CONCLUSION
The foregone discussion make it amply clear the complexity of the linkages between ethnicity, conflict and refugees. Hence there is an urgent need to evolve an appropriate solution, thereby ending the plight of a large number of people. Towards this endeavour, it was argued that there is a prevalence of conflict in society and of an increasing tendency to use violence to settle them. Violence is used primarily, due to its potency in achieving individual and group ends.

Violent conflicts, it was deduced, are not random but conditioned by external circumstances. These circumstances can be suitably manipulated to create conditions of conflict or peace. The need, therefore, is to identify and create conditions of peace.

Every conflict is based on one or more contradiction, or in other words, the blocking of goal realisation. This leads to frustration. An accumulation of frustration results in violent behaviour. The reason for a person’s inability to achieve full potential lies in the hierarchical pattern of society. This results in substantial accumulation of frustration and the resultant violence. An important feature of violence is that often it is built into the societal structure. Besides, there is cultural violence which is the set of those cultural symbols or idioms that legitimise or justify the perpetration of violence.

The focus of this study is the problem of refugees. This implies that the State becomes a crucial institution whose actions are decisive to the direction and outcome of the conflict. Since the State enjoys immense powers, its control becomes the goal of different parties involved in the conflict. However, a post-Cold War trend is that the State has lost its monopoly as the sole coercive authority resulting in many internal conflict. Also an important feature of conflicts in Africa is that a majority of them are internal and have resulted in substantial flows of refugees.

Conflicts cannot be solved using violent and brutal means like genocide and forced mass transfer of people. Such measures do not solve conflicts, but merely
postpones them. The classic approach to solve conflicts is to physically separate the antagonists. Though this temporarily suspends violence but ironically it also provides the warring groups an opportunity for regrouping and consolidation and disrupts integration and cohabitation efforts.

In peace-making, the effort is to identify the underlying contradictions and resolve it. Durable peace, it is assumed, could be possible once the underlying conflict is removed. Experience, however, belies this assumption, as the means of coercion do not wither away and result in future destabilisation. Thus, it is not enough to address the contradictions but a transformation of the groups has to take place so that conflict producing conditions are not reproduced.

Large and long-term refugee flows tend to be triggered due to sustained intra-state conflicts between consolidated groups. A major rallying point in such conflicts is ethnicity. The prospect of a group of dispersed and fragmented set of people aggregating to form a cohesive and assertive ethnic group is high in situations where the following conditions exists: a socially mobilised population and the existence of a symbol pool connoting the distinctiveness of the group; effective selection, standardisation and transmission of this symbol pool by the group leadership; and presence of a reference group, which provides a sense of deprivation to the members of the group.

There are many different repercussions of violence but this study is limited to refugees. The problem of refugees is growing at an alarming rate, and unless suitable remedial measures are taken, the international order threatens to be overwhelmed. Another reason for limiting the study to refugees is because this issue or aspect has been understudied or overlooked.
Prior to 1970, apart from small sets of people, most refugee problems used to be temporary phenomenon. As soon as the conditions normalised at home, refugees used to return or repatriate. The assistance required in such cases was primarily of logistics and rehabilitation. However, a new trend emerged in 1970s when some refugee problem became permanent. This changed the entire approach and perception towards refugee flows, resulting in increasing the pressure on both the hosts and the refugees.

Traditionally, the international regime of refugee protection has been based on two basic premises. First, that a refuge seeker should not be exposed to mortal dangers by being denied refuge. The other principle is that if the costs are high, then the country has the prerogative to refuse protection to asylum seekers. These contradicting principles have never been reconciled and such ambiguity has only made the condition of the refuge seekers tenacious. Thus a refugee enjoys some protection or privileges like non-refoulment provided it does not harm the interests of the host country. In such an eventuality the refuge seeker can be expelled and denied refuge.

The UNHCR has been mandated with the task of defining whether a person qualifies the laid down criterion to be given refugee status under the Geneva Convention and Protocol. This makes both the definition and its application crucial for securing protection. Efforts to extend the definition have not yielded tangible results. Rather even those who have qualified under these Instruments have been denied or refused protection under some pretext or the other. In some situations, the UNHCR has been asked to extend facility to such persons who do not fulfil the criterion. And this is done, under the doctrine of ‘good offices’.

