

permanent solution. If refugees are spending prolonged periods confined to camps, is aid perpetuating a problem? Is dependency being encouraged? What would indicate that this is so?

- 4) The improvement of the early warning system should achieve a better balance between western-oriented systems development and the building of a locally-managed observation and response capacity in the affected countries.

In cooperating with National Society counterparts, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement are working to strengthen local capacities to monitor, prevent and/or react to potential disasters, both natural and complex. The National Society in each country plays an important role in the local and national early warning systems, while the Federation and ICRC delegations function at the regional and international levels. Due to the specific mandates of all three components, there is specialized information collection responsibilities and this, in turn, leads to specialized response capacities. The clarity of each other's mandate is the key to the effectiveness of the system, yet it also is something which is repeatedly discussed and analyzed given new operational scenarios. A willingness to respond to and learn from these organizational challenges is part of our constant evolution. While this is the reality of one element of the early warning and international assistance system, the key messages are hopefully relevant to all. ■

Notes

1. Humanity, Impartiality, Neutrality, Independence, Voluntary Service, Unity, Universality.
2. William DeMars, "Eyes and Ears? Limits of NGO Information for Early Warning," paper presented at the Synergy in Early Warning Conference, Westin Harbour Castle, Toronto, Canada, March 15-18, 1997. □

The Burundi and Great Lakes Project of the Center for Preventive Action, Council on Foreign Relations: An Example of NGO Cooperation

Barnett R. Rubin and Fabienne Hara

Abstract

This paper discusses the Project on the Great Lakes region of Central Africa of the Center for Preventive Action of the Council on Foreign Relations. It focuses more specifically on an evaluation of the Great Lakes Policy Forum, which was established in January 1995 and coordinates conflict prevention activities in the Great Lakes region of US-based organizations.

Précis

Cet article trace les grandes lignes du projet sur la région des Grands Lacs en Afrique Centrale du Center for Preventive Action, Council on Foreign Relations. Il présente une évaluation spécifique du Forum politique sur les Grands Lacs, créée en janvier 1995 et qui a pour objectif d'établir une plate-forme de coordination des activités de prévention des organisations basées aux États Unis.

Introduction

The Center for Preventive Action is a Council on Foreign Relations initiative to study and test conflict prevention—to learn how and whether preventive action can work by employing it. The primary function of CPA is to learn about conflict prevention by sending teams to pre-explosion crisis areas where they map out a strategy to settle or to manage conflicts. These teams subsequently advocate action by the appropriate governments and organizations, national and international, private and public. CPA has four on-

going projects on Burundi and the Great Lakes region, the South Balkans, Nigeria and the Ferghana Valley in Central Asia.

Since January 1995, the Center for Preventive Action of the Council on Foreign Relations has convened the Burundi Policy Forum in Washington (with occasional meetings in New York) in collaboration with Search for Common Ground, Refugees International, and the African American Institute. This Forum, the idea for which grew out of discussions between non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the UN Secretary General's Special Representative (UNSRSG) in Burundi, has developed into an important center for discussion, information exchange, and innovation on policy toward Central Africa. It provides a unique setting in which officials of various government agencies, international organizations, and NGOs can discuss sensitive issues in an informal setting, unconstrained by the usual hierarchies and procedures. It also provides a context for more confidential meetings where more operational matters are discussed across organizational boundaries. As part of its program on Burundi, CPA has commissioned an evaluation of the apparent failure of conflict prevention in Burundi from Michael Lund of Creative Associates and Kathi Austin of the Institute for Policy Studies.

The Burundi Policy Forum (BPF)

When the BPF was established in January 1995, the profusion of international missions to Burundi had made clear to all protagonists that they were under international scrutiny. Various groups were working on humanitarian assistance to refugees from Rwanda or displaced persons within Burundi,

Barnett R. Rubin is Director of the Center for Preventive Action at the Council on Foreign Relations, New York.

Fabienne Hara is Program Associate for the Center for Preventive Action's Great Lakes Project, New York.



conflict resolution training, civil-military relations, democratization, human rights, and other fields (see the inventory compiled at the January 1995 BPF meeting). Some major needs remained unmet, such as those for combatting hate radio or establishing a criminal justice system to deal with the problem of impunity.

