

Assignment 3 - ICGS112

Based on: Hotel Rwanda

Part 1

1. In what ways does the main character, Paul Rusesabagina, and his family experience forced migration during the events portrayed in the film?

Firstly, they were forced out of their home by the military – forced migration. After saving everyone by paying tribute to the force, they settle down at the hotel that Paul was working in high position. The genocide started, they were safe for a while, since there's a group of UN force protecting the hotel – a lot of white guesses. Thing goes down hill when all the white were evacuated off the country; most UN forces left, though they remain in contact. The crowd started to patrol nearer to the hotel, showing constant threat, but Paul ensure everyone's safety by bribing a general. They call for help, which help comes. The first escape attempt failed, due to a staff bedrail. Second attempt to escape were made after the event getting more global attention, they successfully reach the refugee camp (I supposed the retaliation force were support by the French – I'm surprised that the french didn't surrendered at the moment they reach the war zone, usual french/s) – permanent migration. Then, lastly, a few lucky family migrate abroad as a refugee – international migration, since they might have to move around, until granted citizen ship; Paul's family moved to Belgium and settle there – Permanent migration. Sadly, he got lured back to Rwanda, and sentenced to 25 years in prison – I will consider this a bad ending, though he got released 3 years later.

-
2. How does the international community's response, or lack thereof, to the Rwandan genocide contribute to the themes of displacement and migration in the movie?

Based on the movie, the first response is to evacuate the whites out of the country first. Then, only due to that brave camera man who recorded the evidence of genocide, and refugee of the hotel calling their closed ones abroad – gaining international community's attention. There's an academic debate whether the situation is considered a genocide, since they'll not intervene unless genocide occurs: academics are recorded using technical wordings and over complicated explanation to deny the happenings, shame on them. When they conclude the happenings of genocide, they sent troops in, from the south (I supposed); leading by the french, they form a safe zone, create a temporary refugee camp and support the rebels. People in the hotel then get escorted to the refugee camp, and migrate to their designated countries – international community accept them as refugee or migrants.

3. What role do refugee camps play in the narrative of "Hotel Rwanda," and how do they reflect the challenges faced by those forced to flee their homes?

The refugee camps serves as a temporary home for those forced to flee their homes. Moreover, it's the base of operation for the UN forces and rebels (Tutsi and Rwanda people who oppose the genocide). Refugees will then migrate to somewhere they accept them as refugees. The living condition there sucks, they don't have proper shelter – relying on international aid, you lost all belongings, being in a constant fear – stimulus by gun fire, and uncertain future. It will be stressful and hopeless.

4. In what ways does "Hotel Rwanda" encourage reflection on the responsibility of the international community to prevent and respond to mass atrocities as a means of protecting human rights?

- Belgium are largely to blame here. They deserted Rwanda, leaving it with racial biases. People didn't get a proper education, and the lack of financial and infrastructure support from the Belgium are the main cause of this atrocities – international communities, UN and other organization should inspect this action since departure of Belgium, and warn the Belgium and Rwanda authorities.
 - UN peace keeper (mostly Belgium) unwilling to intervene in the early phases of the genocide. Most casualties are caused by Rwanda commoners (civilians), not the military. They are fueled by hatred from the propaganda, a wise political advisor should be able to solve or soothe the situation – they could do better than this.
 - It serves as a good example of how horrible the genocide was. Memorable event that newer generation could learn, not to do it again – studied globally.
 - Most importantly, the international community failed to protect Paul, when he was abducted by the Rwanda government a few years ago, put to trial, and sentenced to 25 years in prison. Belgium didn't do much to save him, but the US and multiple human rights organization did call Rwanda out, and eventually he got released in 2022 and take refuge in the USA.
-

5. In what manner does "Hotel Rwanda" portray the violation of the right to an adequate standard of living, considering the harsh conditions faced by refugees and displaced individuals?

In the hotel scene, when the refugees population increases, the living space decreases, leads to people sleeping in the hall way. Then, when the electricity and water got cut, people's standard of living declined even more, they need to use the pool's water and the food are sparse – poor standard of living. Then, when they moved to the refugee camp, food supplies and hygiene aren't so bad (for a war torn country), but still the standard of living are poor, due to minimal living space, constant fear and uncertainty of their future.

6. What role do the media and propaganda play in perpetuating human rights abuses in the context of the Rwandan genocide, as portrayed in "Hotel Rwanda"?