Therefore, to solve the plight of refugees and the resultant repercussions on the hosts and international order, the conflict that triggered the refugee flows must be addressed and solved. This cannot happen unless the underlying contradictions are
removed and the groups are transformed in such a manner that conflict is not reproduced. As the focus of the study is ethnic conflict, the issues related to ethnicity and identity too must be appropriately addressed and settled for an appropriate solution to emerge.

Turning to the case studies, the conflict system in these countries was established over a long period of time. As a consequence of ecological factors, the Tutsis were able to capture power. As the State became stronger, the Hutus were continuously pushed into a disadvantageous position due to the new land-tenure system such as ubureetwa. Thus, through the control of the State, the Tutsis inflicted enormous amounts of indirect violence on the Hutus, who remained unconscious of it for a long time. Diffused and fragmented nature of the societies helped in delaying the conflict consciousness from emerging.

The State in Rwanda was more centralised and rigid in comparison to the Burundian State. In Burundi, the State was defused and flexible due to the presence of the princely class of ganawa. The colonial rule only helped the Tutsis to further entrench and perpetrate violence on the Hutus. This violence was personified in the office of the traditional chief, held exclusively by the Tutsis. Besides, the colonial rule transformed these societies into two rigid and antagonistic monolithic blocks.

Another process initiated during the latter part of colonial rule was the growing conflict consciousness among the Hutus. In Rwanda, they then began to voice their alienation and deprivation from power. The Monarchy responded with intimidation and violence. This led the Hutu leadership to realise that they must consolidate and made them think of the utility of violence. Using the social resources available they consolidated a group of fragmented and diffused population into a assertive and conscious ethnic group willing to resort to violence. They used ethnic symbols to rally
people. Thus, at the time of decolonisation, they successfully replaced the Tutsi elite and took control of the State.

The situation in Burundi was different. The social structure was flexible enough to provide scope for social mobility. All the political formations had Hutu representation and the pre-independence elections had produced some Hutu legislatures. Thus the Hutus did not feel the need to consolidate and create conflict consciousness or mobilise themselves by using ethnicity.

These conflict systems shifted from the latent to the manifest or behavioural phase after the conscientization process. In Rwanda this occurred during the decolonisation process leading to their successful capture of power. In Burundi the democratic institutions were systematically undermined by the Tutsis due to the fear of losing power and ending up in refugee camps like their Rwandan counterparts. On the other hand, the Hutus were initially hopeful of participating in State power. However, the erosion of democratic structures and the achievements of Rwandan Hutus made them restless and increased their sense of deprivation. This resulted in conflict consciousness which led them to attempt to capture power with force. Their effort not only failed but also resulted in a phenomenal amount of violence being unleashed on them by the Army. Thereafter, the small entrenched Tutsi minority used every pretext to embark upon ethnic cleansing. The most serious efforts at reform and power sharing in the late 80s and the early 90s too failed and ended in disarray and violence.

In Rwanda, the Hutu elite used the conflict consciousness that had brought them to power; using the mass media to demonise the Tutsis and conducting regular pogroms. This process of using conflict consciousness to stay in power reached its crescendo during the genocide in 1994 when about a million people were killed in a span of just three months.
These behavioural manifestations of the conflict in both the countries had a major repercussion on their societies. Apart from other forms of losses, these societies have been destabilised to such an extent that regular massive exodus occur in search of refuge. This region has experienced three different sets of refugee flows, namely that of Rwandan Tutsis, and those of Rwandan and Burundian Hutus.

Successful repatriation, which is among the most plausible and sustainable solution, is not possible unless some form of political reforms are undertaken and structural violence ended; like in the case of Rwandan Tutsis. Their return was prompted by the coming to power of RPF, where as the repatriation of Hutus of both Rwanda and Burundi occurred not due to conducive conditions but due to far more trying conditions in the country of refuge. The policies of the hosts and regime in power are decisive in repatriation. The involuntary repatriation due to the failure of the international protection regime has prompted many refugees to join the ranks of armed groups resulting in protracted violence and strifes. Also both regimes have resorted to massive relocation of people thereby disrupting their lives.

