

Panel 2: Journalism as Genocide - The Media Trial

Introduction

Allan Thompson: Okay, ladies and gentleman, we're going to resume with panel number two. The chairperson for this panel is journalist Thierry Cruvellier, who has years of experience with the Rwanda file and knows each of the panelists very well. So Thierry will take over, and I will slip to the side.

Thierry Cruvellier: Welcome back, I'm confused about the language I should use. It's pretty pleasant to be in Canada, way we can speak French and English. So maybe I'm going to switch to French for a change. In November, 1994, a few months after the genocide, the Security Council at the UN created the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. In January, 1997, the trial began in Arusha, in Tanzania. In May, 2000, since we have to move along quickly in this case, in May, 2000, Georges Ruggiu, who we referred to a little earlier this morning, who was the only non-Rwandan journalist at RTLM decided to plead guilty, and was convicted, and sentenced to 12 years in prison. But it was a few months later that the main trial opened dealing with the question at issue to us today, which is the media trial with Ferdinand Nahimana, Jean-Bosco Barayagwiza, both of which were members of the initiative committee, and founders of RTLM, and Hassan Ngeze, who was the editor-in-chief of the newspaper Kangura. The trial opened in October, 2000, and ended only in August, 2003. So this gives you some idea therefore of the issues they tried to deal with there. And it ended with the conviction and prison for life for nine members Nahimana, Ngeze, and 35 years also for reasons for procedure for Barayagwiza.

To talk about this trial therefore, we have panelists here, you have them listed on the program; Thomas Kamilindi, who has now a rather white beard, so I guess you can see he's a veteran therefore of journalism in Rwanda. Charity Simone also, who was also very active in that trial, and Jean-Marie Biju Duval, who defended Nahimana, and has the courage to come and explain his viewpoint here before a certain number of witnesses, who really did testify against his client, because Thomas testified. And our last speaker here is Francois-Xavier Nsanzuwera also testified in the media trial. So we've also got his biography also. So the trial today is now before the Court of Appeal. So it's not all over yet in legal terms. We have to remember, and this is explained perhaps why some things were dealt with by these legal specialists. So I've think we've heard a lot. We've seen a lot also, and from the moment we can start to think from a rather critical viewpoint about this trial, and about some of the questions, which it raised. I thinking, for example, of two main issues, which I hope we'll be able to deal with a little this morning; the first is to what degree international justice did, in fact, perform it's responsibility to judge these individuals. I think it's very important therefore to try and look at the details of this the way in which they tried to actually perform the mission.

The second problem: what are the consequences and the questions that judgment delivered? One of the questions which asks us as journalists, and I draw your attention to this, because for some of us, there are some concerns when we read this judgment on the consequences it could have, given the behaviour of the media. So I hope the members of the panel therefore will be able to enlighten us to some degree on this. Thomas you have the floor.

Thomas Kamilindi, BBC journalist in Kigali. Former Radio Rwanda journalist

Thomas Kamilindi: Good morning. I've been a journalist for 20 years. I've always worked in Rwanda before the genocide, during the genocide I couldn't, but then afterwards I continued, and I'm still continuing today. So my first question that I could ask you, and ask you yourselves to ask, should the journalists themselves be put on trial? Should they be judged? My answer is yes, and that's why I did, in fact, testify before the International Criminal Tribunal for the prosecution, and I testified against the person, who was the director of Rwanda Information Office, which was, and still is, the governmental press organization, which comprises media, radio, television, etc., because I consider that the journalists are citizens like any other member of the public, therefore they can be found guilty like anybody else, but also because I consider that the journalists have a major role to play for the good of society, and not for the problems of society, but problems were created in my society. Evil also did take place and the media played an important role in this.

So I'd like to give you the background really of the press in Rwanda, place it in context, because when we talk about the press, people in the west think perhaps that it's like it is in the western world. That's not the case. The press in Rwanda has existed since 1933. That was the year when the first newspaper was created. It is a newspaper, which still exists of the Catholic Church, and still exists today. The Catholic Church is very important in my country. And then in the '60s, a government newspaper was set up, both written in my mother tongue, in the native language of Rwanda, and that's all. There were other attempts also to create newspapers, but in fact they didn't lead anywhere, and in 1991 to explain what happened, there was an explosion if you will, a democratic explosion. There was a boom, and a large number of newspapers were created, but radio remained just a single single, which had been created in 1961. It remained unique, and it belonged to the government. So it was the voice of the authorities, and the authorities are respected in my country, and what the radio states, and the way people were educated and brought up in my country, what's stated on the radio is taken as word of gospel. In 1993, RTLM was born. It was created by people, who were in power, in fact, because the national radio, which was a single, unique radio station did not really belong to the people in power, because I have to say we weren't very free. So we contacted a strike, and I myself, I'm not boasting here, but the fact is I lead the strike. The strike was conducted to protest against the lack of independence. So professionally we wanted to report the facts as they actually took place, so that's why we called the strike. In 1992, the first television station emerged. It's the only one. It also belongs to the government. Therefore there's no pluralism there, as you would find in the west.

So that gives you some background of the press in Rwanda. Maybe this explains a few things to you. We're talking about Kangura, we're talking about RTLM. So the second question I'd like to ask you now, well it's a challenge really for you. Should the journalists, should they have worked, or could they have worked actually at the time, yes or no? They had to, but not to fight. Because the press is not there to fight, but rather to correct things, to actually state the real situation, because there was so much propaganda then, and people, in fact, they received so much hate messages. You can't imagine it. For example, me. I'm here in front of you today. I have a daughter. She's 12 ½ now. She was very small at the time. One day somebody said, "that one is a snake. They have to kill her." She still wasn't even three years of age at the time.

She said to me, “Daddy, am I a snake? Am I really a snake? RTLTM said I was snake a thousand times. Kangura wrote that I was a snake.” Is that the role of the press? Is that the role of the media to harm people? You can either harm people or you can do good, that’s a choice. So it was possible to work at the time, but the person who could work, the only people who could work were the people in the camp of the killers. The “good guys” of the epoch. That’s why I wasn’t able to work. I wasn’t in their camp, but I’m a radio journalist so I did still work.