- Journalists and his camera man documented the killings, then probably published the footage to the international community. This serves as a great evidence of genocide, and helped speed up the intervention attempt.
 - Throughout the film, Rwanda radio spread hatred and propaganda. Tutsi are portrayed as cockroaches, treater to the nation. People were fumed with hatred and the killing were unstoppable. Additionally, the media also provide the Tutsi hideout position via radio: the first and second escape attempt – from the hotel to refugee camp.
 - The movie didn't show much of international media, aside from that admirable camera man. The only scene is when the academic are debating with a reporter whether the event is consider genocide or not, why would he pick up a fight with a reporter? He uses confusing definition and other techniques to denied the genocide happenings – didn't have much affect.
-

Part 2

2.1 Types of Migration in the Film

Type of Migration	Scene
Forced Migration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tutsi and some Hutu are forced to flee their home, due to the conflict • when people in the hotel were forced to evacuate by the crowd of Hutu
Voluntary Migration	None for the Rwandans, but there are some international volunteers that voluntary came to help the country. The incentive isn't money or better life, they just wanted to help other human beings.
International Migration	Majority of the Rwanda genocide refugee cross the boarder to neighbor countries: Uganda and Congo. Only a few made it to other destination: Belgium for Paul's family.
Permanent Migration	After international migration, they're able to settle down in the destination country when granted citizenship or the permission to work.
Temporary Migration	The hotel and the refugee camp, people stayed there for a while, before migrate somewhere else, or until the crisis was resolved – for the Hutu – they went back to their home.

2.2 Human Rights Violations in the Film

Human Right	Scene
Right to equality	Hutu were treated as second class citizen at first, but when the Belgium left, they with much larger population and power do the same thing to Tutsi – both lack equality
Freedom from discrimination	Even though Paul's family lives together just fine, there probably discriminatory act from both side – Hutu and Tutsi. Additionally, international community hesitant to send help, as the UN general said to Paul: "You are not even a ni**a, you are African black".
Right to life, liberty, and personal security	Nowhere was safe after the first 30 minutes of the film, no personal security. Paul need to bribe the military multiple times to save the people.
Freedom from slavery	The scene where Paul went out to buy food, I think I saw some Tutsi captured inside a cage, might be a some kind of slavery
Freedom from torture and degrading treatment	Torture happens throughout the event. At the start of the show, we saw a degrading treatment to the Tutsi, then it escalated to killing. Moreover, when Paul got lured to Rwanda and went through a trail, he reportedly got torture.
Right to recognition as a person before the law	International community ignore the Tutsi for a long period of time, before sending actual help – like they didn't acknowledge them as a person.
Right to equality before the law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tutsi were denied help from the police and military. • Hutu were granted the power to massacre every Tutsi.
Right to remedy by competent tribunal	The Tutsi human right are violated – there's a genocide happening, but there's no court to give them justice at the time. They have the right to seek justice and protection
Freedom from arbitrary arrest or exile	I saw some Tutsi locked inside a cage – the scene where Paul went out to buy food for his people
Right to fair public hearing	Paul's trial in Rwanda, though open to the public was criticized by its lack of justice
Right to be considered innocent until proven guilty	None
Freedom from interference with privacy	Violated by the police, military and citizen – raiding houses
Right to free movement	Tutsi were detained in their home (hide) or the hotel, they cannot go out of those zone – they'll get killed
Right to asylum in other countries	The right to asylum were given to Rwandans, but it took some time: Paul and his family were granted Belgium citizenship
Right to nationality	None
Right to marriage and family	Families were torn apart from the genocide
Right to own property	Houses and other properties were destroy

Freedom of belief and religion	None
Freedom of opinion and expression	They (Tutsi) were not given an option to at least flee (get kicked out) of the country. Also, you probably cannot express anything to a mad citizen with a machete – especially, when no one (police) is protecting you
Right to peaceful assembly and association	An assembly would become target for slaughter. Peaceful assembly were suppress
Right to participate in government	In Belgium reign, Hutu had a hard time participating in government action, but when the Belgium left, the problem turned to the Tutsi
Right to social security	None
Right to work	People were forced to abandon their jobs, loose their work. Even the hotel staff lost their job at the time they moved to refugee camp.
Right to rest and leisure	Hard to rest during a genocide, when you are a Tutsi. Poor living condition in the hotel, people lying all over the hallway – would be hard to rest.
Right to adequate living standard	Latter half of the movie shown inadequate living standard
Right to education	Kids don't get school, at least when they were at the hotel. There might be some teachings in the refugee camp
Right to participate in cultural life	Rwandan culture, especially the Tutsi ones were destroyed. They still sing songs and dance – attempt to preserve the culture
Right to social order	I interpret that there should be a system that protects human right, which there is, but the UN peace keeper was hesitant and didn't have allowance to shoot or stop the genocide
Duties to the community	Hutu neglected their duties to the community (nation): to united and developed the country
Freedom from interference in these rights	Multiple human rights violation happens throughout the movie, the rights were taken away from the Tutsi

P.S. The human rights were interpreted based on my understanding. AI was only used to abridge and place them into the table above (via LaTeX script).