Discussions with the UNSRSG in Burundi as well as with the U.S. government and several NGOs led to the

Rwanda or Zaire, particularly in regard to the issue of refugee repatriation and the flow of weapons into the region. Unfortunately, measures advocated at the Forum to prevent another violent crisis were not taken, leading to the recent renewal of war. As discussed below, the Forum has been modified to meet these new challenges.

The Forum convenes representatives of dozens of humanitarian,

media organizations like Voice of America and CNN.

The BPF convenes both regular public meetings and closed meetings of special working groups focused on security and refugee repatriation. Public meetings begin with brief reports from organizations who may wish to place questions for discussion before the group. Often, the central event will be a speaker, either someone recently returned from the field or an important policy maker. Speakers have included former UNSRSG in Burundi, Ambassador Ahmedou Ould Abdallah; the now deposed President of Burundi Sylvestre Ntibantunganya; the man who deposed him, former president of Burundi Pierre Buyoya; Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, George Moose; U.S. Special Coordinator on Rwanda and Burundi, Ambassador Richard Bogosian; Director of African Affairs, National Security Council, Susan Rice; Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, John Shattuck; Assistant Secretary of State for Refugees, Population, and Migration, Phyllis Oakley; Burundian former Prime Ministers Adrien Sibomana and Anatole Kanyenkiko; President of FRODEBU (Front pour la democratie au Burundi; the majority party) Jean Minani; Burundian former Foreign Minister Jean Marie Ngendahayo; writer David Rieff; and people returning from the field on behalf of many NGOs and UN agencies.

Among the Forum's accomplishments are the following:

- 1) Maintaining a sustained Washington focus on Burundi:
 - The Burundi Policy Forum's schedule of regular meetings has engendered continuous, unabating attention in Washington since early 1995 to the ongoing Burundi crisis by the U.S. government, NGOs and possibly other participants such as the UN and the media. This attention is not likely to have occurred without such a forum and has been achieved independently of the events in Burundi itself. This ongoing

The literature on conflict prevention in the post-Cold War environment emphasizes the need for cooperation of NGOs with official bodies. Somewhat neglected have been the equally important needs for collaboration among different types of NGOs and among different agencies within governments and international organizations.

conclusion that the major need was for coordination. Furthermore, the situation continued to evolve, and the international community needed a mechanism to respond to those changes. The ongoing Forum provided a place where such adjustments could be discussed.

The literature on conflict prevention in the post-Cold War environment emphasizes the need for cooperation of NGOs with official bodies. Somewhat neglected have been the equally important needs for collaboration among different types of NGOs and among different agencies within governments and international organizations. Often, individual humanitarian NGOs work with official humanitarian agencies, but do not coordinate their work with those in the political field. Numerous NGOs also compete for funding and seek to stake out positions for themselves, which complicates coordination and strategic action. A policy forum provides a framework in which a variety of participants can exchange information and develop ideas and strategies. It can also serve as a preexisting instrument of early warning. For instance, since the situation in the entire Central African Great Lakes region is interconnected, the Burundi Policy Forum has also served to monitor and mobilize reaction to events in

advocacy, and conflict resolution organizations working in Burundi, together with officials of international organizations and governments. These organizations include the U.S. Department of State (several bureaus), Organization of Africa Unity (OAU), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), National Security Council (NSC), Department of Defence, Embassies of Burundi, of Rwanda, of Canada, of France, UN Department for Political Affairs, UN Department for Humanitarian Affairs (UNDHA), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the International Committee of the Red Cross, CARE, Catholic Relief Services, Missionaries of Africa, Society of St. Ursula, Unitarian Universalist Association, World vision, InterAction, the U.S. Catholic Conference, the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, Parliamentarians for Global Action, the Carter Center, Amnesty International, the International Peace Academy, the International Organization for Migration, the International Lawyers' Committee for Human Rights, the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, Human Rights Watch, and

focus occurs because the relevant government officials working on Burundi know that the BPF exists as a venue for many Burundi-concerned organizations and are regularly expected to brief and interact with the group. The BPF has also provided a venue for knowledgeable professionals on Burundi to ask the USG officials tough questions in a non-confrontational, constructive climate.

