

**Reparation and Reconciliation in Post-Genocide Rwanda:  
Perpetrators' Perspective**



Rwanda's next generation, students on their way to school, Butare, photo by author

MSc Health, Community and Development  
Supervisor Catherine Campbell  
Iran Seyed-Raeisy  
Word count 10,985

## Table of contents

<b>Abstract</b> .....	2
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	3
<b>Chapter I: Introduction</b> .....	4
i. Brief history of the Rwandan genocide	
ii. Motivation	
iii. Research question	
<b>Chapter II: Literature Review</b> .....	6
i. Empirical	
i.i. International response to the Rwandan genocide	
i.i.i. ICTR (International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda)	
i.ii. Domestic responses to the Rwandan genocide	
i.ii.i. Responses before gacaca (community courts)	
i.ii.ii. Gacaca	
i.ii.iii. Restorative/reparative justice and reparation	
ii. Gaps in the literature	
iii. Conceptual	
iii.i. Overarching theory: social psychology of participation	
iii.ii. Relevant theories: social learning and fourth generation approach	
iii.ii.i. Social learning	
iii.ii.ii. Fourth generation approach	
<b>Chapter III: Methodology</b> .....	14
i. Research design: the site	
ii. Data collection	
iii. Interview process	
iv. Analysis	
v. Ethical considerations	
<b>Chapter IV: Findings and discussion</b> .....	17
i. Global theme I: Getting to know the perpetrators	
ii. Global theme II: Reconciliation according to the perpetrators	
iii. Global theme III: Factors facilitating the role of reparation in achieving reconciliation	
iii.i. Dialogue and social capital bonding	
iii.i.i. Groups of perpetrators	
iii.i.i.i. Solidarity	
iii.i.i.ii. Empowerment	
iii.i.i.iii. Peer education	
iii.i.i.iv. Peer pressure	
iii.i.i.v. Peer support	
iii.i.ii. Groups of perpetrators and survivors	
iii.i.ii.i. Support with reparation	
iii.i.ii.ii. Dialogue for reconciliation	
iii.i.iii. Groups of all community members	
iii.ii. Dialogue and social capital bridging	
iii.ii.i. Community-based organisation: AMI	
iv. Global theme IV: Factors hindering the role of reparation in achieving reconciliation	
iv.i. Poverty, barrier to reparation	
iv.ii. Lack of community mobilisation	
iv.iii. Other consequences of the lack of receptive social contexts	
iv.iv. Restorative justice in Rwanda	
<b>Chapter V: Conclusion</b> .....	31
i. Limitations	
ii. Future research	
iii. Implications	
<b>References</b> .....	33
<b>Appendices</b> .....	37
Appendix I: Map of Rwanda	
Appendix II: Participant information sheet	
Appendix III: Consent form	
Appendix IV: Debrief sheet	
Appendix V: Interview topic guide	
Appendix VI: Sample interview topic guide with partner organisation (AMI)	
Appendix VII: Ethics approval form	
Appendix VIII: Sample field notes	
Appendix IX: Sample interview transcript	
Appendix X: Sample codebook	

## Abstract

As we approach the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Rwandan genocide in April, 2014 questions about justice and reconciliation become ever more relevant. Rwanda's restorative justice sentenced thousands of perpetrators to reparation (often a monetary compensation) at the *gacaca* (community courts). However, many survivors have yet to receive reparation. The majority of perpetrators who wish to make reparation are poor and unable to do so. It is against this backdrop that this study examines the role of reparation in achieving reconciliation in Rwanda. I worked in partnership with the Survivors Fund (SURF) in Kigali and *Association Modeste et Innocent* (AMI) in Butare. In-country partner organisations and literature review revealed the need to conduct research on the perpetrators' perspectives. Hence, I specifically focused on the perpetrators' viewpoint on reparation and reconciliation. I conducted 16 semi-structured interviews with perpetrators and perpetrators' family members responsible for reparation. This thesis captures the perpetrators' characteristics and their understanding of reconciliation while also explaining the factors facilitating and hindering the role of reparation in achieving reconciliation. The findings illustrate that reparation can lead to a more empowered and positive social identity through three processes: social capital bonding, social capital bridging and dialogue. The three processes are linked and work together through the social psychology of participation. Freire's conscientisation, social learning and Campbell and Cornish's fourth generation approach underlie these inter-related processes. The findings of this research confirm the increased need to address the issue of reparation for the benefit of both survivors and perpetrators. One way to prioritise the issue is to establish a reparation task force, as various organisations in Rwanda have suggested. Future genocide courts need to give options besides monetary reparation for the road to redemption and reconciliation. Given the success of community initiatives driven by reparation more support for community-based organisations and associations is necessary to create the receptive social contexts to achieve reconciliation.

Keywords: Rwanda, reconciliation, reparation, participation, community, restorative justice, social learning

## Acknowledgments

To Cathy Campbell, my supervisor. Learning and working with you has changed my life. I'm grateful for your understanding, support and encouragement. I look forward to working with you again.

To Rochelle Burgess, my graduate teaching assistant. You understood me when it seemed like no one else could. I couldn't have done it without you. Thank you.

To Jenevieve Mannell, my lecturer. You reassured me and gave me the strength to make this project happen. Thank you for all the support.

To the SURF staff, specifically, Jemma Hogwood, Albert Gasake, David Russell and Gabo Wilson. Thank you for the partnership and trust. Your work is a source of inspiration and I am grateful for the opportunity to have worked with you. Murakoze.

To the AMI staff, specifically, Jean Baptiste Bizimana, David Bazirankende and Jean de Dieu Sekamana. I am grateful for our partnership and your support. Your achievements illustrate the immense value of grassroots and community-based initiatives. I am deeply inspired. Murakoze.

To Joël Murenzi, my research assistant. You represent Rwanda's bright future and its dynamic young generation. I look forward to hearing about your achievements in the years to come. Murakoze.

To Mahsa Foroutan, my dear friend. I wouldn't have had this opportunity if it weren't for you. Thank you for the continuous support.

To my classmates, you are one of a kind. I feel lucky to have shared this year with you. Your support, encouragement, hugs, delicious foods and laughter got me going. Thank you.

Special thanks to my dear friend, Mihoko Yotsui for being there and empowering me all along and AnnaSophia Gallagher for all her help. Thank you.

To mum and dad, I am grateful for your everlasting trust and support.

To the people of Rwanda, especially my research participants. Thank you for trusting and sharing your stories with me. I have learnt so much from you. Your resilience and community spirit are deeply inspiring. Thank you for being so giving. This is for you. Murakoze na nzaguruka.

## Chapter I: Introduction

### i. Brief history of the Rwandan genocide

In the early hours of April 7th, 1994 Hutu extremists shot down the plane carrying Rwanda's president, Juvénal Habyarimana and Burundian president, Cyprien Ntaryamira in Kigali (Prunier, 1998 cited in Clark & Kaufman, 2008). The plane crash sparked the mass mobilisation of Hutus in an attempt to eliminate Rwanda's Tutsis from the country through a systematic programme of genocide (Mamdani, 2002). With the UN and the international community's inaction to intervene, the killings continued until the Rwandan Patriotic Front, an army of mostly Tutsi refugees in Uganda took over the country and stopped the genocide after 100 days (Kagame, 2008; Gourevitch, 1998). The exact death toll is unknown and remains a subject of debate. An estimation in 1998 by a prominent historian suggested it was at least 850,000 (Prunier, 1998 cited in Clark, 2010). A government survey in 2004 estimated the death toll to be 937,000 (IRIN Africa, 2004) while a 2008 AERG (Genocide Survivor Student Association) survey estimated the number to be 1,952,078 (Musoni, 2008). Many sources indicate the mid-range number of 800,000 (Clark, 2010). During the 19th anniversary memorial events in April 2013, I witnessed Rwandans continuing to discover bodies (sometimes because perpetrators confess the burial locations). Hence, the death toll is likely to grow over the years as we learn more about the genocide events and further perpetrator testimonials come to light. The Rwandan genocide was largely committed by simple farming tools such as machetes and spears. Given that it took place in 100 days, in terms of its killing efficiency the Rwandan genocide remains to date the most efficient mass killing, except for the mass killings in Japan as a result of the atomic bombs (Gourevitch, 1998).

The reasons behind the genocide are complex and intertwined. While attempting to explain them is beyond the scope of this paper it is important to note Rwanda's colonial history and its impact on division between the Hutus and Tutsis. Colonial Belgium widened economic and social inequality amongst Rwandans by issuing ethnic identity cards in 1933 (Clark, 2010). In the process Belgium raised the social status of Tutsis whilst lowering the status of Hutus, increasing resentment and division between the ethnic groups, and several waves of killing of Tutsis culminating in the genocide against the Tutsis in 1994 (Gourevitch, 1998). In chapter II, section i I explore events following the genocide.

### ii. Motivation

I first learnt about the Rwandan genocide through a humanitarian lens and the experiences of James Orbinski, a doctor with Médecins Sans Frontières, an organisation I have been involved with since

2004. Orbinski worked in Rwanda during the genocide and in his book (Orbinski, 2008) and documentary film (Basmajian, Raymont & Reed, 2008) drew a heartfelt and honest picture of the genocide. The questions that immediately sprang to my mind were “whose fault was it?” followed by “how did the genocide happen?” Rwanda and the Rwandan genocide soon became one of my areas of interest and I explored Rwanda in further books and documentaries. As I learnt more about the country and its rapid development after the genocide I wondered how Rwanda has since built on its brutal history and how the country is moving forward. Is reconciliation possible? And is there reconciliation in Rwanda? My curiosity about reconciliation inspired me to think about pathways to reconciliation and examining these concerns through the lens of my discipline, social psychology. It was against this background that I approached the Survivors Fund (SURF) about the possibility of conducting a research project with them.

SURF was founded by Mary Kayitesi Blewitt, a British citizen of Rwandan origin. Having lost over 50 members of her family in the genocide, Mary mobilised efforts to support the survivors and in 1997 established SURF. Today, SURF works with partner survivor organisations to develop, implement, evaluate, advocate and raise funds for a variety of programmes. These programmes aim to deliver justice (e.g., through legal representation of survivors and advocating for restorative justice programmes) and to rebuild the lives of survivors (e.g., through investing in education, providing access to health services and alleviating survivors out of poverty) through empowerment and partnerships (SURF, 2013).

In November 2012, SURF’s Chief Executive in London, UK put me in touch with SURF’s Legal Advocacy Project Coordinator and Clinical Psychologist in Kigali. They identified the issue of reparation as an under-researched topic in the context of Rwanda and were keen to know how the perpetrators’ inability to make reparation impacted the process of reconciliation. We decided to focus specifically on the perspective of perpetrators as their viewpoints on the topic were virtually unknown. To access the perpetrators I established partnership with a second organisation that works with perpetrators and survivors, called AMI (*Association Modeste et Innocent*) in Butare.