Thus, it is the failure of international protection regime and of conflict resolution efforts that is responsible for the plight of the people in the region. These efforts were initiated late despite early warning available. This was due to the priority of the international community, especially of United States of America, about engagements in a non-strategic and irrelevant regions. Also, when the efforts began they did not incorporate all the sections who were relevant. Moreover, the formal decisions taken during the negotiations remained dead letters as there was no effort to enforce them.

Moreover, more importantly the efforts were aimed at containing violence and not at solving the structural violence in-built in the society. Nor were the issues of
identity, which had become of paramount importance, addressed. Therefore, unless the issue of identity and societal violence is addressed and suitable solution developed violence will not end and nor will the plight of displaced people end.

The discussion makes it amply clear that the conflict and the resultant sufferings, causalities and disruptions of the people primarily occurred due to the abdication of the responsibility of the international community. There were clear indicators about the outbreak of violence. This is symptomatic of the abdication of the responsibility to uphold universal human values and rights of fellow human beings. Many thousands of lives were lost and basic rights of scores of others were trampled due to the pragmatism displayed by those countries who were capable of effective involvement. These countries have on other occasions – when it suited them – intervened with speed and massive military wherewithal.

Hence, there is a need to bring about a change of attitude so that something tangible is done. There is a need for massive mobilisation so that those at the helm consider humanitarian involvement as being urgent and pragmatic. The events also reflect the larger malaise, which disregards the value and sanctity of human life. Thus, there is a need to revive the importance of human life and this can only come by giving the universally shared values the paramountcy they deserve. For this sustained efforts will have to be made by those who feel concerned at the loss and destruction of life, to spread and inculcate amongst people the need and importance of preserving every single life.

Another feature that has emerged from this study is that the intervention or any other efforts at attaining peace must be long drawn and enduring. There cannot be quick-fix solutions for a society rife with violence. Such short-term and short-sighted interventions invariably make the conflict system more destabilised. Such efforts will
languish and be abandoned for a variety of reasons leaving the recipients in the lurch. Efforts must be made to unravel the latent structural violence with deep and detailed analysis using various available tools at ones disposal.

Another reason for the failure of large number of efforts is that they focus at the manifest or superfluous aspects of violence while the more important latent aspects are ignored. Also, efforts usually begin after direct violence has begun. Such efforts invariably turn sour when the latent aspects rear their head. This emphasise the importance of understanding the conflict and the conflict system correctly before embarking on a solution. Therefore, all the three forms of violence namely, direct, structural and cultural violence must be analysed, understood and addressed. These efforts must occur in every sphere of the society, so that they are addressed suitably and effectively.

The relevant players and actors in a conflict system must be identified. Unless every section of the population is involved, any solution will be a dead letter. The relevance of even small groups must not be ignored because they can easily destroy painstaking healing efforts.

This implies that the efforts must also be made to transform the groups in such a manner that conflict cannot be reproduced. An essential feature of this is that there must be meaningful change in the structure of the society.

This study amply makes clear the potency and efficacy of ethnicity in transforming, moulding, aggregating, and consolidating a fragmented, and defused group of people into an assertive ethnic group. Therefore, ethnicity and its related issues must be properly addressed. Not only must every ethnic group be made to participate in the exercise of power but emotional and material stakes of the community must be addressed too. Towards this end it is essential to understand the role of
ethnicity in the social process. Ignoring ethnic or identity issues as irrelevant, runs the risk of these issues being used for the consolidation and assertion by a group. Thus no ethnic issue must be considered irrelevant rather suitable efforts must be made to accept differences and diversity in society. Also its efficacy in precipitating or dissipating conflict too must be kept in mind. It could become a potent tool for creating and sustaining peace. Thus, the effort must made to create conducive conditions for positive peace.

By positive peace it is meant that there should be rehabilitation of those who have suffered in different manner during the conflict. Though not all losses could be compensated or rehabilitated yet effort must be made to alleviate suffering and loses to extent possible. This should help in the reintegration of the society. Thus, long-term, sincere efforts which are based on the proper understanding of the conflict and the conflict system – addressing the various forms of violence and at every sphere – should over a period of time result in the reintegration of the society and its evolution to positive peace.

Thus, one can conclude by saying that unless the fundamental issues are kept in mind and sincere action taken the solution to the plight of millions of refugees and other form of sufferings due to violence will not cease. This could be only brought about by a true commitment to universal human values cherished by all.