There are a thousand ways in which you can work. When I was a refugee in the Hotel des Milles Collines, Francois-Xavier was there also, and he was a witness. So I asked the people, “what are you doing so the people could know that you’re here?” And they said, “we’re not doing anything.” So I contacted a certain number of refugees like myself, and we had Francois-Xavier, who was a human rights activist, and had a lot of fax numbers, telephone numbers, all sorts of contacts. So we sent faxes and faxes, one on top of the other when the telephone worked. So therefore we informed the world of what was happening. In the Hotel des Milles Collines, I trained the refugees to become journalists, even though we couldn’t speak. We could only speak through this way, but we did act. We did something.

Well 10 minutes is not a lot of time to tell you everything I want to tell you, so I’m going to jump over a lot of things. So should the journalists be placed on trial? Should they be judged? I think they should for the harm that they’ve done, and I’m proud that it’s ICTR, without wanting to offend Mr. Biju Duval, Mr. Nahimana was condemned to prison for life. If he hadn’t been convicted, then I myself would have concluded there was no justice. And if he’s acquitted in appeal, I will state that. We have to be responsible for our acts. If I do some harm to somebody, then I have to answer for this. If I write something bad about somebody, I have to be responsible for that. You can all become journalists. So think about it, think about it carefully.

We talked about the role of the international media, and the international media weren’t there. On April 12, 1994, all the foreigners were evacuated. All international public servants, all cooperants, including the journalists, they were all evacuated. The genocide took place over one or two weeks, nobody knew anything about it. It was in secrecy, and you need a few courageous people to come to the country, a country which didn’t exist. There was no structure left. You can’t imagine what it was like. So the people would have to start to know, but it was too late then. Thousands and thousands of people are being killed, and if the press had been there, then maybe the harm would have been less. On April 26, the telephones were being interrupted, and then they were restored, and I called some friends at Radio France International in Paris, and I said, “we’re still alive,” and they said, “we have no news, what’s going on? Can we have an interview with you? Can you explain to us what’s going on?” and I said, “yes”. So they asked me how we were living, how many of us were there. There were about 700 refugees there, and we were drinking water from the swimming pool in which the military were supposed to look after, where they actually did the washing of their clothes, and they transformed therefore the trend, and in fact, they used it as a washroom, and we had to drink that water without being able to boil it. And so they asked me, “what’s going on in military terms?” Well the government forces, I explained, are in fact, losing ground. There are defeats everywhere. I got this information from friends, and the massacres, and I explained to them, you can’t describe it. It’s indescribable. There are no terms for it. So the interview was broadcast, and the army decided therefore to bomb the hotel. That’s what I was told. But the people there stopped me from going

out. Because I wanted to go out, I was the source of the problem, maybe they wouldn't kill the others. If I were to be killed, maybe the others wouldn't be bombed. So I had to conclude therefore that the government army didn't want this to be known. And therefore if the press had played its role, I think therefore that things wouldn't have happened that way. So justice is necessary, even for the press, even for the journalists. Thank you for your attention. Thank you.



Simone Monasebian, Charity Kagwi-Ndungu, (presenting jointly) Trial Attorneys, Office of the Prosecutor, ICTR. Prosecutors in the Media

Thierry Cruveilli: Thanks Thomas, we move on now, with Simone and Charity Kagwi from the office of the Prosecutor.

Simone Monasebian: I'm going to present from over here, because I'm going to show you some of the evidence in the case, and some pieces of the hate media involved so that you can make your own decision. So I'll just step down for a moment. I came the ICTR as a prosecutor in the year 2000, a true believer in virtually unbridled free speech. I was a defense attorney and a journalist, a First Amendment absolutist. The 240 days at trial tested that on a daily basis. In Rwanda, unlike the United States, which of course, also has its own problems, and is not a pure democracy, the judiciary was emasculated, was made impotent by the executive branch. There was not a free marketplace of ideas, not everybody was given a platform. And while all of the media that emerged by 1994 came under the guise of the liberalization of the press, of freedom of speech, of providing a free marketplace of ideas, it wound up doing the very opposite. And so what I took away from this case was that, what may be very well and good in the United States may not be the same approach that has to be applied elsewhere. I still believe in the absoluteness of the First Amendment in the context of the United States, even in the post-9/11 United States, but in the circumstances of what happened in Rwanda, I don't think one can responsibly take a First Amendment absolutist stance.

I'd like us to look at some of the excerpts from RTLM Radio so we can see what exactly was being broadcasted over the radio in 1994 in Rwanda, but before we do so, I think it's important to make a distinction. In the December 3 judgment in the media case, the judges criminalized RTLM radio's emissions both before and after April, 1994, and while the broadcasts after April 6, 1994, by any responsible accounting were clearly not protected even by a First Amendment absolutist stance, there is a legitimate controversy as to whether or not the broadcasts before April 6 were also criminally sanctionable under international criminal law, and international humanitarian law. In the ICTR, the judges found that the broadcasts before April 6 were just as criminal, albeit to a different degree.

Let's look at a few of them after April 6, and then a few before. So if the booth is ready, I'm going to be playing sound and video, and we'll go to the first clip now. Of course we tested this before, and yet the screen is frozen. Could ... It's frozen. Okay. In the meantime, I'll just speak about something else so we can get this proceeding going.

It's not frozen any more thank you. Okay. What we're going to be looking at now is a broadcast

from RTLM Radio from June 4, 1994, by one of its broadcasters, Kantano Habimana.

FRENCH broadcast (inaudible).

Now for the benefit of you who speak French, that was excerpt five for the booth, and in the future, I will say the number of the excerpt so that you can read that. In the meantime, if the French booth can just read excerpt five, or maybe we can come back to that later is probably more preferable.

That instance of talking about the small noses clearly signified the physical characteristics of Tutsis, and certainly was a call to exterminate them by RTLM.

Another broadcast talks about standing up as one man against the Tutsi, and that's a broadcast from May 30, 1994, by Gaspard Gahigi who was the editorial director of RTLM, as well as a journalist, and if the booth can go to excerpt one, and read that paragraph, I'll now play that short one so you can get another idea.

FRENCH broadcast (inaudible).

Okay, I'm sorry that the sound is not coming out loud enough in that one, but because General Dallaire spoke today, I think it might be interesting to also see one in which RTLM mentioned him. General Dallaire, Francois-Xavier Nsanzuwera, Thomas Kamilindi were among people who were often targeted by RTLM. If the booth can now go to excerpt number two, this is a May 31, 1994, broadcast by Kantano Habimana.

FRENCH broadcast (inaudible).