AMI was established in 2002 by Laurien Ntezimana in the memory of his two friends, Father Innocent Samusoni, killed during the genocide and Modeste Mungwarareba, who survived the genocide and later died in 1999. Before the genocide, using a Christian framework, the three men promoted peace-building in the community through dialogue between Tutsis and Hutus. Their work is now continued by AMI utilising Ubuntu and religious frameworks. According to AMI’s Coordinator, Ubuntu is about understanding our commonality and being reminded of our humanity, what he believes Rwandans lost at the time of the genocide. He further believes that in a society torn by

division and discrimination, it is important to promote people's commonality and in the context of Rwanda where a large majority are believers, to remind them of what the Bible says, that "we are all created in the Image of God," referring to Genesis 1:27 (J. Bizimana, personal communication, April 22, 2013).

### iii. Research question

As we approach the 20th anniversary of the Rwandan genocide, both in Rwanda and internationally there is an implicit desire to 'move on' from the genocide and to put behind the atrocities and traumas of the past (African Rights & REDRESS, 2008). Nevertheless, concerns over reconciliation remain, especially when many survivors still await justice, specifically, in the form of reparation – often as financial compensation to survivors by perpetrators or their families. Discussions of reparation tend to focus on survivors, with almost total neglect of the perspective of perpetrators.

It is against this background that in this study through the eyes of the perpetrators I answer the following question:

What role does reparation play in reconciliation after the Rwandan genocide?

## Chapter II: Literature review

### i. Empirical

#### i.i. International response to the Rwandan genocide

##### i.i.i. ICTR (International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda)

The international response to the Rwandan genocide came following the UN Resolution 955 in November 1994 with the establishment of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda in Arusha, Tanzania. The first trial started in 1997 and to date ICTR has completed 75 cases (ICTR, 2013). The cost of ICTR has far exceeded US \$1 billion (Kagame, 2008). There have been many criticisms of ICTR's efficiency and legitimacy as it was revealed that at least one genocide perpetrator worked for the court (Clark & Kaufman, 2008). Another criticism came from a former ICTR President who stated that the main shortcoming of ICTR was its failure to implement a reparation policy for the survivors (Ibuka et al., 2012). Most of the criticism has come from Rwanda and the Rwandan government. Paul Kagame, current President, highlights the lack of Rwandan involvement in ICTR and specifically its physical distance to Rwanda as a barrier to a Rwandan sense of ownership and dialogue about the genocide. Instead, the Rwanda government encourages support of Rwandan judicial institutions

as a more practical and effective way to bringing justice after the genocide and moving towards reconciliation (Kagame, 2008).

## i.ii. Domestic responses to the Rwandan genocide

### i.ii.i. Responses before *gacaca* (community courts)

In 1996, with the support of the UN and international community Rwanda began rebuilding its judicial system by training lawyers, judges and instituting courts (Clark & Kaufman, 2008). Many perpetrators were soon arrested and Rwandan prisons became overcrowded. At this time the Rwandan judicial system still did not have the capacity to handle trials for these perpetrators and many of them spent years in prison without being sentenced. In 1999, the government started the confession programme in prisons where the perpetrators confessed to their crimes in exchange for their immediate release from prison by presidential pardon or a reduction in their prison sentences (Hatzfeld, 2003; Mgbako, 2005).

The biggest and most unique judicial response to the genocide did not come until 2001 with the establishment of the *gacaca* traditional courts. While more specific details about *gacaca* will be discussed below it is worth mentioning here that *gacaca* also had the jurisdiction to sentence criminals to *TIG* (*Travaux d'Interêt Général*, or community service) as an alternative to imprisonment (Rwanda Ministry of Justice, 2013). *TIG* is meant to be an opportunity for perpetrators who destroyed the country to contribute to its reconstruction (African Rights & REDRESS, 2008). Some of my research participants worked at *TIG*. With the public ban on referencing ethnicity and referring to it as a “crime of divisionism” (Lemarchand, 2008) some perpetrators, including one of my research participants, went to “solidarity camp” or *Ingando*. *Ingando* aims to promote ideas of nationalism and unity under the Rwandan identity, ease reintegration of perpetrators and refugee returnees amongst other goals, such as educating youth and providing military training (HRW, 2000; Mgbako, 2005; Tiemessen, 2004).

### i.ii.ii. *Gacaca*

*Gacaca*, meaning “lawn” or “grass” in Kinyarwanda is a traditional conflict resolution court that was revived after the genocide. *Gacaca* took on a participatory approach to justice and reconciliation. Kagame considers *gacaca* as a response to the need for justice to be delivered by Rwandans and based on Rwandan principles, such that Rwandans would come to own *gacaca* and relate to it (2008). At *gacaca* people elected respected community members as judges. Everyone in the community, including survivors, perpetrators and witnesses were encouraged (or as Lars Waldorf (2006) and Burt Ingelaere (2007, 2008) have indicated, coerced) to participate (cited in Clark, 2010).



In 2001, when gacaca was first rolled out approximately 120,000 prisoners were awaiting judgement. One of the main objectives of gacaca was to speed up the proceedings (A. Gasake, personal communication, April 24, 2013; Clark, 2010) and to do so at the level of community to rebuild social cohesion through justice, testimonials and truth-telling. At gacaca, perpetrators had the opportunity to confess and defend themselves against accusations by survivors or witnesses. However, for many survivors gacaca was also an experience of re-traumatisation and fear of threats from perpetrators. During gacaca, some perpetrators were acquitted, some were handed prison sentences and many were ordered to make reparation, specifically in the form of compensation based on what they looted and properties they damaged at the time of the genocide.

#### [i.ii.iii. Restorative/reparative justice and reparation](#)

Restorative justice is a participatory judicial approach that aims to bring survivors, perpetrators and communities together to understand the impact of the perpetrator's actions on the survivor and community. Restorative justice emerged as an alternative to criminal justice and a response to the gap created by increased attention to the perpetrator that left little room for supporting the victims (Menkel-Meadow, 2004; Weitekamp, 1992). Even when perpetrators were sentenced to compensation it was in an attempt to reduce their incarceration rather than to exercise justice for the victim (Weitekamp, 1992). The goal of restorative justice is to create dialogue between the survivor and perpetrator as part of repairing the damages caused by the perpetrator. Restorative justice gives an opportunity to the survivor to explain the impact of the perpetrator's actions on the survivor and his/her family and to obtain information about the crime, such as how and where it was committed, and in the case of murders, where the burial site is located. For the perpetrator, restorative justice provides the opportunity to understand the impact of his/her actions, take responsibility, tell the truth and seek forgiveness (Restorative Justice Council, 2013).

In post-conflict societies there is a need to repair the relationship disrupted by injustice in an attempt to achieve reconciliation (May, 2011). Reparation initiatives in restorative justice acknowledge the survivor's suffering and violations of his/her human rights (recognised legally by The UN Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law) (Ibuka et al., 2012; Khatchadourian, 2006; Margarell, 2007). Reparation is centred on the survivor and his/her participation (Margarell, 2007). It is a way for the survivor to get justice for the loss of their properties and opportunities (May, 2011; Walsh, 1996) and to ensure that the perpetrator does not benefit from his/her actions (May, 2011). The literature refers to reparation as an ethical, legal and politically sound pathway to achieving sustainable peace and reconciliation (Margarell, 2007). It is

also a pathway to restoring the survivor's dignity and rebuilding trust in the community. Reparation is composed of restitution, compensation, rehabilitation, satisfaction and guarantees for non-repetition and prevention (van Boven, 2012).

Restitution refers to restoring the survivor to the same conditions as the time before the genocide. This includes the restoration of liberty, human rights and identity as well as the restoration of one's property in the same condition as it was before it was taken away (Ibuka et al., 2012). Nevertheless, in the context of Rwanda, where close to 20 years has passed since the genocide, restoration of properties is seldom achievable (A. Gasake, personal communication, April 24, 2013; Ibuka et al., 2012).

Compensation includes a monetary award for all of the damages to the survivor. These include damages for loss of opportunity such as employment or education, damage to the survivor's properties, mental or physical harm and the cost for medical treatments, amongst others.

Rehabilitation refers to legal, social and medical services to provide physical or mental care to the survivor.

Satisfaction largely includes truth-telling and an end to violations of human rights.

Guarantees for non-repetition and prevention include the implementation of mechanisms and institutions to prevent the occurrence of future conflicts (Ibuka et al., 2012).

In Rwanda, a reparation sentence for a perpetrator is simply compensation. As this study aims to capture the perpetrators' perspective, it is important to point out that for them, reparation is understood to mean financial compensation.

The responsibility to make reparation falls on the government, regardless of whether or not the current political power was responsible for the genocide. A government's willingness to make reparation is viewed as a sign of accepting responsibility and responding to the violation of human rights (Margarrell, 2007; van Boven, 2010; Walsh, 1996). In some countries, such as in Guatemala, Canada and South Africa, for example, reparation is paid by the state. The responsibility to make reparation is only taken off the shoulders of the state when a person or entity is identified to be responsible for the violation of human rights (van Boven, 2010). Such is the case in Rwanda, where individual perpetrators make reparation directly to the survivors of the genocide.

The problem in Rwanda, however, arises from the fact that many perpetrators of the genocide do not make reparation. These perpetrators fall under two categories: a) those who do not wish to make reparation and use strategies to evade payment (A. Gasake, personal communication, April 24,

2013) and b) those who wish to make reparation but do not have the means to do so. The focus of this study is largely on the latter group as will be described later in the methodology section. For reparation to be meaningful the perpetrator must also be capable of making reparation (Howard-Hassmann, 2004). Reparation policies are not meaningful unless they are realised on the ground. In Rwanda, challenges facing reparation are not due to lack of good policy per se, but rather due to problems facing the policy's implementation. With the establishment of the Government Assistance Fund for Survivors (FARG) in Rwanda the government claims to have done its part in making reparation to the survivors (Ibuka et al., 2012). Nevertheless, a question about the efficacy of the Rwandan reparation policy arises when the perpetrators are incapable of making reparation due to poverty. Rwanda is not the only country that struggles with the implementation of reparation policies. For example, in Guatemala, although the government has promised reparation, it has not been delivered, therefore preventing the survivors' right to justice and leading to frustration and continuation of their poverty (Viaene, 2011). Unfulfilled reparation damages the peace and reconciliation process and slows it down (May, 2011).

A study by African Rights and REDRESS in 2008 revealed that the judicial responses so far to the Rwandan genocide have left survivors "vulnerable rather than acknowledged and supported, alienated rather than reconciled, angry and fearful instead of positive with hopes for the future." Survivors persistently emphasise the critical role of reparation in justice and reconciliation in Rwanda (Ibuka et al., 2012). Survivors are frustrated by the lack of enforcement by the gacaca jurisdiction that awards reparation to them. Survivors consider it, as does the international law, the responsibility of the government to step in and materialise reparations, specifically in the form of monetary compensation (African Rights & REDRESS, 2008). This belief was also echoed by my partner organisation, SURF as one of the shortcomings of gacaca (A. Gasake, personal communication, April 24, 2013).

