	20
Playing the Game	20
Rules and procedures	20
Elements of randomness	23
Newspapers	24
Press Conferences	25
Assignments and grading	26
Necessary interventions	27
How things might go wrong, how to prevent them and how to fix them	27
Roles.....	29
How the roles should interact	29
How to select students for roles	30
Role Allocation table	31
Assignments and objectives by role	32
Possible Extra Roles	36
What happens if the journalist dies?	36
Possibilities for additional readings and/or activities	36
How Does It End and How Does the Instructor Decide Who Won?.....	39
Guide to Debriefing.....	42
What actually happened	42
What happened next?	47
Why is this important?	49
Ways to conclude	50
How to Make This Game Your Own.....	51
Copies of Game Procedures/Tables.....	53
Class-by-Class summary of what to bring and what to do	53
Table to determine UNAMIR casualties	56
Table to decide whether Public Opinion can tell his/her ambassador how to vote	57
Procedure for determining whether countries can offer forces to intervene in Rwanda (if using)	58
Table to decide whether intervention is successful:	59
Table to decide if there are UN casualties as a result of intervention	60
Rubric for Assessing Game Participation	61
Expanded Bibliography.....	62
GM news service handouts.....	65
Sample Papers.....	84
.....

Teaching the Needs of Others

What is this game about anyway? An introduction to *The Needs of Others*

I wrote *The Needs of Others* because I believe passionately that students need to understand the intersection of values, politics and institutions in the modern world. In particular, as an historian trained in military history and the history of genocide and human rights, I believe students benefit greatly from thinking hard about the institutions and values of the international community.

First, students often have little real understanding of the way decisions are made and policies implemented in the global world of the 21st century. Certainly, almost every student has heard of the United Nations, and most have heard of transnational organizations like the Red Cross or World Vision. But few have a real understanding of the way sovereign states interact within the UN or of the way the UN reaches decisions. Fewer still grasp the way transnational organizations attempt to influence these decisions and actions or why these attempts succeed or fail.

Secondly, students often have a very limited understanding of the philosophy or practice of humanitarian intervention. This does not mean they don't have an opinion; indeed, they frequently have very clear opinions. Nor does it mean they are unaware of cases where humanitarian aid or intervention has been suggested. It does mean they need help to think through the reasoning behind their opinions and those of people who disagree.

Finally, most students have only a vague concept of what the word genocide actually means. Many have used the word, participated in remembrance ceremonies (especially of the Holocaust) or even pledged 'never again.' But few can articulate a definition of genocide or explain coherently how one would prove a crisis actually amounted to genocide. Almost no students (or, indeed, others) can explain exactly what obligations signatories to the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide take upon themselves.

It is the sad truth of the world that there are many case studies I might have used instead of Rwanda. However, there are several reasons why Rwanda is an excellent subject for a game of this nature. First, the trajectory genocide took in Rwanda compels students to decide whether to characterize events as a civil war, 'ordinary' human rights abuses or genocide, helping them to understand the differences among them. Secondly, the nature of the crisis forces students to wrestle with critical issues without adequate information and without equal access to what information exists. Setting the game in an information-rich setting like Bosnia would miss this teaching opportunity. Thirdly, placing the game in Africa encourages students to learn more about a region about which they often know little. Fourth, Rwanda can in many ways be isolated from other events. To be sure, Rwanda didn't occur in a vacuum, and the game tries in small ways to force the students to wrestle with priority-setting in a world with several crises and limited resources. Intellectually, one might prefer a more complex, globally oriented game. From a practical perspective, however, a game about Rwanda makes it far easier for students to learn the historical background and to engage the game fully without becoming overwhelmed. Finally, genocide in Rwanda happened over, at most, ten weeks. As a result, a game can be played in a relatively small number of class sessions, allowing you to integrate it into a variety of courses with minimal changes to the learning objectives or structure of the course.

The rest of this manual contains all of the practical information you need to run the game. However, I want to stress from the beginning that you can tweak the game to emphasize different questions or even change it radically to include other issues or more complexity. I have outlined some of these possibilities near the end of this manual. If you want to try others, please feel free. Just let me know what you tried and how it went.

helpful to remind them of the bureaucratic nature of the UN. You might point out that the UN has developed its own peculiar bureaucratic language its officials use routinely.¹⁴

Class Period 2

If you have not yet met with students to talk with them individually about roles, this is a good day to do so. Several students need particular attention.

- Most instructors will want to talk with the American players as soon as possible, both to clarify the relationship within the American faction and to remind them their papers are due early.
- Journalists will need careful instructions, both on your expectations of newspapers and on how to behave during the press conference. It is helpful to remind them their participation grade is largely determined based on their active questioning during these conferences and outside of the classroom.
- The ambassadors of New Zealand and Nigeria need instructions about running meetings of the UNSC. The first meeting will be especially tight in terms of time. You and the ambassadors should think through in advance how long speeches should be and communicate this to the students early. The speeches will of necessity be shorter than the completed papers and students should understand in advance that they will not have time simply to read their papers.
- It also helps to touch base with the French and Russian ambassadors, Boutros-Boutros Ghali and the representatives of public opinion.

Intellectually, this class should focus on the purpose and history of the UN as well as the historical background of the Rwanda and the UN's activities there. It might follow the following progression:

- The UN Charter
 - Why was UN created and what vision did its creators have for the organization? How is this written into the UN charter? According to the UN Charter, when and how can the UN intervene in conflict? When is it prohibited from doing so?
 - It is important to point out the UN is designed to prevent wars between states, not to prevent intrastate conflict. You should draw students' attention to both Article 1 and Article 2 paragraph 7.
- The UN Convention on Genocide
 - Why was the UN Convention on Genocide created? How does it define genocide? Are there any groups missing from this definition? How is a 'genocide' declared? What obligations exist for signatories when such a declaration is made?
 - Several issues need attention:
 - The absence of political groups in the definition of genocide. Historically, this is a result of pressure from the Soviet Union, which feared the purges, forced famines and deportations of the 1930s and 40s would render them vulnerable to charges of genocide. In Rwanda, this omission allows opponents of intervention to cite the assassination of moderate Hutus as proof the violence was targeted at a political opposition rather than an ethnic group and therefore does not meet the definition of genocide.
 - The ambiguity of the obligations incumbent upon signatories. The convention clearly mandates efforts to prevent genocide and to punish perpetrators. However, it stops short of requiring intervention. Some read such a mandate into Article 9. Others reply that this article allows states to raise the subject but doesn't require a response. Most 'ordinary' people, assume intervention is required. Opponents of intervention, however, will want to exploit this ambiguity.
 - While the UN passed the Convention in 1948 and most member states gradually adopted it over the following decades, it had never been invoked, despite mass killings in places

