

**Study Questions on Maybury-Lewis 81-103 (Genocide)
and Eller 195-241 (Rwanda and Burundi)**

1. Compare what Eller says about the shifting nature of the categorical designations “Hutu” and “Tutsi” to Gladney’s analysis of the category “Hui.”
2. Describe the role played by European racial aesthetics and racism in the received wisdom regarding differences between the Hutu and the Tutsi.
3. Compare and contrast the Rwandan genocide with the Third Reich’s “final solution.”
4. What did you know about the categories “Hutu” and “Tutsi” prior to reading Maybury-Lewis’s and Eller’s essays? What did you know about the genocide in Rwanda? In what ways did these essays change your understanding of the situation?
5. Discuss the ethnogenesis of the Hutu and Tutsi categories as ethnic groups. What did these categories mean prior to colonization? How did colonization change them? What happened to them following independence, in particular what were the effects of instituting democratic rule?
6. On p. 83, Maybury-Lewis discusses “indirect rule” (also see p. 212 of Eller). What does this mean?
7. What conclusions can we draw from the Rwanda and Burundi cases about the likelihood of ethnic conflict becoming seriously violent, to the point of genocide?
8. Describe the arguments made by Tutsi for why they should rule Rwanda (Eller, p. 226). Describe those made by Hutu.
9. Eller says that Hutu and Tutsi were *achieved* statuses almost as much as they were *ascribed* ones (p. 202). What do these terms mean? How did an individual or a family achieve one or the other status?

MIT OpenCourseWare
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

21A.226 Ethnic and National Identity
Fall 2011

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.