## ii. Gaps in the literature

Through a social psychology lens I aim to contribute to gaps in the existing literature as outlined briefly below:

- Capturing the perspectives of perpetrators
- Understanding the sociopsychological pathways to reconciliation
- Exploring the role of reparation in these sociopsychological pathways
- Examining the above in the context of post-genocide Rwanda

To my knowledge in peer reviewed and academic literature there is a lack of focus on the perspective of perpetrators. As noted by several scholars societal understandings of reconciliation is still at its infancy and much more needs to be done on understanding the pathways to reconciliation as well as measuring and evaluating reconciliation efforts (Chapman, 2009 cited in Aiken, 2010). Several scholars have also emphasised the importance of understanding the contexts and conditions that facilitate or hinder reconciliation through a sociopsychological lens (Checkel, 2001 cited in Aiken, 2010). Additionally, on the Scopus search engine only 31 articles relate to reparation and perpetrators and out of these only one makes a mention of Rwanda. The majority of the 31 articles are written using legal and criminal frameworks and do not include the perpetrators' perspectives on reconciliation and reparation's impact on reconciliation. Reconciliation is a two-way street and to achieve it an understanding of both sides are needed. The perpetrators' viewpoints are under-researched compared to that of survivors. This research is important as it captures the perpetrators' perspective. Furthermore, to my knowledge, no academic work has been done on understanding the role of poverty as a barrier to reparation, which is an influential feature in the Rwandan perpetrators' perspectives on reconciliation.

It is important to examine the issues through a social psychological perspective as social psychology draws attention to the three core dimensions of reparation that have not been researched yet:

- The relational nature of reparation
- The participatory nature of reparation
- The role of reparation in building communities

People make sense of their experiences and shape their behaviours based on their social identities. This thesis focuses on the perpetrators' social identities as impacted by the genocide. Identities are relational and constructed based on the relationship between self and others. Identities are further constructed through social participation in collective projects. It is through peoples' participation in common projects that communities are constructed. Community cohesion is conceptualised as a form of social capital shaped by opportunities for positive or negative forms of social participation. The quality of participation thus shapes the level of community cohesion in any particular setting. It is against this background that this thesis conceptualises reparation as a form of social participation in which two social groups with different but closely intertwined historical identities (survivors and perpetrators) come together in an effort to create social cohesion and to repair the torn fabric of Rwandan society. This thesis explores and illustrates the potential for reparation to act as a relational participatory process. Reparation has the potential to re-build positive forms of social

capital that enable people to come to terms with, and move on from, the shattering effects that the genocide had on Rwandan society.

### iii. Conceptual

#### iii.i. Overarching theory: social psychology of participation

The social psychology of participation identifies social identity, social representation and power as the key elements for conceptualising social participation, which lies at the root of human existence. Through participation, people engage in dialogue and develop the critical thinking needed to effect positive social change. In building social capital, they transform their social representations of self, their relationship to others and the surrounding world, to potentially construct more positive and empowered identities (Campbell & Jovchelovitch, 2000).

Social identity and social representation are closely tied to each other. Social identity refers to people's context-based identity and social representation refers to views of the self and the world. Social identity and representation are shared by the community and negotiated and transformed in dialogical social spaces (Campbell & Jovchelovitch, 2000). In doing so, critical thinking or critical conscious-awakening that Freire refers to as conscientisation develops (1973). While social identities and representations are constrained by power structures, they are at the same time capable of challenging power to transform their social identities into more empowered and positive social identities (Campbell & Jovchelovitch, 2000). Through participation, groups are empowered, take ownership, imagine alternative forms of living, and to mobilise for social change as in the present case study, in regard to seeking social change for reconciliation. In the process, they build social capital within the community (social capital bonding) (Putnam, 2000) and build partnerships with more powerful groups (social capital bridging) (Bourdieu, 1986). Building social capital empowers the community and increases its access to resources.

Genocide and ethnic conflict are linked closely to social identity, social representation and power. Rwandan genocide was no exception where the crimes were committed collectively by Hutu extremists against a Tutsi group rather than by Hutu individuals with personal grudges against Tutsi individuals (Drumbl, 2007; Aiken, 2010). In this way, social identities are core to the processes of reparation and reconciliation (Aiken, 2010). The literature also emphasises the need for identity transformation in post-conflict societies (Bar-Siman-Tov, 2004 cited in Aiken, 2010).

### iii.ii. Relevant theories: social learning and fourth generation approach

Social learning and a 'fourth generation' emphasis are keys to my use of the social psychology of participation in this thesis. Participation provides an opportunity for dialogue, social capital bonding and social capital bridging, which in turn facilitate social learning in the social contexts explained by the fourth generation approach.

#### iii.ii.i. Social learning

Social learning in the context of transitional justice is defined as the sociopsychological processes in which people confront and reframe the social representations that broke down their society and replace them with more positive representations and new relationships (Aiken, 2010; Bar-Siman-Tov, 2004). Aiken outlines three mechanisms of social learning as the following: instrumental learning, socioemotional learning and distributive learning.

Instrumental learning focuses on the current circumstances, building relationships and trust as well as opportunities for cooperation between the groups. Aiken claims that instrumental learning leads to the transformation of identity into a more positive collective phenomenon. Socioemotional learning acknowledges the suffering and confronts the perceptions that drove groups apart. Socioemotional learning is thus closely linked to concepts of truth and justice and hence, restorative justice and reparations.

Distributive learning includes efforts to reduce inequality and breakdown power relations that divide the groups (Aiken, 2010; Nadler & Shnabel, 2008). In this particular context, distributive learning involves recognising the survivor's losses and committing to restore the survivor's circumstances to those before the genocide.

These three mechanisms of social learning are interdependent, interlinked and work in tandem with each other (Aiken, 2010; Nadler & Shnabel, 2008). Together they facilitate the transformation of social identity and representation into more positive and empowered identities.

#### iii.ii.ii. Fourth generation approach

According to Campbell and Cornish fourth generation approaches in community and social psychology are those that identify the social contexts where community mobilisation becomes more effective (2010a, 2010b). The fourth generation approach is relevant to this study as social contexts can facilitate or hinder social learning. The three social contexts highlighted by their fourth generation approach are the following: relational, symbolic and material.

Relational context refers to those aspects of social context that facilitate leadership, participation, partnership and relationship-building. In this context, the community strengthens the relationship within itself or experiences social capital bonding (Putnam, 2000) and creates opportunities for bridging social capital (Bourdieu, 1986) to gain support from more resourceful external actors.

Symbolic context refers to the symbolic dimensions of context, particularly those perceptions, symbols and social representations that facilitate or hinder community mobilisation. The symbolic context is tied to how communities and groups understand and treat themselves and others based on social representations.

Material context refers to the availability of and access to funding and other material resources to facilitate or hinder efforts towards reconciliation. A supportive material context enhances the benefits of other social contexts.

These social contexts are closely inter-linked and work in tandem to enable community mobilisation (Campbell & Cornish, 2010a; Campbell & Cornish, 2010b).

### **Chapter III: Methodology**

#### **i. Research design: the site**

In this project I established partnerships with SURF (described earlier chapter I, section ii) in Kigali who then partnered me up with AMI (described earlier in chapter I, section ii) in Butare. AMI's mission is to contribute to reconciliation by addressing post-genocide issues, such as the challenges of reparation and trauma healing through civil participation and strengthening governance (J. Bizimana, personal communication, April 22, 2013).

Data collection took place April 7 – April 25, 2013 at different locations across Rwanda. The timing of data collection is particularly significant as it coincides with the 19th year anniversary of the genocide. Starting April 7th and in the weeks that follow it Rwandans commemorate the genocide in their region at different times depending on when the genocide began in their region. The commemoration events this year kicked off with a memorial walk, in which the president attended and the annual memorial event at the Amaharo Stadium, a site of massacre. I attended these events and numerous events that followed it in Kigali and other sites I visited (see appendix I for a map of Rwanda). Amongst them are Kigali Genocide Memorial (where up to 250,000 were killed) and Nyanza Memorial in Kigali (where over 2,000 who took refuge at a nearby school were killed), Nyamata church (where 2,500 were killed) in Nyamata and Ntamara church (where almost 5,000 were killed) in Ntamara, Murambi Genocide Memorial Centre (where 45,000 were killed and only 2

survived and I spoke to one of the two) in Murambi and the National University of Rwanda in Butare where a memorial event was held for the fallen students and teachers. In attending these events I was often accompanied by Rwandan friends who translated speeches and testimonials by the survivors for me and helped me better understand the context.

### ii. Data collection

Data collection included interviews and field notes. Given the sensitivity of the topic it was important to create a safe space in order to best facilitate the participant's storytelling and elaboration on how they understood their situations and their relationship with the world around them. To allow the participants flexibility I conducted the interviews in a semi-structured fashion (Gaskell, 2000). I used purposive participant sampling in the present study. The research participants were invited by AMI from different sectors near Butare based on their reparation payment status, such that there were some participants who had completed reparation, some who were still paying and some who had never paid. I did not have access to perpetrators who refuse to make reparation, often deny their participation in the genocide and are not willing to speak on the topic. I only interviewed perpetrators and their family members who wished to make reparation but struggled with the payments due to poverty.

### iii. Interview process

The topic guide was designed to build rapport with participants and capture their stories. I also based the topic guide on the research question and concepts relating to it (see appendix V for interview topic guide). I provided an overview of the research procedure and objectives to the research participants and gave them an opportunity to ask any questions. I gave the participant information sheet and debrief sheet to the participants and obtained consent before I started the interview (see appendix II, IV and III for participant information sheet, debrief sheet and consent form).

I conducted 16 semi-structured interviews with participants in a private AMI office in Ngoma outside of Butare. These interviews were conducted in Kinyarwanda with the help of a Research Assistant I hired. He is a survivor and a post-graduate student in Genocide Studies and Prevention at the National University. I also conducted an interview with AMI's Coordinator at AMI's main office in Butare and 2 interviews in English with SURF's Legal Advocacy Project Coordinator and National Coordinator at their office in Kigali (see appendix VI for interview topic guide with AMI's Coordinator).



To understand and connect with my surroundings I kept a journal during my time in Rwanda. In writing field notes I used a combination of saliency hierarchy strategy, where I described events and observations that seemed important and stood out to me and the comprehensive strategy where I described the events comprehensively and in the order in which they happened (Wolfinger, 2002). In the journal I reflected on the research process, my role, thoughts and behaviours as a researcher (Ortlipp, 2008; Watt, 2007). Writing field notes served as opportunities to re-visit my experiences, reflect on their meanings and gain a deeper understanding of the context of my research (see appendix VIII for a sample field note).