¹⁴ For instance, the phrase "the UN will remain seized of the matter" at the end of the UNAMIR mandates reprinted in the gamebook. This phrase is UN-speak for saying the UN will continue to pay attention to the region or crisis.

like Bangladesh, Cambodia and Ethiopia. Any countries that try to invoke it will be treading new ground diplomatically, always difficult to do.

- The Universal Declaration of Human Rights
 - What kinds of rights are identified as such by the Declaration? How do these differ from the rights identified in the American Bill of Rights? Where do these rights come from (in other words, what is the philosophical basis for claiming these rights)? How is this Declaration to be enforced? To what extent does this Declaration supersede the Convention on Genocide?
 - The critical point here is that the Declaration is a statement of philosophy rather than policy. It lacks any kind of enforcement mechanism. It can certainly be cited by those advocating humanitarian intervention, but it requires no action. Thus, it reinforces the overwhelmingly international character of the UN and does not open an alternative path toward intervention.
- The history of the UN since 1989.
 - How had the Permanent Members of the Security Council used their veto power in the past? How did the UN reconceive its mission after 1989? How did this change its behavior? How did Boutros Boutros-Ghali participate in this re-conception? How successful were the interventions begun in the immediate aftermath of the end of the Cold War? How did events in Somalia change attitudes and behavior in the UN? Why? How and why did the UN get involved in Rwanda? What was its mission there? How did it try to achieve it?
 - Worth noting:
 - Students should understand why so many countries by the mid-1990s were so dubious about the UN's capacity to intervene in conflict situations effectively and why the US was willing to threaten to withdraw from the UN altogether if things didn't change. Moreover, the students should understand how wide the UN's responsibilities were by 1994 and how many issues faced the Security Council at the time.
 - Finally, the students should understand the declared mission of the UN in Rwanda, the factors that led up to the decision to intervene (and support the Arusha Accords) and the UN's response to the subsequent political instability. It is worth paying specific attention to the successive mandates issued by the UN and reproduced in the game book. In particular, you should draw attention to the six week extension of the mandate passed on 5 April. This was much shorter than the more usual six months and was forced upon the UNSC by a skeptical US, which otherwise promised to scuttle the renewal of the mandate.
- The history of Rwanda
 - What impact did Belgian rule have on Rwanda? Define what it means to be a "Hutu" and a "Tutsi" and how this meaning has changed over time? How have Hutus and Tutsis interacted politically over time? How and why did the stability of Rwanda under Habyarimana decay and why is that important for Rwandan history? What role did Burundi and Uganda play in the history of Rwanda from 1961-1993?
 - I also provide a list of terms students need to know and cover this list in a number of ways during this and subsequent classes. The list includes:
 - Juvenal Habyarimana
 - Gregoire Kayibanda
 - Paul Kagame
 - RPF
 - Yoweri Museveni
 - UNAMIR
 - Romeo Dallaire
 - Arusha Accords
 - Boutros-Boutros Ghali
 - Mogadishu
 - Leopold II

Class Period 3

If you have not met with students playing particularly important or complex roles, this is a good time to do so.

Intellectually, this day is devoted to discussing the readings about the philosophy of humanitarian intervention. You might proceed through the appendices using the following questions as tools for discussion:

- Walzer
 - Where do the rights of political communities come from?
 - Why is aggression wrong in an international environment defined this way?
 - What is the legalist paradigm?
 - What guidelines does Walzer lay out to decide when intervention into another state's business is appropriate?
 - Why does Walzer argue that intervening in another state to save its people from a domestic dictatorship is wrong?
 - What are the three possible exceptions to this general rule and how do they work? (NOTE: Students often have the most difficulty understanding Walzer's doctrine of counter-intervention. I often select two students, have them come up to the front of the room, and ask the students to vote on who would win if the two were to fight. Then I ask a third student to come up and hold the arms of one of the combatants behind his/her back. After allowing the students to change their vote, I ask if this was fair. When they respond that it of course was not fair at all, I ask if a fourth student's intervention to take the third student out of the fight and thus allow the two original combatants to have a fair fight would be behaving 'justly.' Almost always, students will say yes. It's a small leap from this scenario to the point Walzer makes about civil wars.)
- Nardin and Slater
 - Why do Nardin and Slater disagree with Walzer's definition of "crimes that shock the moral conscience of mankind?"
 - Why, then, do they argue that practical considerations will most often limit the use of humanitarian intervention?
- Teson,
 - Where do the rights of political communities come from? How does this compare to Walzer? Does Teson's definition make humanitarian intervention more plausible or less?
 - What are the conditions that make humanitarian intervention permissible?
 - What questions do countries need to ask themselves before adopting a policy of humanitarian intervention?
 - Is Teson more or less likely to endorse humanitarian intervention than Nardin and Slater? Why?

Class Period Four

If giving the reading quiz, this is the best day to do so. In addition, you might give the American players some time to talk amongst themselves about American policy and how they will address the UNSC at its first meeting. Otherwise, this day can be used to finish any leftover discussion or simply as a time for students to think about their papers.

Important: Ordinarily, I prefer to distribute the GM News bulletins at the beginning of each round in order to simulate the need to think quickly about changing information. However, the very first bulletin is helpful for students writing their papers. Accordingly, I prefer to distribute the GM News bulletin for 6 April at the end of this class meeting so students may use it in writing their papers. This applies only to the bulletin for general distribution—the rest may be distributed at the beginning of Class Period Five.