The last thing I'll leave you with, and we can maybe in another venue later in the day because I'm being held to a tight timeline by the moderator, look at some other transcripts, and play them with better sound quality. But, in the end, what is the danger of this judgment? Because as journalists I'm sure that's probably one of the most important questions, and is there a risk that this judgment will be used in an over broad manner with a sweeping effect to chill speech? I don't think so, and I think the judges provided for that by saying the following in the judgment, and I'm going to read those words to you in closing. The judges wrote that, "the dangers of censorship have often been associated, in particular, with the suppression of political or other minorities, or opposition to the government. The special protections developed by the jurisprudence for speech of this kind in international law, and more particularly in the American legal tradition of free speech, recognize the power dynamic inherent in the tradition, and the circumstances that make minority groups and political opposition vulnerable to the exercise of power by the majority or by the government. These circumstances do not arise in the present case, where at issue is the speech of the so-called majority population in support of the government. The special protections for this kind of speech should accordingly be adapted in the chamber's view, so that ethnically specific expression would be more, rather than less carefully scrutinized to ensure that minorities without equal means of defense are not endangered."

So in closing, the judges looking at who was being targeted and why, and what their level of

power was in comparison to those who had the speech against them was a way of noting that these types of cases have to be judged in a case by case circumstance, and if we do it in that manner, we will protect the rights of freedom of speech. I'm now going to pass over to my partner in the case, Charity Kagwi, to talk a little bit about the print media. Thank you.

Thierry Cruvellier: I'm sorry it's going to be pretty short for Charity. It's only two minutes. Maybe you'll have more time with the questions.

Charity Kagwi: Okay, well since I have two minutes, I'll have to just rush through this. Now one of the main issues with regard to Kangura, was that Rwanda is not a very literate society, in fact, both expert and lay witnesses stated that Rwanda, perhaps a very low percentage of them, the people in Rwanda who are literate. Although the court did not require us to prove that there was an actual causation between the media to genocide, the Kangura, and what actually happened, we had a responsibility to show that there was an actual phenomenal effect in this highly illiterate society, of the print media. Now how did we do this? This was done through lay witnesses, some who were illiterate, who said that they bought Kangura, and they asked those who knew how to read, to read it to them. Professor Marcel Kabanda gave evidence, and said that in Rwanda there is a culture known as oral reporting, in which somebody who knows how to read will read to his neighbor. Sometimes you will actually spread the message, you will photocopy it, and this was a similar that was done in Germany by Doscharmer (sic) although they were actually highly literate, however, the figures of publication did not show the extent of the message, because the message was transmitted in other forms. I'm being told it's one minute now.

So I can read for you one particular excerpt from Kangura that shows perhaps the impact of Kangura, and this is an expert, interestingly enough that was written in Kangura but came from Burundi. This is what the Power of the Hutu president said, "I do not know how to describe the prevailing situation. When this issue of the Kangura appeared in some areas of the Bujumbura all the Hutus heaved a deep sigh of relief. They distributed the newspaper everywhere, including prisons, to the extent that a copy could cost up to 1,000 Burundi francs, and that is if you were lucky, because some people preferred to frame it, so that they could enlighten their family members. Now this particular issue stated that when the Tutsis, this is in Burundi, when the Tutsis saw Kangura, they were struck with fear. So this was the effect that Kangura was having within not just the central Africa region, not just in Rwanda, but in the whole central Africa region. There was fear by the Tutsis all over, and there was a sense by the Hutus that they were to rise up and defend themselves.

Now can I go on? Okay, Well, I think I will answer some questions, but the issues rise here as to, now the extent in which, say a republication, and that is one thing that has not been dealt with actually, because the Ten Commandments were not made by Hassan Ngeze. They were not his publication. He actually republished them, and there was something that was very interesting also the 19 Tutsi Commandments, and the only parallel that you can draw between the 19 Tutsi Commandments that were republished in Rwanda, were the particles of the elders of Zion in which they drew upon a worldwide conspiracy by the Tutsis to take over the central Africa region. That's the same thing that Doscharmer (?) did. There was a worldwide conspiracy of the Jews to take over the world. Now can I have a look at that one. Okay we'll do it later.

Jean-Marie Biju Duval, Defense counsel for Ferdinand Nahimana (convicted in medial trial)

Thierry Cruveilli: The office of prosecutor will never change. Mr. Biju Duval.

Jean Marie Biju Duval: Thank you very much. First, I have to say just how pleased I am to be with this group of experts here today, witnesses, prosecutors, and that they have given the word now, that they have given the floor to the defense now, the defense of a man, not of a press organ. And I see this as a sign, a sign of a commitment that you all have, that we all have to the defense of human rights. I'm a lawyer. The Bar of Paris, specialist in refugee law and criminal law, and since 1996 I was assigned by the international court to defend Ferdinand Nahimana. Eight years later, December 3, 2003, as has been pointed out to you, he was sent to prison for life, convicted to prison for life. The Court of Appeal is now dealing with it, and is yet to hand down it's decision.

So, in what was wrongly called, and I'll come back to this, the trial of the media, or the media trial, the case of Ferdinand Nahimana is at least a symbolic one, in that he's convicted solely on the basis of statements that he didn't make himself, and also programs from journalists, from programs or from journalists of RTLM, and he was convicted also as a founder, a member of the board of this corporation, which owned the radio. He was therefore convicted, and this key date as you can understand as from April 8, 1994, that he broke all contact with the radio station. So we're here therefore to look together critically at the role of the media, and also at the way in which international justice did, in fact, deal with the issue of incitement to genocide. So it's good that this question should be asked by the journalists themselves, journalists for whom the verification of sources, of information are major principles. Major principles, otherwise we would have no journalism, rather we would have is instrumentalization of information, in other words propaganda. The same applies to the legal system. You have to check things impartially, you have to check the facts impartially, you have to apply the law strictly. Now this means justice, but if you had instrumentalization of law, and of the courts.

So let's look together what the situation is that I can explain to you my dear friends that the genocide in Rwanda is something far too serious, far, far too serious to be just left to specialists. All of us, each and every one of us, we're all able directly to take an interest in this issue, and to go right back to the source of the information. So announced as one of the most important trials of ICTR in my view, this did not meet the expectations or the hopes, which were set up at the beginning, either with respect to the events of 1994, or the role played by the media, nor as regards the application of principles, principles of law, in terms of international law, international justice since 1945, which have been implemented since 1945 since the Nuremberg Trial. Let's

go back to the events themselves. In 1945, the Nuremberg Trial did, in fact, bring together in one single trial a very significant number of Nazi leaders in the area of propaganda, and therefore it made it possible to have a consistent approach to the crimes, which were being prosecuted. You can't look at propaganda outside the context in which it's actually offered, and the media trial should look at all the causes, which gave rise to this increase in passions, which created a push towards violence in people's minds. And this wasn't, in fact, the case in Arusha. This wasn't done.