2) Providing leverage and openings for specific policy proposals:

- The BPF is not a lobbying organization and takes no position on issues. But several of its more "connected individuals" have been able to increase the attention of the NSC director and other officials to specific Burundi policy options because of the awareness that there is a BPF "constituency" which the individuals are engaged with that is watching USG policy in Burundi.
- CPA initiated a series of meetings in 1995, with members of the BPF that led to the issuance of a joint press release by 33 organizations on July 13, the 1995 anniversary of the exodus of Rwandan refugees to Goma, Zaire. The press release drew attention to reports of rearming of former Rwandan government forces. These reports came from the Arms Watch Project of Human Rights Watch, headed by CPA board member Ken Roth. This press release called on the US government to take the lead in a series of specific measures designed to address the conflicts in the Great Lakes Region in a comprehensive way. The statement was released to the press by InterAction whose collaboration with CPA made this initiative possible. The range of organizations signing this joint statement was unusually broad. CPA Chair, Gen. (ret.) John W. Vessey sent copies of the press release with letters to President Clinton and UN Secretary Gen-

eral Boutros-Ghali. Most of the recommendations were not implemented.

- Subsequently, on July 25, 1995, in response to this press release, National Security Adviser Anthony Lake convened a meeting on the region with numerous NGO representatives. The meeting included high level representatives of all government agencies working on Rwanda and Burundi. The administration argued that it was already trying to implement most of the recommendations in the press release but that it needed more support from and partnership with NGOs.
 - The NSC director convened members of the group at the White House in January and again in May 1996 to discuss contingency planning for a humanitarian intervention. Certain individuals in the group subsequently sought to keep pressure on the USG to follow through on this proposal, and the USG has done so by putting pressure on the UN to do further planning, with the assistance of the USG. Several other NSC meetings have also taken place.
- 3) Providing a forum for Burundians:
- The President of Burundi Sylvestre Ntibantunganya spoke at the Forum in Washington in October 1995. This event was televised in Burundi, where many felt it had some effect on protecting the president from assassination by Tutsi extremists in the military. Pierre Buyoya, who came to power through a coup in late July 1996, was the main speaker at the June 1996 Forum. Adrien Sibomana, Anatole Kanyenkiko, former Prime Ministers of Burundi, Jean Minani, president of FRODEBU, Jean Marie Ngendahayo, former Foreign Minister of Burundi, spoke at the August 1996 Forum on their way to attend the National Convention of the Democratic Party in Chicago.

4) Providing alternative perspectives and an outlet for government staff:

- The Forum has strengthened the ability of individual middle-level USG staffers within the United States government (and within the UN) to promote more attention to the conflict and advance specific ideas with their superiors within the bureaucratic hierarchy. The BPF provides those individuals with a place outside the regular hierarchy to gain information, discuss ideas, and get broader perspectives on the crisis that are not fostered by their bureaucratic milieu. One staffer said it was particularly helpful to have Burundian perspectives presented when the BPF had Burundian officials or NGO representatives speak to the group. Several officials of the Department of Defence and Army have commented that the Forum has provided new information to the Department and helped to keep them focused.

5) Influencing mediation activities:

- As a result of its work on the BPF, CPA has been involved in continued informal consultations with the mission of the UNSRSG, the Special Envoys of President Clinton, the Carter Center, the Community of Sant' Egidio, International Alert, and the International Crisis Group on peace-making efforts in the region. Partly at the urging of CPA, former President Carter began to pay attention to the situation in the Great Lakes Region. Carter convened a meeting of the heads of states of Rwanda, Burundi, Zaire, Uganda, and Tanzania in Cairo in November 1995, and in Tunis in March 1996.

Being intended as mainly a focal point for exchanging information among mostly Washington-based individuals and organizations, the BPF is inherently limited in how much it can directly alleviate the conflict in Burundi. It is true however, that prominent officials in Burundi know

of the BPF and are thus aware that some nucleus of Washington organizations is "watching Burundi" with a considerable interest. This spotlight effect may have some importance on moderating the conflict itself. Nevertheless the forum realizes its main impact through indirect means, by influencing the process by which important international actors understand and deal with that conflict.