Class Period Five

First meeting of the UNSC and the first set of press conferences. The meeting will be primarily composed of set piece speeches by members of the UNSC along with questions and answers. The ambassador from New Zealand must ensure discussions move at an appropriate pace—there will be no time to make up leftover speeches.

At the very beginning of class, the representatives of public opinion should introduce themselves and announce which country each represents. It is often helpful to ‘go around the table’ and have everyone introduce themselves by role as well.

Public speaking is one of the key elements of Reacting. Accordingly, every student in *The Needs of Others* is required to present their paper publicly. Most of these occur in this first session. Pedagogically, this sacrifices game flow for skill development, as fitting in so many speeches leaves little time for debate or decisions. There is some value to this, as it lessens the likelihood clever students will engineer action before any real information is available. However, it has the potential to decrease student engagement in the first part of the game. One alternative is to require only those players firmly committed to a position (the US, France, Britain, Russia, New Zealand, Czechoslovakia and Nigeria) to present these papers publicly. Essentially, this trades philosophical content (the basis for the papers of the indeterminates) for ease of play.

Your primary job is to monitor the meeting and the press conferences. The students may need particular guidance with the press conferences this first time. During the UNSC meetings during this and all sessions, you should take careful notes of all motions passed and, to a lesser extent, promises made.

You should bring:

- Extra role sheets (in case students have lost theirs).
- A copy of the list of papers to be presented (in case the NZ player has forgotten/lost this).
- The instructor’s manual and game book.

You should distribute at the beginning of class:

- Copies of the GM News Service bulletins.

Class Period Six

Second meeting of the UNSC and the second set of press conferences. A few students will make speeches, but the meeting will mostly be free flowing debate. Because this will be the first real opportunity for students to introduce, debate, and vote on proposals, you may need to explain how this might best be done, either privately to the NZ ambassador or publicly to the entire class.

You should bring:

- Extra role sheets (in case students have lost theirs).
- The instructor’s manual and game book.
- A (six-sided) die.

You should be ready to:

- Tally votes.
- Offer advice (solicited or, if you choose, unsolicited).
- Remind the journalists of their need to produce a newspaper before the next class meeting and to answer any questions they might have about this.

You should distribute at the beginning of class:

- Copies of the GMs News Service bulletins.

Roles

How the roles should interact

There are no formal factions in *The Needs of Others*. However, there are de facto alliances between those countries opposed to intervention and among the countries that support it. So, Russia, Britain, France and the United States will often work together, as will the Czech Republic, Nigeria and New Zealand. In addition, pro-intervention NGOs such as Human Rights Watch and the International Committee of the Red Cross will often work closely with the latter group.

The US roles deserve a brief explanation. In small games, there will be one generic US player, who takes the role of the US ambassador to the United Nations and who is anti-intervention. However, in medium and large games, there are three separate roles for the US. This is a conscious attempt to force at least some players to consider the tension between one's responsibility as a governmental employee to represent the government and one's ethical responsibility to speak the truth and advocate what one believes to be right. Thus, it is assumed as a counter-factual that the US is represented by a delegation rather than a single ambassador.

Two members of the delegation, the army officer and the head of the NSC, share the historically accurate position that the US should not intervene. Each is provided with materials outlining the opinion shared by their institution.¹⁶

The third player is based on two separate incidents. The most obvious is Prudence Bushnell, a member of the State Department. In real life, Bushnell followed her official responsibilities carefully, but did everything she could around these responsibilities to persuade Rwandan officials to stop the killing. It is also based on two State Department officials who publicly resigned rather than follow policies toward Bosnia they believed to be immoral.

The game creates an 'Assistant Secretary of State' in an attempt to recreate the tension these officials faced. With American policy decided by voting within the American delegation, Assistant Secretary of State will quickly realize she is outvoted. To win the game (and thus to do what is 'right' in her eyes), she must figure out how to maneuver within the constraints she faces in order to persuade people to support her position. To do so, she may share (leak) information with allies, intentionally weaken her presentation of anti-intervention arguments, argue for more limited forms of intervention (such as jamming RTML, the radio station broadcasting anti-Tutsi messages and loosely coordinating the genocide) or whatever else she can dream up. However, if the other American players can prove that she is violating the policy decided upon in the faction, they can ask the GM to fire her. As a result, the Assistant Secretary of State is forced to make tough decisions about what she should or should not say or do. If all else fails, she can publicly resign and tell all she knows about the genocide and US information and decisions. Doing so means she loses the game, but she may decide that doing what is right (and the reputation for integrity that comes along with this), is worth the cost.

Finally, the journalists are both partners and opponents. They must work together to produce a timely and interesting newspaper. This may require working together to cover various press conferences and to perform all the necessary interviews. But each has different victory conditions and will focus their writing and research to support these goals.

Because the need to check the veto power of the P5 is necessary to give pro-intervention powers the chance to win, you should pay special attention to the 'representative of public opinion' roles. As outlined earlier, this may mean adjusting the responsibilities and powers of some of these roles. In particular, if there are fewer representatives of public opinion than there are P5 members, some should be allowed to function as "Europeans"

¹⁶ For the army officer, this is an article by Colin Powell in which Powell summarizes what becomes known as the Powell Doctrine. For the Chair of the NSC, it is Presidential Decision Directive 25. Begun well before the Rwanda crisis (and written by an official of the NSC), this outlined the criteria by which the President would decide whether intervention in other states was appropriate. President Clinton approved PDD-25 on 3 May 1994. It remained classified, but a summary was released on 5 May. While the memo is not "finished" at the outset of the game, it was substantially complete by the beginning of April. It thus is reprinted at the end of this player's role sheet, and the player may release it to the public at any time during the game. The document itself laid out a set of criteria that made it very unlikely the US would intervene to suppress violations of human rights.

Journalist #2

Woodward and Bernstein are your heroes. You (you should provide a name and gender for yourself) were a teenager during the Nixon years. You watched eagerly as crusading journalists uncovered secrecy and corruption. In an age when government seemed like it couldn't be trusted, journalists formed the first line of defense for democracy. You must have watched *All the President's Men* a dozen times during Journalism School. You've never gotten over its influence.