I'll give you an example. One of the paradoxes of this trial, under which passions were unleashed is, in fact, the prohibition imposed by the judges in the Arusha. There was prohibition on the defense to present evidence of the event, which was seen as triggering the genocide, namely the attack of April 6, 1994. So therefore you have to consider the importance of words. You have to recognize that, yes, it was necessary to prosecute. It was necessary to convict the call to extermination, the calls to extermination launched by the media.

Nevertheless, because of that you couldn't simply dismiss certain facts, certain acts. Each and everyone of us knows how important they were yet separating in that case the text or the words itself from the context. And when we talk about a media trial, it's a mistake. What they're actually trying here is certain people in the media, certain people who were selected by the prosecutors office. And this selection while it was already pointed out, well there were two sides to this. Really, this ignores a lot of the propaganda broadcast during that time, particularly the propaganda, which was, in fact, broadcast by the other side, by the RPF rebellion. And since we're talking about justice here, we have to recognize that by refusing to examine a large aspect of reality in Rwanda, then the prosecutor's office had denied these people the right to be tried on the real relevance of all the facts. They also deprived their judgment of an historic contribution it should have. So what was left was law. So 56 years after Nuremberg, it's important therefore to look at the situation of propaganda, and to see propaganda as being a crime against humanity, and as being a crime of genocide.

Now the first point I'd like to address and develop during the questions I hope is a question of law, because we're talking here about a trial, and that's what this is, because I'm a lawyer. Now the question of propaganda in terms of genocide is not new. In Nuremberg in 1945, they sat out clear criteria, two men, two names, represent Nazi propaganda in Nuremberg, and the criteria of Nuremberg. Julius Streicher, who was editor in chief of the newspaper, Der Stürmer a slip of the tongue here, a slip of the tongue is very indicative. In Nuremberg therefore we do also have a written press and the radio. Julius Streicher for Der Stürmer he appealed directly for the extermination of Jews, before, during the genocide of the Jews. He said you have to exterminate Jews from Russia, roots and branch, that was the expression he used, and he was condemned to death.

Second name, Hans Fritzsche, he was in charge of the radio of the Nazi party. He was the director of the Department of Propaganda of Joseph Goebbels. He developed anti-Semitic propaganda, which was extremely virulent, particularly hateful, but he did not actually call directly for the extermination of the Jewish people, and as a result, he was acquitted. In 1948, the Convention for the Suppression of Genocide confirmed this dividing line. Only a direct call for genocide can be subject to death sentence, and in 2003 what should the ICTR have done?

We're talking here about a trial. We're talking about rights and law, we're talking about crimes against humanity. The ICTR's role was not to amend the law, rather it simply had to apply the law. And as was pointed out by Madame Monasebian, incrimination includes from now on a large number of dangerous statements, sometimes hateful statements, which have nothing in common nevertheless with direct incitement to commit genocide.

So, we can be pleased therefore of what might seem to be a move forward in human rights in the repression of such statements. In my view that would be a superficial approach. So we'll come back to this, because what we're talking about here is a very, very dangerous, and sometimes unacceptable trivialization of what is the crime of all crimes, the greatest of all crimes, the single crime of genocide.

Now the second point concerns a question of identification of statements, and here we're moving into a very complex area. I just want to say one thing, so to be clear it's quite honest, it's quite clear that after April 6, 1994, it's quite clear that on RTLM there was a direct call for the extermination of these people. That's clear. It's clear there were specific calls, and there were programs quoted by Jean-Pierre Chrétien, and also cited by Madame Monasebian, but before April 6th, the situation was different, and the propaganda was different. And on that point, the point of interpretation of propaganda, there also I would ask you all, as journalists to go to directly to the sources, to look at the extracts cited in the judgment, and to investigate on the question of interpretation of terms, and by chance you have a Canadian decision, a very important Canadian decision, which was handed down in September, 2003, concerning somebody from Rwanda, somebody who was calling for the genocide, Mr. Nsanzuwera. So I'd ask you therefore to examine this decision carefully, because it shows the enormous danger, what I would call really the quicksand of interpretation. This is extremely dangerous. When you're talking not about you know context like today, where we can discuss things pleasantly, you're dealing with a different context, a context where men are convicted, and it's a court case. So I'll just conclude on this. Well that's the end of it. That's all I have to say.

So I just wanted to draw your attention to that, the rule of law, rule of human rights are based on the rights of individuals, who are accused, we all know. And to ensure that the individual should not be crushed by authorities, even international authorities, international criminal authorities, and it's a duty to make sure this is the case. It's a sacred duty, and it's the role of the defense really to show such vigilance, and to speak out. But I'm not telling you anything new here. Ladies and gentlemen, you are journalists, and vigilance is your duty. Well, we're all familiar with this, this is your profession. So thank you very much.



Question Period

Thierry Cruvellier: Merci. Mr Nsanzuwera, you now have the right to ask two questions.

Francois-Xavier Nsanzuwera: Well I'd like to ask three questions, because they're very complex questions. The first question is addressed to Mrs. Simone, and Mrs. Charity, who were

the trial attorneys in the case. I will not ask them to repeat the trial here, but I would like to ask them if they were able to establish a link between the three people found guilty, the intellectual authors of the crime, and those who actually killed. My second question, which might seem to be provocative is to know when should a reporter stop being a reporter, and become a criminal responsible for crimes against humanity? This is provocative, because this morning I found myself being accused, if not charged, because between 1990 and 1994, I was a crown prosecutor of the Republic. I am very bitter. I often ask myself if I did enough, if I did my duty as I should have during that time, and I console myself sometimes by saying that November, '93, I wrote, way before the genocide, that we the Rwandan authorities were responsible, were guilty, because of the dictatorship and the violence that existed in our country, and that we were responsible because we did not speak out, because fear had shut our mouths. And then in '94, there was the genocide. So I would like to repeat my question when does a reporter stop being a reporter, and when does he become a criminal? And my last question: what can we do as a reporter so that international justice will not be suspect of serving other interests than justice? Thank you.

Thierry: Mrs. Kagwi. Speak more. I guess you can answer the first question. Thanks.

