## Essay on the basics of bosnia and rwanda conflicts

Experience, Peace



Whenever there is no peace, there has to be conflict for these two cannot exist in the same environment. It is for this reason that it is well understood that where one is, the other can never be. This situation can best explain the circumstances in Rwanda and Bosnia a while back. These two countries experienced a couple of years of turmoil because civil war arose which led to the death of hundreds of thousands of people. When such happens, then it is evident there is conflict, and in the presence of such happenings, there is no peace, peace is therefore that situation of sustained stability minus conflict. In regard to Rwanda, the country had experienced favorable peace for a couple of years where two ethnic groups, the Tutsi and Hutus lived together. There were intermarriages and sharing of resources until Belgium, who was their colonial master that was in Rwanda withdrew their troops in the year 1962 when Rwanda was awarded independence (CNN News Para 2. At the same time, the monarch was dissolved and this led to a power tussle that saw the two ethnic groups fight for leadership. This led to a conflict that culminated in the year 1994 (Thompson 167). There was ethnic cleansing where Hutus and their Tutsi sympathizers were killed in the now famous Rwandan Genocide.

In Bosnia, there was also ethnic conflict which came up when Yugoslavia broke up as a result of the Slovenian and Croatian secessions (Burg 23). The Bosnian Serbs had gone their way to form their own republic. War came up when Yugoslavia and Bosnian Serbs warmed up and wanted to get hold of the entire Serbian territory. This led to a war that not only targeted Serbia but also the Muslim Bosniak population which was a majority group especially in eastern Bosnia (Shatzmiller 18).

In both countries, the war and genocide came to an end because the international community intervened and the people in both republics decided to bury the hatchet and move on despite the pain and anguish that all the groups concerned went through. But the fact is that it is not an easy task to move on because the past is always carried into the future. The aftermath therefore has seen all groups embrace each other. The other way to go about the aftermath of the war is by the governments in both countries ensuring that there is equal distribution of not only resources but power too. This way no one will feel left out in nation building. Again, the two nations should learn from past mistakes and avoid such scenarios in the future because the end result of a genocide or civil war is best seen through the pain and suffering of not only the people at it but also the future generations.

According to Prunier, if there is a policy that should be given preference in order to sustain peace and stability in the two nations is promoting the culture of peace and stability among all the ethnic groups (11). If only the people learn to appreciate the past and move on. The past can always act as a reminder of where they have come from (Bartos & Wehr 43). This will make them never want to go back there. The culture of peace and stability when well engraved in the masses, the truth is that there is no single day that they will ever want to take peace for granted.

## Works cited

Bartos, Otomar & Wehr, Paul. Using Conflict Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2002

Burg, Steven. "The" War in Bosnia-Herzegovina: Ethnic Conflict and

International Intervention. New York. M. E. Sharpe. 2000

CNN News. "A Brief History 1400- 1994." Cnn. com. 1996, Web, 11th may 2013. http://edition. cnn. com/EVENTS/1996/year. in.

review/topten/hutu/history. html

Prunier, Gerard. Africa's World War: Congo, the Rwandan Genocide, and the

Making of aContinental catastrophe. Oxford: Oxford university press

Shatzmiller, Maya. Islam and Bosnia: Conflict Resolution and Foreign Policy in

Multi-EthnicStates. Quebec: MQUP. 2002

Thompson, Allan. The Media and the Rwanda Genocide. London: Pluto Press. 2007