As you've moved through your career, you've tried to be the same kind of journalist. Thorough, careful, systematic, all of the ordinary attributes the media usually display. More than that, you're trying to improve American democracy, to make the country and the world a better place. Driven by your faith, you really believe people matter, wherever they are in the world. So you've been drawn to stories about suffering and pain. In just the past few years, you've travelled to Cambodia, to Iraq, to Bosnia and to Haiti to help people understand the poverty and desperation that still exist in the 1990s.

Now you recognize all the signs of another crisis. The assassination of President Habyarimana (could it really be an accident?) appears likely to set off a wave of violence in Kigali. The Arusha Accords were fragile to begin with. You doubt they'll survive any significant violence. Again innocent people will suffer.

You're determined to tell the people what is really happening in Rwanda and mobilize the international community to help the Rwandans. To do so will be a lot of work, since you know little about the country. But injustice and oppression have always driven you forward. No doubt they will again.

There is one caution however. You are certainly practicing advocacy journalism—trying to convince the public of the need to intervene in Rwanda. But you're still driven by a need to get it right as well as get it fast. You're a bit concerned about the young journalist who is also covering the story. You've seen his type before. Young, ambitious, *hungry*. People like him (her?) get great stories. But they're not always concerned about getting the story *right*. Nor are they really interested in staying the course. Instead they want to make their name and move on. When they do, they tend to leave both the public and politicians suspicious of good journalists like you. Stories dry up and readers disbelieve. There's nothing you can do about this directly. But you can't afford to have your chance to mobilize public opinion destroyed by a foolish young reporter who can't be bothered to care what impact his stories have.

Victory conditions:

You win if:

- A majority of the players representing public opinion write letters to their national leaders urging their country to intervene in Rwanda and show that your articles influenced their decision. The GM will poll these players at the end of the game

to judge your influence on them. If their letters refer to your articles as evidence for their position, the GM will consider that evidence as well in his/her judgment.

and

- The UNSC declares the violence in Rwanda to be genocide before the end of the 4th UNSC meeting. Note, however, that it is not at all clear at the beginning what is happening. Therefore, you may not speak or write publicly about genocide during the first round of the game. As soon as the second meeting of the UNSC begins, you're free to use the word as you see fit.

You lose the game if:

- You fail to publish your newspapers on time with a variety of stories
- You publish a story that turns out to be false and you are forced by your publisher (the GM) to publish a retraction.
- You fail to achieve your victory conditions.

Responsibilities and powers:

You and your journalist colleague(s) must publish three newspapers during the course of the game. These should contain newspaper articles about Rwanda and all of the events and debates relating to it. You may include articles on other areas of the world if you choose.

These papers are due on the dates specified by the GM. Typically, they should be posted on the course website before the third, fourth and fifth day of the game, but your GM may modify this. Be sure to check with him or her well before the game begins so that you are not taken by surprise.

The papers may be as long as they need to be. Each journalist should write at least 750-1000 words in each issue. In addition, the papers may (and should) contain articles written by other players—op-eds or cartoons or informational stories.

One of the journalists should take responsibility for editing the paper (collecting articles, formatting the paper, which should look as much like a newspaper as possible, ensuring that non-journalists who want to publish an article have a contact person, etc.) To compensate for the extra work, that player may write one fewer article during the game (that is, about 250-400 words less than the other journalist).

Your papers will be distributed to all players in the game and will help them achieve their own goals. Accordingly, if you publish a story that turns out to be false and you are called on it, you will be forced to publish a special retraction and/or clarification. This may well have significant consequences for your attempts to cultivate private sources (and for your chances of winning the game). Note: good journalists always have two unrelated sources for any story they write. You need not do this, but you should anticipate being called out for unprofessional conduct or simply naïveté if you choose to publish based on one source.

The press conferences staged by the UN and other organizations and individuals are a key source of information for your articles. You should ask lots of questions at these conferences—to confirm information you think you heard at meetings of the UNSC and to probe for further details, explanations and insight. In particular, these allow you to find leads that you can later use to approach people privately, or publicly confirm things you know but can't cite. **If you don't consistently ask questions during these and use this information in your stories, your participation grade will suffer significantly.**

In addition, you should cover any demonstrations that occur. Demonstrations make good news and sell newspapers. Your publisher (read GM) will be very disappointed if you don't publish stories about demonstrations, complete with quotes from participants and reactions from policy makers.

Finally: You may gather the information for a scoop by traveling to Rwanda and publishing a story drawn from your experiences there. The GM will point you to specific readings you may do that will form the basis of your story. This will count for **one** story and can be done a maximum of one time. However, there are two consequences of this.

- The first is simple. Reporting from a war zone is risky business and there is a chance you will be killed or seriously injured during the trip (only the GM knows the exact likelihood of this happening). If this happens to you, you may gain fame and fortune, but you will lose the game.
- The second is that traveling to and from Rwanda takes time. Should you chose this option, you must miss one complete round of the game (you should be present in the room, but may not speak nor interact in any way with the other players). This naturally will impact your ability to do the research to publish your second scoop.

Strategy suggestions:

Your primary goal is to persuade people, especially the representatives of public opinion, that what is happening in Rwanda is genocide and must be stopped. This requires you to gather as much information as possible. To some degree, you need facts, both about the situation on the ground in Rwanda and about the decisions being made in New York. But it is not sufficient to know what is happening. You need to understand motivations and goals. Why are the powers voting the way they are? Why are some players refusing to share information or claiming that they know little? Why do some ambassadors seem to stall at every opportunity? Only by understanding the politics of the situation can you hope to persuade others to back your position.

Thus, you must ask as many questions as you can at the press conferences. Moreover, you should approach people privately as well. Both human rights organizations and politicians/diplomats may have agendas they can't admit publicly. It pays off to touch base regularly with all kinds of people in your search for information that will support your stories. If you choose, you may promise anonymity to your source. If you do, you must keep this promise or lose the game. Remember, too, that people will be using you just as you use them. You should not be surprised if someone passes you false

information in an effort to impact the debate or sway public opinion. It's your job to figure out what is true and what is false.