Charity Kagwi: Yes, now the first thing I want to say is that international law does not require us to show a link between the actual incitement and the killings. In fact, all we need to show is that there was the act of the incitement. The fact that the genocide did occur is not, in fact, relevant. However, what we have shown, and what we did show in the media trial was what the Kangura Journal and the RTLM did, was to stigmatize the Tutsi ethnic group within the Rwanda, to stigmatize them to such a level that killing them not only became a matter of national duty, but killing them was not like killing a human being. You were getting rid of a cockroach. That is why it was very easy for you to take up a machete, kill somebody, and go back home, and talk to your children. It was like getting rid of a snake, and in every single genocide there has been the stigmatization of the people, the dehumanization of the people that makes it easy, gives us, gives the people, the reason to take up whatever weapon they're going to do to exterminate what they consider is vermin in the society.

Another thing I would like to show is that what consistently happened within Rwanda, and this was shown through the Kangura Journal, was that the Tutsi population within Rwanda, were being held hostage to the war situation. What was being seen was that the people outside Rwanda, who were attacking the country were people from the 1959 Diaspora, mainly Tutsi, and the people within Rwanda, the Tutsi within Rwanda, were being held to be accomplices of the enemy. So I can just read one small extract that shows the people in Rwanda, the Tutsi civilians in Rwanda were hostages to the war situation. This is in Kangura 54, and it says, "It is up to the Inyenzi, now Inyenzi means cockroach, and that came to mean the Tutsi people, now to demonstrate that they are courageous, and to know what till happen in the future. They should understand that if they commit the slightest mistake, then all of them will perish. And, that if they make a mistake of once again attacking, launching an attack, no accomplice will survive in Rwanda. They should know today that all Hutus have become united. They are united as one man." I think that's all I have to say about that.

Thierry Cruvellier: Mr. Biju Duval do you want to say something about that?

Biju Duval: Well yes, it's an important question. Mrs. Kagwi has just given more details concerning the Kangura Journal, and there again you mustn't create confusion. There's Kangura. There's RTLM Radio. There are 80 other newspapers being sold in Kigali. There's Radio Muhabura. There's the government radio, and all that is a very complex reality. And as you have all understood certain words come back repeatedly, certain expressions "Inyenzi-Nkotanyi," accomplices of the cockroaches, and these will play an important role in the propaganda. And one of the main questions that was judged in Arusha was to identify and to know if these words have a criminal sense to them, if the use of these words has as its purpose, direct extermination of a people, and of course in 30 seconds I can't present all the details of this debate, but I'd like to tell you that the debate does exist. It's a complex one, and it's a debate will even come before your Canadian courts, which last December rendered a decision, which encourages you to reflect on this subject, a decision which is diametrically opposed to the judgment of ICTR. So you can see the danger for justice. If in Montreal, in Ottawa, you are acquitted, and if for the same case you are found guilty for using the same words in Arusha, where's the role of justice? So you have to be very prudent, and maybe prudent or caution is not the right term. When you speak of justice, you must be brave, but you must be very rigorous in your use of principles. You must be brave, because you have to be brave to not follow the experts, to speak out for yourself, and that's the answer I would give to Mrs. Kagwi.

Thierry Cruvellier: Madame Kagwi wants to reply of course. Please shortly so we can move to the second question, very shortly.

Charity Kagwi: Okay. The Mugesera judgment that was rendered in Canada is in appeal, so I think that's not a complete issue, and neither is this one that was in the media trial. It's still going to go on appeal, and these issues will be handled in other courts. But I want note that while I read an extract from Kangura, this is an extract of Kangura 54 that came up in March, of 1994. At the same time within Rwanda, RTLM was running a competition, was actually running what were advertisements for Kangura. They would tell people, and this was read straight onto the record, they'd tell people, "go read Kangura 54, read Kangura 54. See what Kangura 54 is saying". Now apart from that, there was a competition in which people were told, "go buy Kanguras, fill in answers, have answers, we're going to give you a lot of rewards for the people who win this," and, they also stated that you should rate RTLM. Now the people, who were the owners of RTLM cannot take themselves away from what Kangura was saying at that time, because by advocating for the Kangura Journal what they were actually doing was propagating the message that Kangura was giving. So that's about what I'm going to say.

Thierry Cruvellier: Thomas Kamilindi, maybe you want to answer the second question at what point a journalist becomes a criminal? How would you understand that?

Thomas Kamilindi: Thank you very much. It's extremely difficult to answer that question, because journalists are human like everyone else. Sometimes reporters think they are supermen or women, but no we are human beings. We have feelings like everyone else, and we are members of society. And we can be caught up in the circle of violence like anyone else. We can identify with the group responsible for violence, like other members of society can do. So that is why as reporters we should be more objective. In April last year, I was in Cote d'Ivoire covering

journalism, covering the situation in Cote d'Ivoire, and I spoke to journalists about what we lived in, in Rwanda. I said that certain reporters participated in this violence by speaking out, but other reporters spoke out against the violence. 48 of them were killed because they spoke. So these reporters asked me, "how can we know if what we're doing is wrong?" They didn't know the answer to that question. They had already gone too far. They had entered the hate media without knowing it. So I told them, "look at what you write. Listen to what you say, and analyze yourself. If you are demonizing people, if you are stigmatizing other tribes, other clans, you're involved in violence. How did you get there?" They don't know. So I said, "you're no longer reporters. You're no longer journalists, and I would like to congratulate the politicians who managed to co-opt you, and co-opt you without you're knowing it. I congratulate these politicians. They're good politicians. Very effective. Now, stand up and be reporters, do your job, report the facts objectively." And during these three days I stayed with them, they reacted, and somebody said, "well there was a politician who has said, well, we want Cote d'Ivoire for the people from Cote d'Ivoire". They said, "can we repeat that?" Well yes, you can say that, you can say that this politician said that. You can report that, and public opinion will know how to react to this politician, who is an ultra-nationalist. You can report the facts, but don't get involved.

So in conclusion, it's hard to know as a reporter when you've taken the wrong turn. Despite ethics and so on, it's hard to know when you've taken the wrong turn, but don't be a coward. Stand up for your work as a reporter.

Thierry Cruvellier: So what I just heard here, we see here we have certain journalism, then we have propaganda, but then we have another level, which is crime. Maybe the lawyers could inform us about this, what this actually means in terms of law.