#### iv. Analysis

Each interview was audio recorded and then transcribed and translated into English by my Research Assistant. I also edited the transcripts while listening to the audio (see appendix IX for a sample interview transcript). I used thematic analysis network to analyse and identify the themes in my data using the hybrid approach where the analysis was grounded both in the data and driven by theoretical concerns (Attride-Sterling, 2001). I used Atlas.ti7 software and coded the data. Using the codes I looked for reoccurring themes and created my codebook and network by hand. For example, the codes “perpetrators’ education about the importance of reparation” and “perpetrators’ education about understanding the survivors” were clustered together to form the basic theme “peer education.” This basic theme and other basic themes “solidarity,” “empowerment,” “peer pressure” and “peer support” formed the organising theme “groups of perpetrators” that describes the perpetrator groups’ characteristics. This organising theme and organising themes that describe the groups of survivors and perpetrators (“group of survivors and perpetrators”) and groups made up of all community members (“groups of all community members”) formed the sub-organising theme “dialogue and social capital bonding.” This sub-organising theme and another sub-organising theme “dialogue and social capital bridging” (describes social capital bridging with AMI, a community-based organisation) formed one of the global themes “factors that facilitate the role of reparation in achieving reconciliation” (see appendix X for a sample of my codebook).

#### v. Ethical considerations

My research project was approved by the Institute of Social Psychology Research Ethics Board at LSE (see appendix VII for my ethics approval form).

Before beginning the project, with SURF’s Clinical Psychologist I developed a protocol to address any ethical and psychological issues that might arise during the project. In such cases, the Clinical Psychologist would provide participants with appropriate resource referrals after the interviews. The

interviews were deeply personal and involved the sharing of sensitive information. I drew on my communication and empathy skills as a crisis counsellor to interact with the participants in an open and trusting manner. At the end of several interviews participants emphasised the relationship and trust we established and how this allowed them to open up and share their stories. To my knowledge, no participant required a resource referral after the interviews. In addition, while in Rwanda to cope with the traumatic stories and realities I witnessed I wrote reflections and had regular meetings with SURF's Clinical Psychologist.

#### **Chapter IV: Findings and discussion**

This thesis captures the perpetrators' characteristics (global theme I) and their understanding of reconciliation (global theme II) while also explaining the factors facilitating (global theme III) and hindering (global theme IV) the role of reparation in achieving reconciliation. In brief, the data illustrates the way in which reparation can lead to a more empowered and positive social identity through three processes: social capital bonding, social capital bridging and dialogue. However, at times there are obstacles in the way of the three processes that make it difficult for reparation to lead to positive outcomes. The three processes are linked and work together through participation. Reparation drives the three processes and through them facilitates the transformation of social identity and representation. The processes are neither linear nor exclusive. They are inter-related, go back and forth and work in tandem.

##### **i. Global theme I: Getting to know the perpetrators**

Perpetrator's feelings towards reparation and his past wrong-doings serve as motivation for mobilisation to make reparation. Perpetrators accept their role in the genocide and express shame, guilt and regret about their past actions.

"I regret what I did in the 1994 genocide...I made a mistake. I regret it so much." Int16

Perpetrators show an understanding of the impact of their actions on the survivors and their families.

"Genocide happened and us perpetrators killed and took goods of others. After the genocide, the victims were left with nothing but a complicated life." Int6

They show their acceptance of their role in the confessions they make to the authorities, at prison or at gacaca and to the survivors and their families.

About returning home after the genocide and before gacaca: "The victim's family welcomed me, because I confessed to my sins and gave them information about where their relatives were killed and buried. I testified against the killers." Int7

Perpetrator's confessions often included an acknowledgement of the perpetrator's crimes and those of their colleagues.

Noting that each perpetrator's journey towards reconciliation is different, some perpetrators stated that making confession marked the beginning of their journey towards reconciliation.

"The first step to reconciliation is to confess about what you did and accept it." Int7

With the acceptance of responsibility in the genocide came the acceptance of punishment, including reparation.

"Reparation contributes to reconciliation. Before the genocide survivors had properties. After the genocide they had nothing. We destroyed them. We must pay back their properties." Int10

I found a strong sense of desire and commitment on the part of perpetrators and their families to make reparation. Perpetrators and their families who make reparation state their wish to have enough money to make reparation.

"I wish I had money to pay so I could reconcile with the survivor families. Reparation has helped us with reconciliation...If I had money I would pay, because it helps to achieve reconciliation." Int8

Perpetrators recognise the importance of making reparation in getting justice for the survivors. Some perpetrators emphasised that without reparation justice was not possible.

"It can't be justice without paying reparation. It is like half justice without reparation." Int6

"Perpetrators must do their best to pay reparation so they can achieve reconciliation and [survivors] have full justice." Int14

"Once I paid reparation I felt peace with myself and survivors got justice." Int7

Some perpetrators and their families took initiative before gacaca to return the stolen goods to the survivors;

"Before gacaca I returned the metal sheets [I stole during the genocide]...I started paying when I got out of prison before gacaca." Int7

While there is a strong desire to make reparation, as noted earlier, poverty is a huge barrier to making reparation and thus cases of perpetrators making reparation without judicial order appear to be rare. Nevertheless, when it happens it is met with survivor's appreciation for the perpetrator's hard work and commitment to make reparation.

When the perpetrator approached the survivor to make reparation: "[The survivor] said, 'No, no, we do not want your reparation, because we know how committed you are.'" Int16

"[The survivor] said he appreciates my hard work and efforts to make reparation." Int9

Feelings of guilt and frustration arising from the inability to pay are shared between perpetrators and their family members.

Wife of escapee perpetrator: "I feel guilt, because I have nothing to pay." Int11

Wife of dead perpetrator: "I have no peace, because I am not paying...If I had money I would pay. When I meet survivors I feel frustrated, because I am not paying." Int4

These feelings are also shared amongst perpetrators.

"If your neighbour does not pay you feel frustrated. When you see people making reparation you get peace." Int2

"We need to fight strongly against [perpetrators who don't pay]. They have money. They destroyed houses of survivors. They killed their families and yet they do not want to pay." Int16

On the other hand, perpetrators feel happy and relieved once they start making reparation or finish the payment.

"I will be extremely happy [once I am done with the payment]. Int13

"I felt happier and more satisfied after paying. I also felt more confident, because of the trust I received from families of victims I paid. I felt peace in my heart." Int6

Motivated by an acceptance of responsibility and reparation as well as feelings such as, guilt, shame, regret and frustration perpetrators illustrate a strong desire to make reparation and experience happiness, confidence and renewed relationships when paying.

## ii. Global theme II: Reconciliation according to the perpetrators

Perpetrators achieve reconciliation in different ways and in different stages. When asked about what reconciliation means to them they largely defined it as unity and social cohesion.

“[Reconciliation] is to unite people and to work together.” Int8

Building trust and relationships and developing togetherness were identified as ways to achieve unity.

"The survivors elected me [as the President of the survivor and perpetrator group]. This showed me that they trusted me and this ameliorated our relationship." Int7

Perpetrators further indicated that survivor’s forgiveness, perpetrator’s truth-telling, good leadership, gacaca, reparation and dialogue were pathways to reconciliation. Specifically, some perpetrators stated that reparation was an opportunity to connect with the survivors and get justice for them.

"Reparation helps us to meet survivors, because while paying we are obliged to meet and when we meet we have time to talk to each other and sometimes share a drink or meal after cultivating their land. At that time, you ask for forgiveness and confess to a victim you never had the opportunity to talk to." Int6

Perpetrators referred to socialising with survivors, inter-marriage and inter-family relations as signs of reconciliation in their communities. They emphasised that to achieve reconciliation they had to “work for a better future for [their] country and [to] build peaceful lives...to finish what [they] started...and to build Rwanda.” Int3

## iii. Global theme III: Factors facilitating the role of reparation in achieving reconciliation

It is against this backdrop (as outlined above) that the community mobilises to make reparation. Reparation drives the three processes of dialogue and social capital bonding and bridging and transforms social identity and representation. Conscientisation underlies these processes and overlaps with social learning.

### iii.i. Dialogue and social capital bonding

Dialogue and social capital bonding happen in groups of perpetrators, groups of survivors and perpetrators and groups made up of all members of the community.

### iii.i.i. Groups of perpetrators

#### iii.i.i.i. Solidarity

Perpetrators have often known each other throughout their entire lives. They were together in looting or killing groups. They are familiar with each other's crimes and know each other's stories. Most of them struggle with making reparation and sharing the same problem brings them together and creates a sense of solidarity. Perpetrators hence prefer a peer group approach to meeting the challenge of making reparation.

"[The perpetrators] know each other's stories and they know the crimes they have committed. I prefer that perpetrators go and convince other perpetrators to pay." Int6

#### iii.i.i.ii. Empowerment

Perpetrators initiate peer groups in their communities. This provides an opportunity for community involvement and leadership. One perpetrator (Int1) motivated by his strong will to make reparation initiated a perpetrator group by going door to door to perpetrators and encouraging them to join him in his reparation efforts. In describing the group's achievements the perpetrator expressed pride and satisfaction with his leadership role and the accomplishments of other perpetrators in his group. Community participation empowered the perpetrator and served as an opportunity to remind him about his potential and those of his colleagues in changing their circumstances.

#### iii.i.i.iii. Peer education

Groups of perpetrators also hold dialogues where they teach each other about the importance of reparation and understanding the perspective of survivors. In acknowledging the right of survivors to reparation and justice, perpetrators develop socioemotional learning and an understanding of the survivor's circumstances. Socioemotional learning happens in and in turn reinforces the social symbolic context that facilitates perpetrator mobilisation.

"[Reconciliation] it is not an end. It is a process...We continue to educate them on the importance of paying reparation." Int16

"We have not achieved full reconciliation in Rwanda, because there some people who are still stubborn about paying reparation while they have means to pay. We continue to visit them and teach them." Int6

#### iii.i.i.iv. Peer pressure

Some perpetrators struggle with how to best manage their money and soon after getting paid spend the money on beer or shopping. Perpetrators are bound by their responsibility towards each other and commitment to the group. They work together to ensure that reparation remains a priority and it is made soon after the perpetrator is paid.

"Sometimes the perpetrators get tempted when they have money. When they pass a bar they go in and buy beer...When they have money it is difficult for them to not spend it on other things. But because we are in a group we help each other to make sure that we make the payments. We work until we finish the payments." Int1

#### iii.i.i.v. Peer support

Perpetrators support each other in different ways. The support is both moral and material. Perpetrators understand each other and share feelings of frustration and disappointment. They give each other reassurance and remind one another about their togetherness and shared problem.

"We say to them, 'just get focused, get committed, we shall help you. It is a long process, it is also hard work, you need to persevere, you need to be strong and not to be discouraged.'" Int1

One form of peer support includes approaching perpetrators together to seek forgiveness or negotiate reparation.

"Sometimes one perpetrator in our group comes and asks us to accompany him to ask pardon [from a survivor]." Int6

In the peer group, reparation becomes the problem of all members. Individual perpetrators support each other even if they complete their own reparation payment.

"We pay [reparation] as a group. We support each other." Int1

"Even though I am now about to finish paying my reparations, I must support other perpetrators who have not yet finished paying their reparations." Int16

Most Rwandans living in the rural areas engage in cultivation. In cases where a survivor accepts a perpetrator's labour in his land as a form of reparation the group of perpetrators cultivate together in the survivor's land. To make cash they cultivate together, sell the crops and share the profits.