Once you have this information, you can use it to press your agenda. You can do so through your newspaper articles, which must be fair and truthful, but may take a position on subject you're writing about. You can also do so through your questioning at the press conferences. It is certainly appropriate to ask tough questions about subjects ambassadors don't want to discuss. It is also wise to press ambassadors to explain why they refuse to answer certain questions. Other people are present at press conferences. Use your questions to persuade these witnesses.

Finally, factual articles are important and valuable. But emotional appeals and narratives sway readers more than dispassionate analysis. If you are going to persuade people they should risk their money and relatives to stop violence in a far-off country, you need to show them the human faces of those you hope to save.

Allison Des Forges, Senior Advisor for the African Continent, Human Rights Watch

You are one of the world's leading authorities on Rwanda. Both your Master's thesis and your Ph. D. dissertation, completed in 1972 at Yale University, dealt with the history of Rwanda under colonization. You had become interested in the region even earlier, when you spent a semester in Tanzania teaching Rwandan refugees while at Radcliffe.

Most people spend a year or two doing additional research and then publish their dissertations. Somehow you never had the time. You don't regret it, though. Your academic interests were never as strong as your interests in human rights. Shortly after completing your doctorate, you began to work as a volunteer for Human Rights Watch. Your expertise and conviction were so apparent they soon hired you. You kept your teaching job, but from then on you spent much of your life travelling in the US and Africa advocating for peace and justice.

Lately you've been increasingly worried about Rwanda. No, that's not the right word. You've been terrified. You've been there several times since the civil war erupted in 1990 and have kept in close touch with friends and officials. Where most people have been paying attention to Arusha and the negotiations over the Broad Based Transitional Government, you've been watching events on the ground. There, you've seen evidence of massacre after massacre, primarily of Tutsis. You know what happened in Burundi in the early 1970s and again in 1993. It looks for all the world like it will happen again.

You've done your best to stop it, to put your finger in the dike. You persuaded (or so you thought) the Rwandan government to produce and distribute new identification cards that lacked a spot for ethnic identity. You even managed to raise funds from international organizations to pay for it. Somehow it never got done. Recently, you participated in an investigation that condemned human rights violations against Tutsis and against critics of the government. Since then, you've tried repeatedly to bring Rwanda to the attention of high-level officials in the US and UN.

You've largely been frustrated. Most people aren't even sure where Rwanda is. Others respond simply that if Arusha is given time to work (translation: "we need to ignore human rights violations for the moment"), it will solve everything. You believe the opposite. If human rights are ignored, momentum for oppression and atrocity will continue to build, leading eventually to catastrophe.

Then you learned of the plane crash. Your immediate concern is for the safety of your friends in Rwanda. But your broader goal is to force the US and the UN to do something to protect all Rwandans and to set a precedent that massive attacks on an ethnic minority are unacceptable. How sad that you would have to argue for this at the end of the 20th century. How can you convince them to help?

Victory conditions:

You win automatically if, at the end of the game,

- UNAMIR has remained in the country, under UN leadership, without being weakened, throughout the game.

AND

- The UNSC has reinforced UNAMIR and authorized it to suppress violence against civilians **before the end of the third game session**. Such a mission must be sponsored and staffed by the UN, not by an individual country.

You may win if the UNSC passes an alternate plan for intervention that succeeds in ending the violence against civilians. The success of such a plan will be determined by a die roll at the end of the game. A variety of factors, such as the strength of UN support for the mission, the continued presence of UNAMIR, the extent and quality of planning for the mission, and so on, will modify this die roll.

You lose if

- Most or all UNAMIR soldiers are withdrawn from Rwanda and are not replaced by another intervention force.

OR

- UNAMIR remains in Rwanda but its Rules of Engagement prohibit it from intervening to suppress the violence against civilians and the UNSC does not authorize any other means of suppressing genocide.

Strategy suggestions:

Your main advantages lie in your intimate knowledge of the region and your access to and reputation with journalists. You need to maximize both of these assets in order to win.

You should do some research to find out exactly what your character would have known about Rwanda since 1990. You should at a minimum consult the report you co-wrote entitled the *Report of the International Commission of Investigation of Human Rights Violations in Rwanda since 1 October 1990*, published in January 1993, posted at <http://www.grandslacs.net/doc/2523.pdf>. While written diplomatically, the message of the report is clear. It was one of many reports by human rights organizations warning about the future in Rwanda (see, for instance, the Amnesty International Report *Rwanda: persecution of Tutsi Minority and Repression of Government Critics, 1990-1992* published in May of 1992). You should also consult the chronology in Alison Des Forges, *Leave None to Tell the Story* for a comprehensive list of human rights violations in the period immediately before April. This lengthy analysis of events in Rwanda in

April and May of 1994 is no longer in print but is available on line. Remember that you may use this as background, but may not cite it, as it has not yet been written in 1994. You might also skim Linda Melvern, *Conspiracy to Murder: The Rwandan Genocide*, especially chaps. 2-6. You may assume your contacts in Rwanda provide you with much of the information in this book. Recognize you are one of the few players to have been given these tips. Many of the other players have little knowledge of the region and its past. You need to figure out who these are, who might be willing to help you, and how to get your message out. **IMPORTANT:** Remember that, while you may choose to read ahead, you **MAY NOT** cite events that happened in history after the date of the current round of the game. Doing so intentionally or repeatedly will cause you to lose the game.

However, just information is insufficient. You must persuade people to take action. Perhaps you can persuade the US or UN to intervene. You should certainly try. But if this fails, you need to persuade public opinion to intervene. There's one thing you know. Both President Clinton and Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali place a great deal of emphasis on public opinion polls. You need to use press conferences (both as questioners and as presenters) to get your message across and persuade public opinion to demand intervention.

As you think about how you'll make your case, remember a simple truth of communication. Rational arguments are important and valuable. But emotional appeals and narratives change minds more than dispassionate analysis. If you are going to persuade people they should risk their money and relatives to stop violence in a far-off country, you need to show them the human faces of those you hope to save.