Biju Duval: Well I think the question here is absolutely crucial. When you're talking about international justice in Arusha, as in the Hague has only one purpose, and only one subject: crime against humanity and genocide. That is the most capital of all crimes. That's the sole subject, and the sole purpose of international criminal justice. There's one thing I want to say here. I think that's why this trial for the incitement to genocide is not a really a trial about freedom of expression, even distorted. It's not a kind of journalism as I say, which has gone wrong, which has really been incriminated here, which has really been judged by international law. What we're talking about here is a journalism, which is no longer going to be called journalism. What we're talking about here is a crime. What they're trying to do is exterminate people. And in Kigali, in the studios of the RTLM after April 6, then it's absolutely clear what we have here is not journalists who were at the microphone. They're actually wearing military uniforms. They had weapons. Every morning, they went to headquarters in order to get their instructions. They themselves take part in combat, and then they return to the microphone, the microphone which they use, themselves, as a weapon. They use it as another form of weapon, but really we're not talking here about freedom of expression. It's a different matter altogether. What we have here is the most capital of all crimes, the crime against humanity, namely genocide. And that's what, in fact, as from 1945 has been examined by the international criminal justice system, and it's on the basis of this criminal involvement in the most capital of all crimes that the judges in Nuremberg, and also the United Nations delegates in 1948, it was in those areas that they imposed legal standards. They created the charge of direct and public

incitement to genocide. So this is the mission of the international criminal system, and the international criminal system- if we want it to be legitimate- if we want it to be legitimate in ethical terms and also in legal terms to protect all of mankind without any political involvement, then it has to be limited solely to its main purpose, which is the essential purpose, otherwise in fact, it will lose all effectiveness. Thank you very much.

Thierry Cruvellier: I'm sorry, maybe we can move onto the third question now. We've got 25 minutes I think, and that's all the time we have. We don't have any more than that. First we'll give the floor to the ladies.

Blythe McKay: (?) My name is Blythe McKay (?), and I have a question for Thomas Kamilindi. You mentioned that journalists have a role to play for the good, and I was wondering what positive roles are media in Rwanda currently playing in rebuilding Rwanda and reporting on the genocide, and is it enough?

Thomas Kamilindi: So once again after 10 years of genocide, it's difficult for Rwanda to get over the situation, to recover. So I just want to talk about the press here. I'm not going to talk about other things, for example, the creation of the journalism school, or this kind of initiative. The press at the present time, it's weak in financial terms and professional terms. Well, the journalists themselves are traumatized, as is the rest of society, so there's a haunting feeling. They're afraid that they're going to go back to the mistakes of the past, with the divisions, the extremism, etc. So there is a press that censors itself very much, and also it's sometimes very passionate. I'll explain why. Well it's very easy, for example, for the press in Rwanda to report certain things without any evidence. This could also happen. Interahamwe is the name which has been given to the militia. It's the name of the militia who exterminated the Tutsi in '94. So sometimes they do some good things. There are sometimes journalists who do, in fact, report the facts as they are, as they took place without being in favor of any political party, without being partisan in any way. So it's difficult still. Nevertheless, there are some good steps, which have been taken, but there are still problems.

And as regards reconciliation, as regards reporting genocide, there's also the issue of international solidarity. That's very important. At the present time, there are some Americans, in fact, who are setting up a project, and I'm going to get involved in it. It's still at the early stages, which is called Benevolencia. I guess this term came from Bosnia, an initiative by Jewish people there, who saved people in Bosnia, people who were being hunted. Benevolencia, I guess it means benevolence really, is where it comes from, goodwill. So they want to go back to the origins of genocide, the sources of it, the traumatism, trauma healing, this kind of thing. Through leaflets, radio programs, small plays, for example, plays on the radio, factual programs, documentaries, magazines, because these programs while they're fiction, and we also have documentaries based on the facts. So this is the kind of thing they're trying to do in order to go back to the source of the problem of genocide. There is, or example, at the ICTR, and it's a pity that the international press is not at all interested in what this tribunal is doing, but there's an agency there, which everyday, the Hironnelle Agency, which reports everyday. They're based there, and they report everyday what's going on at the ICTR, the trials, etc. So as I say, things are being done, but nevertheless problems do remain.

Thierry Cruvellier: Next question please.

Alex Ferrier (?): Hi I'm Alex Ferrier. My question is for the panelists, who were at the ICTR. During the trial process, did you find the tribunal to actually be impartial, or did they demonstrate favour to either side in this conflict?

Thierry Cruvellier: That's a question for me. I was not supposed to answer. Yes, it's been a major concern for most observers of the tribunal, and it still is. There is clearly a deep feeling among those who have been covering the trials that the political drive that created the tribunal is still there. In a way the ICTR has not emancipated itself from its political origin, and so it is still being felt that the trials are pretty much influenced politically, and under the political influence, are sensitive to the political concerns of both the international community and the Rwandan government.

Thierry Cruvellier: Yeah sure.

Jean Boscu Culiny: (?) Thank you. I'm Jean Boscu Culiny (?). I'm a student at Laval University. I'm preparing my doctorate in law on the prevention of genocide. I've only one question. It's addressed to Mr. Duval, but before asking my question, I'd like to express what was said by my compatriots if when he asked whether everything was done which could have been done. I was there. I know that everything was done that could have been done, and I'd say that some people are very courageous. So my question, Mr. Duval. Before asking the question, I'd like to say two things; one which is factual, and deals actually with the events before and after April 6, 1994. It seemed to me, that Mr. Duval thinks that before April 6, 1994, the RTIM was not broadcasting really incendiary or inflammatory messages. That's not true. I was there. Everybody knows, that even before April 6, 1994, that the newspaper, news media were, in fact, making broadcasts advocating genocide. Maybe he has other information, but I was there. I actually witnessed that. So I don't know really who could decide this between us.

Now as regards the law issue, well I very much appreciated your argument, but I don't agree with you on one point. You talked about the conviction of Julius Streicher by the Nuremberg courts, the court in Nuremberg, in fact, he was convicted not because of what he said during the genocide, during the holocaust, but rather long before that, he began long before that. He continued- it wasn't because he actually broadcast inflammatory things before the holocaust. He was convicted because of the newspaper he published, which is anti-Semitic, and also because he persecuted a race. He was convicted for crimes against humanity through persecuting a race or an ethnic group.

So having said that, I've made those points. Now I've got to ask you a question. If Mr. Streicher was convicted and sentenced in 1945, then you rely on the 1948, December 9 conviction concerning the prevention of genocide in order to say that the law should have gone backwards? I don't think it should. I think rather that law has evolved. The protection of human rights has evolved since then. So we can't go back to before 1945. It's only from 1945 onwards that we have to look at things. If in 1945, Julius Streicher was found guilty, then you'd expect therefore a journalist to be found guilty now, a journalist, who created a media, which was calling for genocide.