In supporting each other perpetrators develop relationships and social capital bonding. Perpetrators also develop instrumental learning facilitated by the relational social context. This relational context also facilitates social capital bridging where perpetrator groups develop relationships with community-based organisations as will be explored in section iii.ii. of this chapter. Perpetrators also develop distributive learning as they work together to make reparation and restore the survivor's losses. The material context that facilitates fund creation and material sources is a challenge for perpetrators who struggle with poverty. Nevertheless, through developing social capital, instrumental learning, socioemotional learning and distributive learning perpetrators manage to make the best of the circumstances and create a material context that facilitates their social learning.

### iii.i.ii. Groups of perpetrators and survivors

#### iii.i.ii.i. Support with reparation

These groups also provide an opportunity to make reparation collectively. Reparation negotiation takes place in the group's safe social space. In addition, survivors join effort with perpetrators to support them in making reparation. For instance, a survivor's son joins a perpetrator who needs to make reparation to cultivate together in a survivor's land as an alternative to monetary reparation. In working together the group members experience distributive learning and learn to support each other in their material context of poverty.

"Today, they come to cultivate in your land and the next day you go to cultivate in their lands to help [perpetrators] make reparation. They say, we are survivors and we should support you." Int2

#### iii.i.ii.ii. Dialogue for reconciliation

Though survivors and perpetrators often live in the same communities and are neighbours they are sometimes hesitant to meet each other. Groups of survivors and perpetrators provide a safe space for dialogue where survivors and perpetrators break down their fears, share their feelings and develop an understanding of each other. They confront their social representations of each other and in doing so discuss pathways to reconciliation, trust-building and social cohesion. They further reinforce the relational and symbolic contexts that facilitate instrumental and socioemotional learning, respectively.

"Perpetrators would not sit with survivors and survivors did not wish to sit with perpetrators. [Dialogue] taught us to regain a sense of humanity in our hearts." Int2



For perpetrators, participation is an opportunity to transform social identity and representation through dialogue and social learning.

### iii.i.iii. Groups of all community members

Groups of perpetrators, survivors and perpetrators create receptive social contexts for groups that include all members of the community. These groups go beyond reparation support and seek to lift the community out of poverty. Through associations and co-operatives they generate shared income. Sometimes the groups are savings-clubs with monthly membership fees. A member list or lottery system determines who gets a loan, cow or health insurance each month. In the group members develop solidarity, trust, relationships and partnerships that facilitate social cohesion, unity and ultimately, reconciliation.

"I feel that reconciliation can be achieved through solidarity. Even the survivors come and join our groups. Other people who have nothing to do with the genocide come and join our groups. They support our group." Int2

"These groups help us [with developing] solidarity, to be open before others and see the other person as a partner." Int10

By working together towards a common goal the community and specifically, perpetrators transform their social identities and representations of self and others through conscientisation and social learning.

### iii.ii. Dialogue and social capital bridging

Dialogue and social capital bridging happen between the aforementioned groups and AMI, a community-based organisation.

#### iii.ii.i. Community-based organisation: AMI

Most participants highlighted AMI's pivotal role in the initiation, evolution and expansion of community groups. AMI uses participatory methods to mobilise communities to make reparation and to create social cohesion. In doing so, AMI develops and reinforces receptive social contexts for dialogue and conscientisation in the direction of community unity and reconciliation.

"The group that AMI made...it was survivors and perpetrators. The purpose was to pay reparation with the support of the community. They helped each other to pay or help members to cultivate." Int2

“With the help of AMI we have taken full responsibility to mobilise perpetrators and help each other to pay reparation.” Int6

In working with AMI groups develop social capital bridging. To create material contexts for distributive learning AMI provides consultation and advice to perpetrators about making reparation. For instance, when a perpetrator (Int1) mobilised other perpetrators to make reparation AMI provided the group with suggestions about alternatives to cash payment.

“The approach [to cultivate the survivor’s land] was suggested by AMI to see how I can pay back the properties and get peace of mind.” Int1

The suggestion created an opportunity for perpetrators to show their goodwill to survivors and for survivors to trust the perpetrators. Perpetrators cultivated the land belonging to the president of the survivor group and gained the trust of survivors in the community. This led to the president of the survivor group encouraging other survivors to accept cultivation of their lands as a form of reparation. Perpetrators who were disappointed about their inability to make reparation were empowered by their physical strength to work and commitment to make reparation.

AMI also engages more directly in mediation and reparation negotiation through creating a critical space for dialogue and facilitating dialogue.

“I appreciate how AMI supports dialogue to see how [survivors] can be flexible with payments.” Int10

“AMI facilitates dialogue with survivors and some of them forgive reparations.” Int12

AMI gathers separate groups of survivors and perpetrators and asks them about their perspective of the other. Each group creates a list which is then presented to other group. After a discussion about the list AMI puts the two groups together, creates a safe space of dialogue and allows each group to confront their social representations of self and others. AMI’s facilitation is essential to enhance dialogue and learning. AMI educates and sensitises perpetrators and survivors separately and in the larger groups about unity, equality and reconciliation using Christian and Ubuntu frameworks.

"AMI tells us we are all created in the image of God. It simply means that you respect me and I should respect you. If you kill me, you then kill the image of God, you kill God. When you look into my eyes you see yourself. This means we are all together. When you kill me, keep in mind that we have the same blood...the AMI lessons helped me identify myself as human." Int2

Through dialogue and conscientisation perpetrators and survivors gain mutual understanding. Perpetrators learn about the impact of their past actions on the survivors, while survivors learn about the perpetrator's commitment to make reparation and how poverty limits this desire. Perpetrators and survivors confront their social representations of each other and attempt to understand the genocide, what divided them and what can bring them together towards reconciliation. In dialogical spaces and receptive social contexts they learn the truth about each other, reconstruct their social representations and experience socioemotional learning. Simultaneously, they rebuild trust and broken relationships and develop instrumental learning in relational contexts. Dialogue sessions enhance conscientisation, where both survivors and perpetrators develop a sense of solidarity in tackling the consequences of the genocide. Dialogue creates receptive social contexts where perpetrators and survivors share their problems, take ownership of them, feel empowered and collectively identify solutions and ways to support each other. Social identities and representations are transformed into more empowered ones through social capital bridging with AMI and social capital bonding and relationship-building with community members, especially survivors.

#### [iv. Global theme IV: Factors hindering the role of reparation in achieving reconciliation](#)

Perpetrators who do not make reparation fall under two categories. There are those who do not wish to make reparation and evade payment using strategies, such as transferring their properties to family members and claiming poverty (A. Gasake, personal communication, April 24, 2013) and those who wish to make reparation but genuinely do not have the means to do so. As mentioned, the focus of this thesis is on the latter group for whom poverty is the biggest barrier to reparation.

##### [iv.i. Poverty, barrier to reparation](#)

For perpetrators willing and committed to make reparation poverty and lack of receptive material context is the biggest barrier to reparation. As mentioned earlier, inability to make reparation leaves the perpetrator disappointed, frustrated and powerless. These feelings are shared by the perpetrator's family members who make reparation on behalf of the perpetrator. Reparation is an added burden to families already struggling to feed themselves or send their children to school. Reparation is a priority to these families and hence, as soon as funding becomes available it goes towards reparation. A perpetrator (Int7) stated that because of reparation he could not afford to send his children to school. Another interviewee, an escapee perpetrator's wife (Int11) also cannot afford to send her children to school, because she cannot afford the school uniform. One can thus

argue that for these families reparation is perpetuating poverty with long-term impact on the future generations.

Participants also raised concerns about the reparation amount. While perpetrators acknowledge their participation in the genocide, looting and causing damages to the survivor's properties, they indicate that the reparation amount is sometimes simply beyond their capacity.

“Paying 1 million RWF (Rwandan Francs) in reparation is beyond the perpetrator's capacity. It is very complicated when you have nothing to eat.” Int2

“There are some people who were very poor during the genocide. So they looted a lot, many things, many properties. They are charged with high reparations, around 5, 6 or 7 million...it is a lot for them to pay...it is beyond their capacity, it is beyond their understanding...it is also very complicated for to approach the survivors and ask to reduce the reparation. It is also very difficult to convince the perpetrators to go and ask for a reduction from survivors. It is very complicated.” Int16

As seen, the reparation amount is also a factor to be considered when it comes to sentencing reparations or negotiating reparation. Perpetrators indicated the need to assign reparation based on the capacity of the perpetrator.

“I do not want reparation to be pardoned. All I ask is a reduction in the amount of reparation. The reparation amount is 3 million RWF. I wonder if they can reduce it to an amount I can afford...I understand that to get reconciliation I need to pay reparation to the families. I hope that survivors can understand my circumstances and reduce the reparation amount. They should judge me according to the means I have.” Int9

Some perpetrators face immense challenges in access to assistance with reparation. With the lack of receptive material context distributive learning and conscientisation that follow it are difficult to achieve. Nevertheless, as mentioned earlier community and specifically perpetrator participation and mobilisation play an important role in creating receptive material contexts that support perpetrators with reparation.

#### [iv.ii. Lack of community mobilisation](#)

Below, I address some of the reasons why social capital bonding and bridging via community mobilisation and participation do not take place in some communities.

In some communities, receptive social contexts that facilitate mobilisation do not exist. In some communities there is resistance to helping perpetrators with reparation.

"Some people are somehow against supporting each other to pay the reparations." Int16

Consequently, whereas some communities have several community groups and associations other communities have no groups.

When asked about support from groups with reparation: "I wish I could have [their] help."

Int10

The lack of relational context receptive to instrumental learning and the resistance to supporting perpetrators could be due to the lack of symbolic contexts that facilitate dialogue and socioemotional learning. Conscientisation, social learning and social capital bonding are less likely to develop when opportunities for dialogue and relationship-building are limited.

In addition, where community groups do exist, joining the group is difficult for some community members. For instance, one perpetrator (Int3) who used to pay a monthly membership fee to a savings-club is no longer part of the group as he is sick and cannot afford the fee. In other words, at times where the relational and symbolic contexts exist material contexts might be lacking.

"I was a member of those groups before. But I am no longer part of the group, because I am sick." Int3

Lack of any of the three social contexts hinders community participation and development of social capital bonding and bridging.

#### [iv.iii. Other consequences of the lack of receptive social contexts](#)

The lack of receptive social contexts, specifically, relational contexts hinder instrumental learning as well as relationship and trust-building. As mentioned earlier, perpetrators emphasise the importance of approaching survivors to confess and ask for forgiveness. Nevertheless, in the absence of relationship-building opportunities, approaching survivors for forgiveness or reparation negotiation becomes difficult for perpetrators. In the same way, survivors also hesitate to forgive or reduce reparations.