Finally, there are ways to try to intimidate the interim Rwandan government into changing its policies. For instance, the UNSC can threaten its leaders with prosecution for war crimes or violations of UN covenants. It can vote to freeze any bank accounts they have in foreign countries (think Switzerland). It can even ask UN member countries to jam or suppress the hate radio station RTL. Each of these actions requires a vote by the UNSC. **NONE** of them, on their own, will stop the atrocities (thus, even if all of these are passed, they are not sufficient to win you the game). But they may decrease the violence and make military intervention more likely to succeed.

Paper Assignments:

Paper #1: Write a 4 page persuasive paper presented to the American government asking it to declare events in Rwanda genocide and to propose intervention to the UNSC. It should be 4 pages in length and should be given to the American players before the 2nd meeting of the UNSC. You may choose to present this to the UNSC (if the UNSC allows this) or leak it to the media as early as the second round of the game. This is unlikely to make you popular with the American or UN administration. On the other hand, if they won't acknowledge the truth, how will others learn what's happening?

Paper #2: Write a short (4 pp. or so) paper supporting your goal of stopping violations of human rights in Rwanda. The exact focus of the paper will vary based on discussion and

events in the game to that point. It may be a speech or memo to the UNSC, but might be a letter to a particular individual, an op-ed, or similar writing as agreed upon with the GM (this may change the requirement to post the paper—consult the GM if you are not sure). In all cases, it should be persuasive in tone and should address both game events and the philosophical questions regarding intervention. It should be posted sometime before the 3rd or 4th round of the game.

British Ambassador to the United Nations

The posting to the UN is a capstone to a successful diplomatic career. You have progressed through a number of appointments at embassies across the world and in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in London (the FCO formulates and implements foreign policy for Her Majesty's government-subject to the Prime Minister). But the UN is the feather in your cap, at least until now. The British government and people have demonstrated a profound ambiguity toward the United Nations. Nevertheless, while in practice Britain's relationships with the US (the so-called special relationship) and the countries of the still brand new European Union are more important, the symbolic importance of the UN is unparalleled. You are right to be proud.

This doesn't make it any easier. Early in his tenure as Prime Minister, John Major laid out a policy of respect for humanitarian needs and for Britain's duties in the international community. You can't be sure if he was serious about this or not (even at your exalted level, you know only what your bosses see fit to tell you). What is clear is that Britain has paid, at best, lip service to these ideals as time has passed. Now it faces a number of tricky diplomatic situations. Most important is the crisis in the former Yugoslavia. What started out in 1991 as efforts by various provinces to defect has turned into a bloody confrontation between rival ethnic and religious groups. Serbs, Croats, and Bosnian Muslims have been fighting for more than two years, a conflict that resembles, at times, blood feuds more than it does proper warfare. While you have your doubts, the Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister believe these feuds are just that, the result of ethnic hatreds dating back centuries rather than rationally planned campaigns to achieve rationally determined goals. If this is in fact true, the only policy Britain can reasonably adopt is allowing them to fight it out until one side or the other wins.

Unfortunately, the UNSC has moved much farther in the direction of international intervention and peacekeeping (making!) than Britain would like. Rather than staying aloof, it has ordered lightly armed and equipped soldiers into Bosnia. Unable to be everywhere, these forces have chosen to focus on a few safe havens (as the journalists called them), small cities like Srebrenica and Gorazde which have swelled to three or four times their original size as refugees from across Bosnia have streamed into them. How these "safe havens" are to be made safe is a difficult question. The Serbs understand this and periodically shell the safe areas (with shelling particularly intense in Gorazde over the past few weeks). Whether they aim to create panic among the refugees or simply to thumb their nose at the international community is an open question. But the UN's rules of engagement have prevented any significant response, making the UN forces something of a laughingstock. The United States and France have increasingly advocated a stronger UN response or using a NATO force to intervene on behalf of (or, you suspect, in spite of) the UNSC. Whatever your doubts about the Prime Minister's interpretation of the origins of the war, you agree wholeheartedly with him about this. Any intervention simply risks getting young men killed (the recent loss of a British Harrier fighter-plane over Gorazde emphasizes this danger). Neither the Serbs nor the Bosnians are likely to call it quits now.

The crisis in Bosnia is one example of a larger problem. The United Nations, you (and your superiors) believe, is facing a crisis of confidence. The dramatic increase in peacekeeping (chap VI) operations since the end of the Cold War was, at best, ill-judged. The UNSC acted with the best of motives but an appallingly ill-considered estimate of its ability to mount operations successfully. The most visible of many failures was the disastrous incident in Somalia, where 18 US peacekeepers were killed attempting to apprehend a Somalia warlord. Upon hearing the news, the US had almost visibly recoiled. Both President Clinton and leaders in the Congress had insisted the UN pull back from its present commitments and avoid future entanglements. Another disaster could destroy the UN's ability to act in the world.

So the recent news that someone shot down President Habyarimana's plane on the 6th of April left you rather cold. It's not clear how much the FCO knows about Rwanda. As you learn from a quick glance at the FCO directory, Britain doesn't even have an embassy in Kigali (the closest is in neighboring Uganda, where the British High Commissioner in Uganda also served as non-resident ambassador in Rwanda and Burundi). What you do know is London sees Rwanda as a country about which "we know little and care less."¹ Accordingly, British policy toward events there will be based on broader concerns, not its interest in the country itself. In practical terms, the FCO has identified the following goals:

- Maintain the special relationship with the United States.
- Make sure British troops are not committed at any risk to them or significant expense to the British government unless vital national interests are at stake.
- Make sure the prestige of the UN is not put at risk by casualties in UNAMIR or in any succeeding force. In fact, if casualties seem likely, it is better to persuade the UNSC to withdraw UNAMIR altogether than to risk the deaths of peacekeepers.
- Don't let Rwanda get in the way of a cooperative relationship with France. Ever since the 1960s, France has endeavored to create in Africa a French Commonwealth. This putative commonwealth is made up of French speaking countries (and former colonies, you remember, although you risk being the pot that called the kettle black) tied to France through financial aid and, in many cases, a common currency, military agreements and advisors and personal relationships between French and African leaders. This "commonwealth" forms an essential component of France's strategy for remaining a global power. You know full well France sees the RPF, led by English speaking soldiers and coming from English speaking Uganda, as a threat to this commonwealth. How significant these fears are is unknown to you. A conversation about this with the French leader is advisable.