You talked about another gentleman, I don't want to talk about that now, because it's before the Supreme Court, the case, but I would ask the students in journalism here to consider the judgment of Georges Ruggiu, Georges Ruggiu, which did not consider the other judgments, particularly Mugesera. Thank you very much.

Biju Duval: Thank you very much. It's a long question, but a very short answer. At least I hope it will be short. Well, the effect or the impact of law, or the effect first of all, of the impact, and I'm talking only about RTLM, because we shouldn't mix everything up. Before April 6, as you said, these were also inflammatory programs, which would lead to genocide. These are the facts. So I think therefore that as regards to the substance here, that I think we could almost agree with one another. It's obvious that given the extremely tense situation, given the civil war situation, the hidden civil war, in fact, which existed before April 6, then when you have programs, which lead to a violent political fight in which the ethnic factor is very obvious, then these programs, such programs, obviously are not conducive to peace. They're not conducive to the Arusha Peace Accords, so we agree on this. And I would even go as far to say, and here, I guess historians will have to consider this in some way or another, maybe the answer is yes to some degree did these programs, in fact, lead to the genocide, the explosion after April 6? Yes, we probably agree on that, on the analysis. But here once again, I'm not speaking here as a witness of April, 1994, I'm talking rather as somebody involved in a trial. Now a trial means actually judging people based on the evidence, and the evidence here was, in fact, 300 radio recordings. There was an enormous amount of evidence here. 300 radio programs. So I'll ask all of you to actually go back to the source of information here, and there was a lot of evidence. Look at the judgment of December 3, look objectively, look carefully, scrupulously at the programs selected by the tribunal. That is essentially what was said before April 6, 1994, and you'll see, in fact, those programs which were inflammatory, and not, in fact, a direct cause to extermination, even the worst.

So we can come back to this on the legal question, but I think the point is clear. Simone

Monasebian? Because we would like to take a few other questions.

Simone Monasebian: Yeah, it's a mistake to suggest that the entirety of the judgment was based on 303, 45-minute cassette tapes when RTLM broadcasted for 365 days, several hours a day, sometimes 24 hours a day. But within those 300 some-odd tapes, there are numerous examples of RTLM expressing before April 6th that they knew their broadcast had an impact, and just one of them was on January 21, 1994, when one of the RTLM broadcasters said, "Little Tutsi children in Nyamirambo came over to me and said, Kantano, why do you persecute us? We are few in number, and when we walk down the down street, CDR, the militia, beats us up, pounces upon us. Why do you hate us just because we're Tutsis? We're few in numbers. Please don't heat up people's head." And there's a term for that in Kenya and Rwanda, which is called "gushushway nitway" (?) to heat up heads. Chauffer la tête. And RTLM acknowledged on several occasions in these 300 some-odd tapes before April 6th that people were getting beaten up. There was causation demonstrated by their very own words.

And finally on the other thing that Mr. Biju Duval says that, my colleague Charity Kagwi points

out that there was lay witness testimony. When Francois-Xavier Nsanzuwera talked about the four times that he was incited against on RTLM, twice before April 6, and twice after to his knowledge, and we only have one of those four tapes, are we to discount his testimony? Should people be acquitted because not all the tapes existed? Should we have no genocide trials if nobody was fortunate enough to record those tapes? The judges relied on witness testimony. The judges relied on expert testimony and the tapes, and in all three circumstances found that there was sufficient evidence that these journalists knew, they were told by the Ministry of Information, they were told by Francois-Xavier Nsanzuwera, who was threatened if he continued to stop RTLM, he would be killed. They were told they did not care, and they were lawless, and that is why they were convicted.

Thierry Cruvellier: Thank you, next question please.

Ernesto Caceres: My name Ernesto Caceres, I'm a second-year student here at Carleton, and I have two separate but connected questions dealing with the current state of Rwanda. I'm wondering in the past panel it was discussed that the low literacy rate in Rwanda lead to the depth of, I guess the commitment to radio, and the listening to radio. I was wondering if there's anything currently in Rwanda that is going on to increase the literacy rate in English, French or Rwandan? And also my second question is does radio still have the same impact now that it did 10 years ago? I know that I guess what was the RPF is in control of the country now, are they promoting a certain pro-Tutsi line that is anti-Hutu in the radio, and are the people of Rwanda listening into it with the same kind of loyalty that they listened to RTLM? Thank you.

Thierry Cruvellier: I guess Thomas would be the one answering that question.

Thomas Kamilindi: Rwanda is still a country with a low level of literacy. But when I follow the education policy, I see that there's a break, given what happened before. Before we had an elitist type of education. They educated the elite, but today this has changed. Now we have a mass type education, education of the masses, but this hasn't borne results yet. And this can be seen at the higher level also. Before '94, there were a few universities. Today I think there are about 10, about 10 or 12 universities including private universities, so something is being done, but we still haven't seen actually the results of this in terms of literacy.

Now in terms of radio, do people listen to the radio as much as they used to? Is the situation as it was? The answer to that is yes. We still have only one radio station, the state radio network. But over the last three or four weeks, there has been a new private radio network, which was setup, which has started to broadcast, which is still at the trial level, and which broadcasts only music for the moment. It's a very young network. It has a small team there, not very large, not that much experience, but there are about four or five private radio projects, which in fact, have been approved by the government. And they think that the frequencies have been attributed already to some, so they should to broadcast soon. So as from June, maybe there'll be four radio networks, which will be broadcasting, which are not government-owned, and therefore I think myself, that this will break, this will break the myth of the radio, because the radio has an enormous mythic value there. That's the way the situation is. Only the government for the moment has access to radio and television. There's only one television network, except a corporation which redistributes foreign programs also. In other words, it's still the same

problem. And radio is listened to as much as it was 10 years ago. It still has a myth value as regards the promotion of two ethnic groups. There has been a break. Genocide created an enormous rupture, an enormous break. It's very, very difficult therefore to promote the two ethnic groups, but that's the situation.

In legal terms, for example, we've set up a system, a traditional justice system, or semi-traditional justice system, and we hope that it's a system where everybody will judge everybody else. So they'll judge their peers, and it's the people who decide who is guilty and not guilty. So we think that this might reconcile the two groups. A lot has been done. I'm just giving out one example, given all the shortcomings, and given all the weaknesses that such a system might have.