Expanding the Regional Focus

For some time now, the Forum has dealt *de facto* not strictly with Burundi alone, but with the Great Lakes region as a whole. The combined effect of the events of last year, including the coup in Burundi, the Rwanda-supported rebellion in Eastern Zaire, the resultant political upheavals in Zaire and the return of refugees to Rwanda from Burundi, Zaire, and Tanzania, as well

Mobutu Sese Seko. Further violence and disintegration is almost inevitable in Zaire. There is, if anything, an increased need for focus and analysis if the international community is to provide effective help to prevent further violence in this region.

Effective action more than ever requires understanding. Burundi shares a common ethnic structure with Rwanda, both of which have a history of post-colonial political strife between the traditionally dominant Tutsi minority and the Hutu majority (estimated at 85 percent in both countries). Rwanda experienced a post-colonial Hutu revolution, while Burundi did not. This revolution was captured eventually by racist rather than democratic forces, leading to the 1994 genocide and the victory of the current predominantly Tutsi regime, led by the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF).

Eastern Zaire, Tanzania, and northern Burundi. Recently most of the Rwandan Hutu refugees have been constrained to return. Most of the Burundian refugees, however, remain, and some who were forcibly repatriated were massacred.

Zaire and Uganda both charge each other with supporting rebel groups on the other side of their mutual border. Rwandan Tutsi rebels received support from Uganda and Burundi; Tutsi rebels in Zaire later received support from Rwanda. Rwandan Hutu rebels until recently had bases in Zaire, and Burundian Hutu rebels had bases in both Zaire and Tanzania. As a result of recent events, anti-Tutsi sentiment is high in Zaire, which is related to an increase in hostility in that country's relations with Rwanda, Uganda, and Burundi. Anti-Tutsi sentiments are also affecting Tanzania, which aggravates its relations especially with Burundi.

Underlying all of these conflicts are harsh economic realities. Rwanda and Burundi are the most overpopulated countries in Africa with the most polarized social systems. Both they and Eastern Zaire rely on transit largely through Tanzania for much of their economic life.

There have also been some positive signs of regional cooperation to solve problems. As already noted, former President Carter convened the heads of state of the entire region on two occasions. Subsequently, under the leadership of Tanzanian former President Julius Nyerere, who agreed with Carter to take the lead in mediating the conflict in Burundi, a set of East African states has elaborated a common approach to Burundi, at least. The economies of Uganda and Tanzania have shown some positive trends recently, and they are reactivating a regional framework for economic cooperation that also involves Kenya.

At the beginning of 1997, the Forum changed its name to the Burundi/Great Lakes Forum in order to emphasize the regional aspect of the problem and of solutions. The Forum has

The widely seen pictures of refugees returning en masse to Rwanda has begun to create an impression that the problems of the region have been solved. This is far from the case.

as the increase of tension between Zaire and Uganda, has been to link the various conflicts in the region more tightly than before.

The widely seen pictures of refugees returning *en masse* to Rwanda has begun to create an impression that the problems of the region have been solved. This is far from the case. Rwanda now has to contend with about one million returned refugees, many of whom are suspected of complicity in genocide in a context of severe shortage of land and housing. Furthermore, the Rwandan political system provides no opportunity for these people to be represented or to participate. The war in Burundi has, if anything, intensified, and the Burundian refugees remain in the surrounding countries while hundreds of people a week are killed. Zaire has been divided between areas controlled by the Rwanda-supported rebels and those under the sway (if not control) of the government of dying President,

Burundi has remained largely dominated by a Tutsi-controlled military.

The conflicts in these two countries interact in a number of complex ways: the assassination in October 1993 of Burundi's first Hutu president by Tutsi army officers strengthened the fears of Hutus in Rwanda; the genocide of April-July 1994 in Rwanda strengthened the fears of Tutsis in Burundi. These are just examples. In addition, Eastern Zaire has contained for centuries populations of Rwandan origin, including both Hutus and Tutsis, whose citizenship has been revoked by Zaire.