All in all, these instructions leave you little room to maneuver. Whether you'll need any depends on how events play out, both in Kigali and in New York.

¹ Paraphrased from diplomatic instructions to British diplomats regarding Rwanda, cited in Linda Melvern and Paul Williams, "Britannia Waived the Rules: The Major Government and the 1994 Rwanda Genocide", *African Affairs* (2004), vol. 103, pp. 1-22.

Victory conditions:

You win automatically if, at the end of the game,

- Most or all UNAMIR soldiers are withdrawn from Rwanda and are not replaced by another intervention force

OR

- UNAMIR remains in Rwanda but its Rules of Engagement prohibit it from intervening to suppress the violence against civilians and the UNSC does not authorize any other means of suppressing genocide.

You may win if the UNSC passes an alternate plan for intervention to end the violence against civilians. The success of such a plan will be determined by a die roll at the end of the game. A variety of factors, such as the strength of UN support for the mission, the continued presence of UNAMIR, the extent and quality of planning for the mission, and so on, will modify this die roll. If this plan fails to stop civilian casualties, you win.

You lose if

- UNAMIR has remained in the country, under UN leadership, without being weakened, throughout the game AND The UNSC has reinforced UNAMIR and authorized it to suppress violence against civilians **before the end of the third game session**. Such a mission must be sponsored and staffed by the UN, not by an individual country.

OR

- UN forces take casualties three or more separate times.

Responsibilities and powers:

You are a public representative of a government elected in a democracy. If the representative of public opinion in Britain favors a particular policy and expresses this opinion persuasively, you must support this in the UNSC. If that occurs, you have probably lost the game.

This power may only be used **beginning in the 3rd session** of the UNSC. The GM will direct you when you must follow the wishes of the representative of public opinion.

Strategy Suggestions:

The rules for voting in the UNSC leave you in a strong position. You have the veto power granted to permanent powers, as do France and Britain. You can reasonably

assume both France and the US will oppose intervention, at least at the beginning. This makes you likely you will be able to block any attempt to strengthen UN forces in Rwanda unless the representative of public opinion forces you to vote differently.

Your first task is to prevent UN casualties. Especially if UNAMIR suffers losses, you must strive to remove it from Rwanda (remember that you lose the game if UN forces take casualties three or more times). It was created to enforce a peace agreement, not to force the sides to negotiate (remember that UNAMIR is authorized under Chapter VI of the UN Charter, not chapter VII). If and when fighting erupts between the RPF and the Rwandan army, the peace agreement will clearly be null and void. And, legally, UNAMIR should leave the country. Once it is gone, it will be much more difficult to persuade the UNSC to create a new intervention force and get that force into position to act.

More broadly, you should persuade the UNSC that intervention is unjustified and unlikely to succeed. One way to do this is to work hard to describe the conflict as at heart a civil war rather than violations of human rights (if the UNSC or the US publicly recognizes this as genocide, your hopes for victory have suffered a huge blow). A second element of this argument is to talk about capacity. How can the UN mobilize a force large enough and powerful enough to end a conflict both sides want (well, except perhaps the civilians)? How can it be deployed in a way that will be effective without risking casualties? Keep raising objections. This is a short game. Delay almost always works to your advantage.

The role of public opinion is critical. While leaders of NGOs and journalists don't possess votes in the UNSC, they do have ways to influence public opinion. You should work with your allies to implement a common strategy to manage the media to ensure they don't sabotage your efforts. Here again, you need to paint an alternative narrative to that presented by those who advocate intervention. Public relations is all about ensuring the public remembers your version of the story, not that of others. Make sure you think carefully about this.

Finally, it's unclear to you how much you, the British government or even the UNSC as a body knows about what's going on in Rwanda. You need to work hard to have access to any information other powers (in particular the United States or the UN Secretary-General) have about events. Then you need to manage that information in ways that will further your goals.

Special Note: You may, should you choose, donate money (up to 4.5 million pounds, or more than \$6.5 million) to Rwanda in some way shape or form for **humanitarian assistance**. This **may not** fund any UN force, but is rather to be bilateral (bilateral is the fancy way of saying aid given by one country directly to another rather than money contributed to a larger pot funded by a number of countries—referred to as multilateral aid). From a practical (and historical) perspective, this money does little. Its primary purpose is political—to be able to head off calls for intervention by public opinion by

claiming to be doing something already. Accordingly, this announcement is probably best made only if public opinion seems to be moving in favor of intervention.

Paper Assignments:

Paper #1: Write a 4 page paper arguing against intervention in Rwanda (or, alternatively, for withdrawing UNAMIR). It should address both the philosophical issues regarding humanitarian intervention (make sure you address the readings assigned for the game) and the practical challenges facing it in this specific case. It should be posted as indicated by the GM sometime before the first meeting of the UNSC and presented verbally at that meeting.

Paper #2: Write a short (4 pp. or so) paper supporting your goal of preventing intervention in Rwanda. The exact focus of the paper will vary based on discussion and events in the game to that point. It may be a speech or memo to the UNSC, but might be a letter to a particular individual, an op-ed, or similar writing as agreed upon with the GM (this may change the requirement to post the paper—consult the GM if you are not sure). In all cases, it should be persuasive in tone and should address both game events and the philosophical questions regarding intervention. It should be posted sometime before the 3rd or 4th round of the game.

Representative of Public Opinion in Europe

News stories blurs together as you prepare dinner in your small flat. Real Madrid preparing to sign another player from Latin America. The Serbs still lobbing shells at Gorazde. Mitterand (the president of France, looking more and more ill recently) still squabbling with Balladour (the French Prime Minister, of a different party from Mitterand, in an arrangement the French call “cohabitation”). Revelations in Austria about Austrian participation in the Holocaust fifty years earlier. Chaos still plaguing Liberia. And, at the very end, a minute or two noting that the plane of President Habyarimana (who’s that?) from Rwanda (Africa? Asia?) was shot down last night. All on board were killed. You let most of this run in one ear and out the other. While you’d like to have the time to pay attention to the rest of the world, in fact most of your life is consumed with making sure your son gets to football (soccer) practice and your daughter to and from school on time.