Thierry Cruvellier: One question from the floor first, and I'll get the question from Maria.

Jean-Claude Ngaboziza (?): Thank you. I am Jean-Claude Ngaboziza.(?) I'm a survivor of genocide. I was in Rwanda in '94, and I have a question for Mr. Duval, and if I may, I would just like to make one comment. I would point out that in '94 the journalists were fully aware that their statements would, in fact, lead to people being killed. They were fully aware of this. Habimana Kantano, for example, who we quoted, did, in fact, ask I remember this very well, he asked his militia to show some pity towards a Tutsi, who was a goalkeeper in his favorite soccer team, Rayon Sport, but he said, "don't kill that one. Close your eyes." But he was very aware of the fact of what was going on, and what was being done. I'd also mention that the only positive point for the media, because instructions were given openly, you could change where you wanted to hide. Once you found you were a target, you change your hiding place.

So I have a question for Mr. Duval. I understood that he regrets that Mr. Nahimana was, in fact, convicted, by acts, which were committed by others, because he, in fact, was just directing things. So my question is as follows. Nahimana was the head. He was the boss, if you will. He could authorize the broadcasting of certain facts, of certain events. By authorizing the broadcasting of certain messages, was he not guilty? Yes or no. That's the question by authorizing that.

Biju Duval: Thank you very much. Now as regards your first comment, I think that we agree. It's perfectly clear that after April 6, 1994, Kantano in particular, became the archetype, if you will, of the criminal journalist against humanity. Now the second observation, and this is the whole question of the trial of Ferdinand Nahimana. As you can appreciate, it's difficult for me to answer this at length, well just in 30 seconds, but I do nevertheless, well I will answer the main point, what seems to be the main point. I'll rise to the challenge there. You talked about the difficult sense of deposition of international justice, which is exercised under a certain pressure, which by its very nature does, in fact, endanger its fans or its equity. And therefore, there's a risk. There's a very serious risk, an inherent risk, if you will, which is characteristic, if you will, of crimes against humanity. There's a temptation here, a temptation to find a scapegoat, to get somebody convicted because of crimes committed by other people, because people are so horrified by something that surpasses anything we've seen before, and in order to withstand that temptation, which is absolutely fatal in terms of the justice system, there's only one way you can withstand this. You have to establish principles of law, principles of law which

have to be applied with absolute rigor. These principles of law are individual penal responsibility, individual criminal responsibility. You can be found guilty only if you yourself have committed a crime, or if you are, as you say, the person in charge, the boss if you will, and it's on that basis that the international criminal justice system was set up in Nuremberg. You have to first convict the leaders. And of course, you must define international justice, international law, in fact, defines who a leader is, what the person in charge is, it's the person who exercises effective power of control similar to that which is, for example exercised by a military commander over his troops. You have to prove in that situation that you do have an almost military power of control over somebody. And what's striking here, and what's very interesting, and what's shocking also in the Nahimana case is that as from April 6, as from the call for extermination, Nahimana is totally absent. He's not involved. And there was no contact which was ever established here, no link between him, who was at the other end of Rwanda, and the journalists of RTLM. So that's the serious question here, which the ICTR has to decide on, and my criticism here of the judgment is that these standards, these absolute criteria which make it possible to avoid finding a scapegoat, these criteria were not, in fact, applied, at least that's the way I analyze things.

Thierry Cruvellier: I can see the reactions, I know. But it's really time to stop. You'll have time in private.

Simone Monasebian: Thierry, can I just say something? This is very short, just brief, a reference. All I can suggest is that people read Mr. Nahimana's comments of April 25, 1994, in the judgment, and when you see what his comments of April 25 were, I leave it to you to decide whether or not he was sanctioning RTLM, and applauding it, and saying that it did reach the majority of the population, and did good work. So look at the judgment.

Thierry Cruvellier: Thank you, yeah, read the judgment. That's a good point. Thank you, I want to thank, of course, all the participants, and Mary Kimani has the last comment.

Mary Kimani: I just wanted to add a comment, because I see we've concentrated on Nahimana, and the head of Kangura, and we've not dealt at all with the Rwandan journalists, who are still in jail in Rwanda. I think it's important to underline that as much as the decision at ICTR is important, we have to think about what motivated the actual journalists to follow the instructions of their leaders. And unless we address the things that make such local journalists to follow whatever they are told, we still have not solved the problem. We can sentence Nahimana, we can sentence the head of Kangura, but we have to do something about the ordinary journalists. I've talked to many of them, and for a lot of them, the problem was not ideology. They didn't necessarily believe in the genocide. For a lot of them, it was a question of fear, it was the question of poverty. It was a question of having been brought up to believe that the majority population they were once suppressed, and they have to fight to make sure that this oppression does not return. And I think we have to do this in all the other communities that are in conflict to make sure we address the things that make journalists likely to follow what their leader says.

The second very brief point I want to outline, it's very easy in such a symposium and we're in a hurry, to let things pass off very quickly without correction. Inyenzi it means cockroach. True, and it was used to mean that, but Inyenzi has a separate meaning, and if you have history books,

go and read them, and it's that play of words that made RTLM and Kangura very effective. If you miss out on the second meaning, you miss out on the entire meaning.

Last thing, ...

Audience: What is it?

Mary Kimani: Inyenzi was at times used for the former for some of the brigades of the monarchical armies, and it was used in the early '60s during the invasion back into Rwanda of the Tutsi leaders that had been sent out, trying to come back to restore themselves to power. So if you miss out on that meaning, that clear of meaning by RTLM and Kangura, you might miss out on why it was so effective.

The last thing is there's a lady who asked the question of what the press is doing now. I have to add this because I work for Internews. It's an organization that currently is taking the stories of what is happening at the ICTR, and what is happening in the Rwandan national courts, making a newsreel, and taking it to the rural audience by cinemobile, and even in prison. So there are people who are trying to make sure that there's more information so that people can make better decisions hopefully in the future.

Allan Thompson: Thank you very much. Thank you very much to the panelists. I remind those who were still at the microphones, please we have volunteers, who are going to come and speak with you. They want to take your names, your questions, and who you would like those questions to be directed to, and this will become part of the proceedings. We're moving to the lunch period now. For those who don't know their way around this campus, look for volunteers who will lead the way. You can go underground or above ground to the Residence Commons for lunch. We will resume on time at 2:00. It's a buffet. So you can eat very quickly. Thank you.