Refugee flows from these countries have crossed all the regional boundaries. Tutsis fled Rwanda in the early 1960s for Uganda and Burundi. Burundi's Hutus fled to Tanzania and Zaire from a series of massacres by the Tutsi army since the mid-1960s. In 1994 Rwandan Hutus (including genocide perpetrators) fled the RPF, composed of Tutsi refugees based in Uganda, into

changed incrementally in order to promote a more regional focus:

- Speakers and programs have increasingly dealt with related regional questions.
- The partner organizations have made increasing efforts to coordinate with a related effort (inspired by the BPF), the International Watchers of Zaire, organized by Prof. William Zartman of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies.
- In order to make the Forum into a place for more focused discussion, more presentations of analyses as well as reports from the field are presented. We anticipate more such reports, as well as appearances by analysts and experts whom we will invite.

CPA is also engaged in consultations with potential partners for a joint North American (United States and Canada), European, and African independent working group to carry out a study of the challenges to a more stable regional peace in Central Africa over the next several years. We anticipate using the Forums as platforms for discussion of the ideas coming out of these studies.

EuroForum on the Great Lakes

Since the founding of the BPF, the partner organizations have tried to coordinate their work with European ones. International Alert initially held a series of meetings on Burundi in London for European (mainly British) NGOs, including one conference which many official representatives also attended. IA's project on the Great Lakes has now taken a different direction, though it still convenes occasional trans-Atlantic conference calls, most recently one in September, to deal with the consequences of the July coup in Burundi.

In general, however, while European countries are deeply involved in the region, we have no mechanism for coordinating with European NGOs, nor do they have a mechanism for coordinating with each other. The European Union has taken a key interest in

the Great Lakes region and has appointed a special envoy, Aldo Ajello. The European parliament also includes many deputies concerned with the region, as well as with early warning and conflict prevention, and many NGOs concerned with the region have offices there. In addition, because of its colonial history, Belgium is a center of activity in Europe regarding the region.

After consultations with European colleagues, we concluded that there was interest in a forum on the region at the headquarters of the European Union in Brussels. Together with the European Center for Common Groups in Brussels (ECCG), CPA convened a planning meeting on December 19, 1996 and two meetings of the Forum on February 26 and April 24, 1997. Ambassador Richard Bogosian, U.S. Special Coordinator for Rwanda and Burundi and Ambassador Aldo Ajello, EU Special Envoy for the Region were guest speakers. Representatives of the European Commission (Direction General I and VIII), European Parliament, Belgian Parliament, Belgian Secretariat for Cooperation and Development, Association for Western European Parliamentarians, Christian Concertation for Central Africa, Centre for Peace Research, Dutch Centre for Conflict Prevention, European Institute for Research Information on Peace and Security, World Watch Institute, NGO-European Union Liaison Committee, Fondation Hirondelle/Radio Agatashya, International Alert, Disaster Relief Agency (NL), and the Amnesty International EU Association attended the meeting.

The reception was overwhelmingly positive. The obstacles are significant, as the type of informal interchange practised at BPF meetings across organizational and hierarchical boundaries is quite unfamiliar in the European context. But it was precisely this lack which made many of our European colleagues enthusiastic about the prospect. Such an effort, which will introduce a new form of NGO-government interaction into European institutions, could have effects beyond the specific region dealt with by this project. ■

Legitimate and Illegitimate Discrimination: New Issues in Migration

Edited by Howard Adelman

ISBN 1-55014-238-0. 1995.

287 pp., indexed. \$22.95

Freedom of movement: If the members of a state are forced to flee, the legitimacy of that government is questionable. On the other hand, if members cannot or must leave, again the government is not democratically legitimate.

Immigration control: While limiting access and determining who may or may not become members of a sovereign state remains a legitimate prerogative of the state, the criteria, rules and processes for doing so must be compatible with its character as a democratic state.

Legitimate and Illegitimate Discrimination: New Issues in Migration, edited by Professor Howard Adelman, deals with the question of legitimacy with cases studies from the Developing World, Europe, Australia, the United States, and Canada.

CONTRIBUTORS:

Rainer Bauböck, Howard Adelman, Gaim Kibreab, A. Essuman-Johnson, Grant M. Farr, Lawrence Lam, Oscar Schiappa-Pietra, Tomas Hammar, Frédéric Tiberghien (in French), Lois Foster, and Arthur C. Helton.

Available from

Centre for Refugee Studies

Tel.: (416) 736-5843

Fax: (416) 736-5837

Email: refuge@yorku.ca