"...[there are survivors who] refused [to forgive reparation even when their own family (brother of the survivor's widow) begged them to forgive me and reduce reparations...I thought there is no reconciliation with people who still have a bad attitude and are not willing to cooperate with us." Int9

Against this backdrop, the development of receptive social contexts for social capital bonding, social capital bridging, social learning, conscientisation and dialogue are hindered or delayed.

#### iv.iv. Restorative justice in Rwanda

In Rwanda, the responsibility to make reparation falls on the perpetrator. If the perpetrator is not available, because he has escaped, died or gone to jail his family members represent him at gacaca and become responsible for his reparation. Perpetrator families stated that they did not take part in the perpetrator's wrong-doings and were not aware of them. As described in chapter II the purpose of restorative justice is to give perpetrators the opportunity to understand the impact of their crimes on survivors. How can the perpetrator learn about his wrong-doings and have dialogue with survivors if his family members are responsible for reparation and not the perpetrator himself? A jailed perpetrator's wife (Int12) who made reparation on behalf of her husband stated clearly that her husband still held "genocide ideology," denied looting properties and did not accept reparation. In this case, the perpetrator's wife sold his lands and without his consent made reparation. However, the wife indicated that "when he is released he intends to go to court to see how he can get back his lands." In this case the survivors benefited from restorative justice as they were paid reparation in full. However, has reparation worked for the perpetrator who still holds "genocide ideology"? Similarly, an escapee perpetrator's wife (Int11) is held responsible for the perpetrator's reparation though she was repeatedly abused and abandoned by her husband before, during and after the genocide. She stated that she feels "guilt, because [she has] nothing to pay." In this case, where the survivors do not receive reparation and the perpetrator does not make reparation one wonders if putting the burden of reparation on the perpetrator's wife is fair to the wife and is an effective form of restorative justice.

The family members responsible for reparation stated their powerlessness in the face of gacaca and reparation.

An escapee perpetrator's wife: "Some people said he should pay 100,000, some said, 50,000. Because my husband was not there people tried to accuse him of every looting. One of the survivors told me later that one of the things that they wanted me to pay for was not in fact true. My husband did not do it. I had to accept it...I must accept it. The judges told me they knew my situation and knew that I didn't commit any crimes, but because it was the law they said I had to represent my husband. I told them, 'I have no money'." Int11

As shown earlier, whereas reparation can empower community members, it can also further isolate and disempower perpetrators' family members who were often already marginalised due to other circumstances.

Perpetrators also stated their powerlessness in the face of gacaca.

"I respected [the gacaca ruling], because it was the rule of gacaca and the accuser's voice were louder [than mine]. He was in a more powerful position." Int7

Disempowerment hinders participation and transformation of social identity and representation.

As mentioned earlier, alternatives to reparation, such as labour in the survivors' lands instead of money empower perpetrators who would otherwise struggle with payment. However, currently, no other alternatives exist for survivors who do not own lands. In Rwanda, where poverty and lack of receptive material contexts are barriers to reparation more alternative forms of reparation are needed.

"[Some perpetrators] are committed to pay reparations and yet they have nothing except for their hands. They can cultivate...[but] the survivors have no land to cultivate... so the perpetrator should pay reparations but he has no money and the survivor has no land...how can [the perpetrator] pay?" Int16

In a sense, the lack of alternative pathways to reparation reflects the mismatch between restorative justice policy and its exercisability against the backdrop of unreceptive social contexts, especially, material contexts. This mismatch hinders the role of reparation in achieving reconciliation in Rwanda as stated by one perpetrator who calls for increased partnership and collaboration between top-down and bottom-up actors;

"[Organisations] should come to the field and discuss with local people instead of sitting in their office far away and make policies. If they come and consult the local people and get [their] ideas they can make good policies." Int6

In sum, the factors that hinder the role of reparation and perpetrators' ability to make reparation are lack of community participation, social capital bonding and bridging and receptive social contexts as well as lack of alternatives to reparation and mismatch between policy and on the ground realities.

## Chapter V: Conclusion

This study explores reconciliation in post-genocide Rwanda in the following ways. It captures the perspective and stories of perpetrators, a relatively neglected group in research and does so through a social psychology framework. In examining the role of reparation in achieving reconciliation, an under-researched area in literature, it focuses on the participatory and relational nature of reparation and clearly illustrates reparation as a driving force for building social cohesion and transforming social identities of perpetrators. This research contributes to identity literature as it outlines how reparation facilitates or hinders the transformation of social identities from feelings of guilt, shame and regret into more positive and empowered identities. In terms of its contribution to the transitional and restorative justice literature this research goes beyond Aiken's social learning and uses the Cornish and Campbell fourth generation approach to explain the social contexts that facilitate or hinder social learning. Moreover, this thesis uses Freire's conscientisation that occurs through dialogue and social capital bonding and social capital bridging to further highlight the conscious awakening that is needed for social learning and ultimately, reconciliation. It further shows how the three processes of dialogue, social capital bonding and social capital bridging enhance the role of reparation in transforming perpetrators' social identities in receptive social contexts. It also illustrates how in the absence of receptive social contexts the role of reparation in achieving reconciliation is hindered. This understanding is particularly important in the case of Rwanda where poverty exists and social material context is limited.

In sum, this research's contributions are three-fold:

1. Capturing the perspective of perpetrators
2. Developing a social psychological understanding of reparation as a driver for community participation and building social cohesion while transforming perpetrators' identities
3. Investigating factors and social contexts that facilitate and hinder the role of reparation in achieving reconciliation

### i. Limitations

Study participants did not include perpetrators who currently refuse to make reparation, as these perpetrators do not wish to speak on the topic for a variety of reasons. Hence, I only focused on perpetrators who agreed to partake in the study, and who showed their willingness to make reparation. This study serves as the groundwork into the very important domain of considering perpetrator perspectives. For further research it is necessary to capture the perspective of perpetrators who refuse reparation. This research focused on the monetary aspect of reparation.



Further research should seek to develop ways to measure other aspects of reparation, such as satisfaction and rehabilitation. These aspects should be studied through the perspective of both perpetrators and survivors.

I am visibly non-African and do not speak Kinyarwanda. Therefore, a limitation of this study is that the majority of the data was translated into English. It is important to note that some meanings may have been lost in translation. I also acknowledge the limitations of being an outsider to the Rwandan community and culture. Nevertheless, in the context of Rwanda, where many Rwandans of my age and older have had some connection with the genocide my unbiased and outsider perspective has also served as an advantage.

## ii. Future research

As shown earlier, there is a mismatch between top-level policies and their implementation on the ground. To create more effective policies there is an increased need for context-based understandings of reconciliation. Future research is needed in exploring sociopsychological processes that facilitate and hinder reconciliation. Additionally, building on this research an understanding of the role of reparation in achieving reconciliation through the perspective of survivors is needed. Specifically, research to verify the genuineness of survivor's forgiveness of reparation is necessary, as in Rwanda authorities encourage survivors to pardon reparation and refusal of authority is rare (A. Gasake, personal communication, April 24, 2013). Moreover, interdisciplinary research is also needed to investigate poverty and its role in reconciliation at the micro and community level on both survivors and perpetrators.

## iii. Implications

*Ibuka*, collective of survivor organisations, including SURF have long called for the prioritisation of reparation on the government's agenda. The findings of this research further confirm the increased need to address the issue of reparation for the benefit of both survivors and perpetrators. *Ibuka* has called for the establishment of a reparation task force. The implementation of the task force and the government's support for it is one form of prioritising reparation in Rwanda. As shown, in the absence of receptive social contexts reparation can limit reconciliation efforts and exclude those who cannot make reparation. Future genocide courts need to give options besides monetary reparation for the road to redemption and reconciliation. Given the success of community initiatives driven by reparation more support for community-based organisations and associations is necessary to create the receptive social contexts needed to achieve reconciliation.

## References

- African Rights, & Redress. (2008). *Survivors and Post-Genocide Justice in Rwanda: Their Experience, Perspectives and Hopes*. Retrieved September 4, 2013 from <http://www.redress.org/downloads/publications/Rwanda%20Survivors%2031%20Oct%2008.pdf>
- Aiken, N. (2013). *Identity, Reconciliation and Transitional Justice: Overcoming Intractability in Divided Societies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Attride-Stirling, J. (2001). Thematic networks: an analytical tool for qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 1(3), 385-405.
- Bar-Siman-Tov, Y. (2004). *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-248). New York, NY: Greenwood Press.
- Campbell, C., & Cornish, F. (2010a). Towards a 'fourth generation' of approaches to HIV/AIDS management: Creating contexts for effective community mobilization. *AIDS Care*, 22(S2), 1569-1579.
- Campbell, C., & Cornish, F. (2010b). How can community health programmes build enabling environments for transformative communication? Experiences from India and South Africa. *AIDS and Behavior*, 16(4), 847-857.
- Campbell, C., & Jovchelovitch, S. (2000). Health, community and development: towards a social psychology of participation. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 10(4), 255-270.
- Clark, P. (2010). *The Gacaca Courts, Post-Genocide Justice and Reconciliation in Rwanda: Justice without Lawyers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, P., & Kaufman, Z. D. (2008). After Genocide. In P. Clark & Z. D. Kaufman (Eds.), *After Genocide: Transitional Justice, Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Reconciliation in Rwanda and Beyond* (pp. xxi-xxvi). London, UK: Hurst.
- Drumbl, M. A. (2007). *Atrocity, Punishment, and International Law*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Education for Critical Consciousness*. London, UK: Continuum.