You are, in other words, an ordinary European. You may make up your own name and backstory, but you must be “normal” (no far left communist or neo-fascist far right characters allowed and no characters from the Balkans). You do have one family relationship predetermined. Someone close to you is in the army (might be a brother or sister, perhaps a cousin or even close friend). **You should introduce yourself and your backstory, including which European country you represent, at the very beginning of the first meeting of the UNSC—before any speeches or debates are made.** You should choose one of the P5 power, thus Britain, France or Russia. Should there be more than player playing the role of European public opinion, you should coordinate with that person so you don’t choose the same country.

Victory Conditions:

In this game you will function as an indeterminate. As such, your task is to listen carefully to all of the arguments presented by the other players and decide whose position you will support.

To help you do this, you will need be present at and pay careful attention to the meetings of the UNSC. But you should also attend press conferences purposefully, listening carefully to the questions asked and answers given and even asking questions yourself. You should read carefully the newspapers produced by students playing the role of journalists. The journalists may have access to information you do not. But you should not necessarily count on them presenting it impartially.

You should tell the GM (make sure to talk to him or her to determine what means of communication is preferred) which side you support immediately after the **4th UNSC debate**. From then on, your job is to work in the game to try to get your point of view represented in measures passed by the UNSC. However, you may not publicly announce your decision until after the **4th press conference round** (although you may imply it through your questions or participation in protests). You win if the policy you support is

the policy actually implemented by the end of the game. To help this happen, you should take an active role in talking with other players (although your opportunity to talk during UNSC meetings is quite limited) and in participating in demonstrations. To the extent that you are active and persuasive, you have the possibility of forcing **one** of the European ambassadors to vote the way you demand.

Responsibilities and powers:

First, as the representative of public opinion in a democracy, your opinion carries great weight. **Beginning in the 3rd meeting of the UNSC**, you may attempt to force the American policy makers to vote the way you want them to. To do so, you should stand up after the UNSC chair has announced the vote but before the US has voted and tell the GM that you wish the US to vote a certain way. At that point, the GM will ask you to give a speech. You should then explain to the class how the US should vote and why you believe it should vote that way. This explanation should be thoughtful. It should include references both to the readings and whatever events in the games (speeches, debates in the UNSC, newspaper articles, statements at press conferences, demonstrations, etc.) have shaped your decision.

The GM will then roll a die and consult a table. That die roll, modified by the quality of your speech, your actions up to this point, and events in the game itself, will decide whether you may determine your ambassadors vote. If so, the GM will instruct the American delegation to vote as you wish.

Remember that the power of your speech is a significant modifier to the die roll. Accordingly:

- You have to present a compelling argument for your government should follow your preferred policy.
- Just because your first intervention is successful does not mean it will be again. In the same way, failure the first time should not prevent you from attempting to intervene again.
- An inner consistency in your position is important. If you switch positions seemingly at random or without substantial justification, it will be difficult for the GM to accept your arguments. Accordingly, it's not a bad idea to delay intervening if you are at all unsure. If you do change your position, you must explain why you did so and why you found the other position so persuasive.
- You will not get a chance to plan or practice your speech. So it is critical that you are paying careful attention to the debates and that you sketch out potential speeches as you go.

Second. You will find it difficult to make up your mind if you don't get answers to your questions. Accordingly, you are **required** to ask at least three substantial questions (in other words, asking a player "how are you today?" won't count) during each set of press conferences. You should note these questions in the attached chart and show the chart to the GM at the end of the game.

Strategy Suggestions:

Your biggest task is to figure out what side you believe makes the most compelling argument. **The GM will undoubtedly lower your participation grade should you appear to pick a side based simply on how likely that side is to win the game.** So don't try to game the system. Instead, work hard to understand the arguments each side is making and to decide for yourself which are the most convincing.

To say you are an indeterminate does not imply you are a blank slate. You share the healthy suspicion of the United States common in Europe (even after the election of Bill Clinton as President). While you heartily embrace international institutions, you are suspicious of their behavior in Africa (**part of your role** will be to determine how your choice of your country of origin affects this opinion). Your head is still spinning from all the changes over the past decade, from the collapse of the Soviet bloc to the passing of the Maastricht treaty (what a surreal feeling, not to have to present your passport when you cross into another country!) to the outbreak of war in Bosnia. In particular, the images of blue-helmeted peacekeepers in Bosnia watching ineffectually as fighting continued has made you doubt your previous commitment to the UN. Your default position should be one of suspicion of international intervention. If you switch from this position without careful explanation, the GM will undoubtedly weigh that in his/her grading.

On the other hand, you do believe in our obligation to help each other. You can and might change your mind and support UN action in Rwanda. To convince you to support an international operation to put this into practice, however, would mean persuading you that it was a dire emergency and that intervention would actually achieve the results it promised. In addition, you must be convinced the UN has a plan for Bosnia as well as for Rwanda.

Paper Assignment:

Paper #1: Write a 4 page paper describing what an average citizen of your country would be thinking, reading, hearing or caring about in April of 1994. This paper should be distributed to the rest of the class in a manner determined by the GM. It may be written in an academic style, but you may choose to write it as a journal entry, as a magazine article, or in another, more creative way. This will require some significant research. Perhaps you can find history books in the library that will help. But you may be better served by reading a newspapers and magazines from March and April and using these as your primary source material (you will need to look at more than one source here. You might well look at *The Economist* for political, economic and foreign policy coverage, and then consult a newspaper like *The Guardian*, *The European*, or *The Independent* for cultural coverage) It will **not** be sufficient just to find some timeline from the internet and crib from that. The paper should be posted as indicated by the GM before the beginning of the second round of the game.

Paper #2: Write a 3-4 page paper laying out what policy you think the UN should adopt. It should take the form of a letter to your national leader (president, chancellor, etc.). It should demonstrate an understanding of the various issues that have emerged during the game and should try to persuade the reader that your conclusions are correct. It should be posted on as indicated by the GM immediately after the 4th round of the game.

Game round	Who did you ask?	What did you ask?	What was the answer?
1			
1			
1			
2			
2			
2			
3			
3			
3			
4			
4			
4			