- Gaskell, G. (2000). Individual and Group Interviewing. In Bauer, M. & Gaskell, G. (Eds.), *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook* (pp. 38-56). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gourevitch, P. (1998). *We wish to inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families: Stories from Rwanda*. New York, NY: Picador.
- Hatzfeld, J. (2003). *Machete season: The killers in Rwanda speak*. New York, NY: Picador.
- Howard-Hassmann, R. E. (2004). Getting to Reparations: Japanese Americans and African Americans. *Social Forces*, 83(2), 823-840.
- HRW. (2008). Solidarity Camps. *Human Rights Watch*. Retrieved September 4, 2013 from <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2000/rwanda/Rwan004-13.htm>.
- Ibuka, SURF, & Redress. (2012). *Right to Reparation for Survivors Recommendations for Reparation for Survivors of the 1994 Genocide Against Tutsi: Discussion Paper*. Retrieved September 4, 2013 from [http://www.redress.org/downloads/publications/121031right\\_to\\_rep.pdf](http://www.redress.org/downloads/publications/121031right_to_rep.pdf).
- International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. (2013). *Status of Cases*. Retrieved September 4, 2013 from <http://www.unict.org/Cases/tabid/204/Default.aspx>.
- IRIN (2004, April 2). Rwanda: Census finds 937,000 died in genocide. *IRIN*. Retrieved from <http://www.irinnews.org/report/49384/rwanda-census-finds-937-000-died-in-genocide>
- Kagame, P. (2008). Preface. In P. Clark & Z. D. Kaufman (Eds.), *After Genocide: Transitional Justice, Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Reconciliation in Rwanda and Beyond* (pp. xxi-xxvi). London, UK: Hurst.
- Khatchadourian, H. (2006). Compensation and Reparation as Forms of Compensatory Justice. *Metaphilosophy*, 37(3-4), 429-448.
- Lemarchand, R. (2008). The Politics of Memory in Post-Genocide Rwanda. In P. Clark & Z. D. Kaufman (Eds.), *After Genocide: Transitional Justice, Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Reconciliation in Rwanda and Beyond* (pp. 65-76). London, UK: Hurst.
- Magarrell, L. (2007). Reparations in Theory and Practice. *Reparative Justice Series, International Center for Transitional Justice, New York*. Retrieved September 4, 2013 from <http://ictj.org/sites/default/files/ICTJ-Global-Reparations-Practice-2007-English.pdf>

- Mamdani, M. (2001). *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- May, L., (2011). Reparations, Restitution, and Transitional Justice. In L. May & A. Forcehimes (Eds.), *Morality, Jus Post Bellum, and International Law* (pp. 32-48). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Menkel-Meadow, C. (2007). Restorative Justice: What is it and Does it Work?. *Georgetown Public Law Research Paper*, (1005485).
- Mgbako, C. (2005). Ingando Solidarity Camps: Reconciliation and Political Indoctrination in Post-Genocide Rwanda. *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, 18, 201-224.
- Musoni, E. (2008, October 4). Rwanda: Report Claims 2 Million Killed in 1994 Genocide. *The New Times*. Retrieved from <http://allafrica.com/stories/200810040044.html>
- Nadler, A., & Shnabel, N. (2008). Instrumental and Socioemotional Paths to Intergroup Reconciliation and the Needs-Based Model of Socioemotional Reconciliation. In A. Nadler, T. E. Malloy, & J. D. Fisher (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup reconciliation* (pp. 37-56). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Orbinski, J. (2008). *An Imperfect Offering: Humanitarian Action in the Twenty-First Century*. Toronto, ON: Doubleday Canada.
- Ortlipp, M. (2008). Keeping and Using Reflective Journals in the Qualitative Research Process. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 695-705.
- Putnam, R.D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. (pp. 16-28). New York, NY: Touchstone.
- Basmajian, S., & Raymond P. (Producer), & Reed, P. (Director). (2008). *Triage: Dr. James Orbinski's Humanitarian Dilemma* [Motion picture]. Canada: Kinoshmith.
- Restorative Justice Council (2013). What is Restorative Justice? Retrieved September 4, 2013, from [http://www.restorativejustice.org.uk/what\\_is\\_restorative\\_justice/#.UiiK5V9wbGg](http://www.restorativejustice.org.uk/what_is_restorative_justice/#.UiiK5V9wbGg)
- Rwanda Ministry of Justice. (2013). Justice and Reconciliation. *Justice and Reconciliation*. Retrieved September 4, 2013 from <http://www.gov.rw/Justice-Reconciliation>.
- SURF. (2013). Who We Are. *Survivors Fund, Supporting Survivors of the Rwandan Genocide*. Retrieved September 4, 2013, from <http://survivors-fund.org.uk/>.

- Tiemessen, A. E. (2003). *After Arusha: Gacaca Justice in Post-Genocide Rwanda* (Doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia). Retrieved from <http://www.africa.ufl.edu/asq/v8/v8i1a4.pdf>
- van Boven, T. (2012). The Need to Repair. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 16(5), 694-697.
- Viaene, L. (2011). Dealing with the legacy of gross human rights violations in Guatemala: grasping the mismatch between macro level policies and micro level processes. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 15(7), 1160-1181.
- Walsh, B. (1996). Resolving the Human Rights Violations of a Previous Regime. *World Affairs*, 158(3), 111-121.
- Watt, D. (2007). On becoming a qualitative researcher: The value of reflexivity. *The Qualitative Report*, 12(1), 82-101.
- Weitekamp, E. (1992). Reparative Justice. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 1(1), 70-93.
- Wolfinger, H. N. (2002). On Writing Fieldnotes: collection strategies and background expectancies. *Qualitative Research*, 2(1), 85-93.

## Appendices

### Appendix I: Map of Rwanda



Source: [liftuptheirhearts.org](http://liftuptheirhearts.org)

## Participant Information

### **Understanding the role of reparation in reconciliation in post-genocide Rwanda: perpetrators' perspective**

Thank you for taking time to speak to me today. You are being invited to take part in a research study. Before deciding to participate it is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take the time to read the following information. If you want you can discuss it with someone. Please feel free to discuss any questions or concerns you might have with me. Take your time as you read this sheet and please don't feel rushed.

#### **What is this research about?**

I am interested in understanding the role reparation plays in achieving reconciliation in Rwanda after the 1994 genocide. Specifically, I am interested in capturing the point of view of the perpetrators on this topic. During our interview, I will ask you some questions about your life before and after the genocide. I am interested in hearing your life story. I will ask you questions about your opinion on reparation and the role it plays in reconciliation. I will not ask you about the actions you took during the genocide. However, most of my questions are open-ended. So you can share as little or as much as you like.

#### **Who is doing this research?**

My name is [REDACTED], and I am a student in the Health, Community and Development programme at the London School of Economics. You can reach me by email at [REDACTED]. My research project is supervised by Dr Catherine Campbell. She is the Director of my programme. She can be reached by email at [c.campbell@lse.ac.uk](mailto:c.campbell@lse.ac.uk).

#### **Why have you asked me to participate?**

I am interested to understand what you think about the role of reparation in achieving reconciliation. As someone who was ordered to pay reparation, you have first-hand experience and knowledge about the role it played in your healing and reconciliation.

#### **What will participation involve?**

Your participation involves discussing your opinion and experiences with reparation and the role it played in healing and reconciliation for you and that of the wider Rwandan society. I will ask you

some questions on this topic during our interview. Most of my questions are open-ended. So you can share as little or as much as you like.

**How long will participation take?**

Your participation involves a 1 hour long interview. If you need to leave at any point during the interview, please let me know.

**What about confidentiality?**

I am recording the interview to ensure that I do not miss any information as the interview happens. The interpreter and I are the only persons who will listen to the interview. We will make a transcription from the recording and delete the recording afterwards. I will keep your identity anonymous and not mention your name anywhere.

**If you are willing to participate, then please sign a Consent Form.**

**You can keep this Information Sheet for your records.**



### Informed Consent

**Project:** Understanding the role of reparation in reconciliation in post-genocide Rwanda: perpetrators' perspectives

**Researcher:** ██████████ Masters of Science student in the Health, Community and Development Programme at the Institute of Social Psychology at the London School of Economics  
██████████

**Supervisor:** Dr Catherine Campbell, Director of the Health, Community and Development Programme at the Institute of Social Psychology at the London School of Economics  
[c.campbell@lse.ac.uk](mailto:c.campbell@lse.ac.uk)

---

### To be completed by the Research Participant

**Please answer each of the following questions:**

Do you feel you have been given sufficient information about the research to enable you to decide whether or not to participate in the research?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Have you had an opportunity to ask questions about the research?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Do you understand that your participation is voluntary, and that you are free to withdraw at any time, without giving a reason, and without penalty?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Are you are willing to take part in the research?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Are you aware that the interview will be audio recorded?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Will you allow the researcher to use anonymised quotes in presentations and publications?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Will you allow the anonymised data to be archived, to enable secondary analysis and training future researchers?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>

**Participants Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Participant's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

If you would like a copy of the research report, please provide your email or postal address:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Debrief Sheet**

**Understanding the role of reparation in reconciliation in post-genocide Rwanda: perpetrators' perspectives**

Thank you for your time and for participating in this research project. I am thankful for the knowledge and stories you shared with me in helping me understand the role of reparation in reconciliation.

If you feel emotional distress as a result of anything that came up during our interview and would like support, please contact the Survivors Fund.

If you like to discuss this project with me further or obtain information about the results, please contact me, [REDACTED] by email at [REDACTED].

## Interview Topic Guide

(With perpetrators)

### Research question:

What role does reparation play in reconciliation after the Rwandan genocide?

### Introduction:

Introduce myself, explain purpose of the interview, assure confidentiality and ask permission to audio record the interview.

### Warm-up:

Where were you born? Is that close to here?

Tell me about your life growing up.

How do you make your living?

### Theme Development:

Tell me about your life before the genocide.

Probes:

- What was life like in your village?
- How were your relationships with your community, family and friends?

Tell me about life after the genocide.

Probes:

- What was life like in your village?
- How were your relationships with your community, family and friends?

Can you tell me what category you were placed in at the gacaca? First? Second? Third?

What was the process?

How was your experience at the court? How were you feeling?

How did you feel about the reparation that was assigned to you?

Did you pay it?

### If paid reparation,

Why did you think it was important for you to pay it?

### If not paid reparation,

How come you did not pay it? What happened?

Is there anything that makes it difficult for you to pay it?

**If paid some reparation,**

Is there anything that makes it difficult for you to pay it?

What does reconciliation mean to you? *(From this point on mirror the interviewee's definition of reconciliation when asking about reconciliation.)*

Do you think it is possible for you to achieve reconciliation? How do you think you can achieve it?

How do you think reconciliation can be achieved in Rwanda?

In your opinion, what has so far worked and what hasn't?

**If paid reparation,**

Do you think paying reparation has helped you in feeling reconciled?

**If not paid reparation,**

Do you think that not paying reparation has made it difficult for you to feel reconciled or prevented you from feeling reconciled?

**If earlier indicated desire to pay reparation,**

What could be done to help you make your reparation payment?

**If paid some reparation,**

What role has paying reparation played in you feeling reconciled?

Do you think that your reconciliation is incomplete?

**If earlier indicated desire to complete reparation payment,**

Do you think that once you make the full payment you will feel reconciled?

What could be done to help you make your reparation payment?

Do you know others who paid or did not pay reparation? What did they think about it?

Do you have any ideas for achieving reconciliation besides reparation?

**Wind-down:**

What advice would you give to others in your situation?

What would you say to an organisation that aims to support reconciliation efforts in Rwanda?

Anything else you would like to add?

## Appendix V: Sample interview topic guide with partner organisation (AMI)

### **Interview topic guide**

(With partner organisation, AMI)

- How did AMI start?
- It uses the framework of Ubuntu. What is Ubuntu and what does it mean in the context of AMI?
- Can you give me an example of the work of AMI? What impact has it had so far?
- What does reconciliation mean for AMI?
- Where does the funding for AMI come from?
- How does AMI access perpetrators and survivors?
- What happens in the dialogue sessions? What topics are discussed?
- Why do you think it is important for the two groups to have dialogue?
- What have been the challenges?
- Is there reconciliation in Rwanda and do you think it is possible in Rwanda?
- How can reconciliation be achieved?
- What is the most important factor?
- What is the biggest barrier to reconciliation?
- What do you say to organisations that want to bring perpetrators and survivors together?
- What role do you think reparation plays in reconciliation?
- Is reconciliation possible without reparation?
- Can we get justice without reparation?
- Who will benefit from perpetrators paying survivors?

Appendix VII: Ethics approval form

**Ethics Application**  
Institute of Social Psychology

Title of project: Understanding the role of reparation in reconciliation and mental well-being in post-genocide Rwanda
Name of Researcher(s): ██████████
Email Address: ██████████
Name of Supervisor (for MSc/PhD projects): Catherine Campbell
Date: March 11, 2013

		Yes	No	N/A
1	Will the proposed research entail any risk to the researcher(s)? (eg., entail travel to unstable regions, exposure to environmental risks, collection of sensitive data, or lone working in an unfamiliar context)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you ticked **Yes** to Q1, you should complete a **risk assessment form**

		Yes	No	N/A
2	Will you describe the main experimental procedures to participants in advance, so that they are informed about what to expect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Will you tell participants that their participation is voluntary?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Will you obtain written consent for participation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	If the research is observational, will you ask participants for their consent to being observed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Will you tell participants that they may withdraw at any time and for any reason?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	With questionnaires, will you give participants the option of omitting any questions they do not want to answer?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Will you tell participants that their data will be treated with full confidentiality and that, if published, it will not be identifiable as theirs?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Will you debrief participants at the end of their participation (i.e. given them a brief explanation of the study)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you ticked **No** to any of Q2-9, you should **tick box B** overleaf.

		Yes	No	N/A
10	Will your project involve deliberately misleading participants in any way?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Is there any realistic risk of you or any participants experiencing either physical or psychological distress or discomfort? If <b>Yes</b> , give details on a separate sheet and state what you will tell them to do if they should experience any problems (e.g., who they can contact for help).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12	Does your project involve work with animals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	Do participants fall into any of the following special groups?  Note that you may also need to obtain satisfactory CRB clearance (or equivalent for overseas students).	Schoolchildren (under age 18)		
		People with learning or communication difficulties		
		Parents		
		People in custody		
		People engaged in illegal activities (e.g. drug taking)		

If you have ticked **Yes** to any of Q10-13 you should **tick box B** overleaf.



**Purpose:**

What role does reparation play in achieving reconciliation in Rwanda after the 1994 genocide? How important is reparation for perpetrators to experience justice and move on?

In the background of the closure of gacaca, traditional community courts in June 2012 and the approaching of the 19<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Rwandan genocide this April the question of reconciliation becomes ever more relevant. Organisations, such as SURF (Survivors Fund, my partner organisation in Rwanda) that support survivors of the genocide believe that reparation (often a monetary compensation) plays an important role in reconciliation for both survivors and perpetrators. The extent of the role of reparation is unknown and under researched. In light of the fact that many survivors have not received reparation, I wish to collect the voices of Rwandans affected by the genocide and explore the extent of the role of reparation in reconciliation. As Rwanda begins its term on the Security Council this year, it is the aim of SURF to utilise results of this research as evidence to lobby the UN for the establishment of a national reparation task force to address reparation in Rwanda. This study has the potential of playing a role in reconciliation in Rwanda.

In this project I hope to capture the viewpoint of perpetrators of the genocide as their outlook is under-researched.

**Participants, methods and measurements:**

I will interview 16 participants amongst perpetrators of the genocide. The participants will be male/female between the ages of 18 to 65 years old.

SURF will provide me with extensive support in recruiting participants. I will engage with SURF and its partner organisations, such as AMI (*Association Modeste et Innocent* in Butare) to access possible participants. SURF and I both understand that it is challenging to find perpetrators who are willing to share their story. If it happens such that I can't find enough number of participants amongst perpetrators, I will focus the research on survivors and interview 16 survivors.

Each interview will be minimum 1 hour long and will be audio recorded.

The interviews will be semi-structured. I will go in with an interview topic guide and some questions prepared in advance. However, I will be flexible with the flow of the interview to allow the interviewee to share his/her story.

A Rwandan interpreter will assist me with the interviews. I will hire the interpreter with the help of SURF and train the interpreter with the necessary skills to assist me with the interviews. The interpreter will most likely be a graduate student of Genocide Studies with fluency in English and Kinyarwanda.

The interview will take place at a safe location accessible and convenient to participants and decided by SURF.

After the initial data collection in the field, I will also conduct a few interviews with experts on the topic of reconciliation and the Rwandan genocide to gain a better understanding of my collected data.

To analyse the data, I will use thematic network analysis.



**Consent, participant information and debriefing:**

Attached you will find the consent form, participant information sheet and debrief sheet.

**Possible ethical issues:**

I have developed a protocol with SURF's Clinical Psychologist to address any ethical and psychological issues that may arise as a result of this project. Discussing personal and sensitive topics might be very challenging for the participants. Though I will keep the interviews focused on the question of reparation, reconciliation and participant's current state (as opposed to questions about the genocide or atrocities committed by participants) some issues may trigger uncomfortable memories in the participants' minds. In such circumstances, SURF's Clinical Psychologist will provide the participants with appropriate and sufficient resource referrals after the interviews. I understand that the realities of working with traumatic stories may affect my mental health. SURF's Clinical Psychologist has agreed to debrief me after the interviews.

I will practice critical personal reflection throughout this project. I will draw on my communication, empathy and reflection skills earned from my experience as a crisis counsellor in Canada to interact with each interviewee in a non-judgemental, respectful, open and understanding manner.

**Study dates**

March 27 – April 24, 2013.

I am familiar with the BPS Guidelines for ethical practices in psychological research and I have discussed them with other researchers involved in the research (e.g., supervisor or co-researcher).

Student signature	Print Name	Date
Supervisor signature	Print Name	Date

**Statement of Ethical Approval: To be Completed by the Chair of the Ethics Committee**

This project has been considered using agreed procedures and is now approved.

Signature	Print Name	Date
-----------	------------	------

## Appendix VIII: Sample field notes

### **Day 1: April 7, 2013**

*At the Amaharo Stadium, annual memorial event marking the beginning of commemoration week*

There was lots of singing. A couple of singers sang a few times, maybe the same songs. There was one speech by the VP of Ibuka (collective of survivor organisations). I didn't understand anything. It was all in Kinyarwanda. Only one announcement was in English.

I saw Paul Kagame. That was exciting. Kagame joined the youth in the grass field and lit the first candle. Kagame looked like an average man. He didn't seem to have security around him. No suit or tie, just wearing a simple black hoodie. He was tall and thin. He had a presence. You could tell.

The sun went down and all you could see was the light of candles sparking on the other side of the stadium. I sensed something in the atmosphere. I could feel that the mourning had started. It wasn't until 8:00 pm that I heard sounds similar to those the seagulls make when they call each other. I thought that's strange, why are birds making these sounds and here at the memorial event in Kigali? A minute later, another one, and then another one, like dominos collapsing on top of each other. It had started. It wasn't the sound of birds. It was the sound of people wailing, wailing out loud. You can't cry like that unless you are feeling extreme pain. Some say it's been 20 years and people are moving on, but no, the wounds are very fresh. I lost track of how many cries I heard. It was emotional. I couldn't hold back the tears. The stadium was quiet. Everyone paid attention. The songs continued. Everyone accepted the pain of the other. I guess they were all experiencing similar level of pain and understood each other. I could see people getting up to help the person who was crying. There were staff in yellow vests who went to them and quietly helped them out of the stadium. It was calm though intense. My head was exploding. I had a terrible headache. It had been a long day. I wanted to stay till the end. I wanted to see the ending. People kept coming. It was packed with young people. I guess the older generation is gone. But I am impressed that young people feel committed and attend the event. Perhaps some of them were orphans of the genocide. I wondered seeing the young kids, what they thought of the word 'genocide' or what the screams meant to them. How did they interpret it? It was strange. I waited. Sat there amongst the locals and waited. What was I waiting for? I don't know. The youth in the grass field got up and walked towards the edge with candles in their hands. They gathered around the fire. I couldn't take it anymore. I was nauseous. I had to leave. I feel guilty for not staying till the end but I just couldn't. I headed for the

exist and outside saw lots of people walking around, saw one young girl who was holding on to a man with a yellow vest. It looked like she had passed out. I could feel the tension. The streets were busy but calmer. Masses of people were walking away from the stadium. I walked quickly, couldn't wait to get home.

**Day 4: April 10, 2013:**

There is something special about the sounds and smells of this land. I can't quite describe it. Imagine the smell of fresh grass with a faint fragrance of freshly picked tea, maybe even some coffee. The smell isn't flat. There is some warmth and sweetness to it. As for the sounds, it is the sound of birds singing and the rain hitting the tin roofs as if trying to drill a hole in them. And then the thunder. There is a certain peace and quietness. I'm falling in love with this land. There is a chemistry and attraction that draws me to the soil.

This is a place of tranquillity ironically. It's the land that puzzles me. People are respectful, honest, warm and kind. They greet each other most sincerely and yet they harmed each other so painfully. What happened? What's happening now? I can't make sense of it. Rwanda is a pretty puzzle with multiple dimensions.

Appendix IX: Sample interview transcript

**Transcript of interview #1– April 16, 2013**

I : Interviewer/Researcher

P : Participant/Perpetrator

I: Where were you born?

P: I was born in the Isimbi sector, the Mugobore cell, the Nyagasozi village and in the Huye district in the Southern province.

I: So it's close to here?

P: Yeah, 14 km.

I: I am very interested to know about your life while growing up in your village.

P: I am from a very poor family. I have primary education. I also took technical schools after primary school. I was in technical school for 3 years.

I: OK.

P: We were 11 children and I was the second child. After my studies I became a cultivator just like my parents.

I: What was life like in your village?

P: I lived a peaceful life with my neighbours, relatives and siblings. We lived a very good life.

I: How was the structure of the community? Was there a community leader? Was there someone who took care of the community? What was the structure like?

P: We have cells and we had a cell leader. My cell leader was also the leader of the MRND Party (National Republican Movement for Democracy and Development)

I: Were you involved in your community?

P: I was only a cultivator.

I: How are you making your living today? Are you still farming?

P: I am still a cultivator. I have been a cultivator my whole life. I am also in the lowest class of cultivators. I: Is that because of the crops that you grow that you are at the bottom?

P: The reason is that I come from a very poor family and that puts me at the bottom of the cultivators.

I: what kind of things do you grow? What are your crops?

P: I cultivate beans, cacao, coffee, pineapple and potatoes. I also have goats.

I: So you also herd goats and use the products from the goats?

P: Yes.

I: Before we started you said that you wanted to introduce yourself to me. Is there anything you would like to tell me to introduce yourself and let me get to know you better?

P: Nothing, I don't have anything to add. I will talk more when we start talking about life during and after the genocide.

I: Sounds good. I wanted to know about your life before the genocide and it looks like we covered that. Now I want to know about your life after the genocide. What was life like after the genocide for you when you returned to your village or if you were living at your village during that time?

P: After the genocide, life changed dramatically, because I was arrested and went to prison and because I was also a perpetrator and at the same time a victim.

I: How?

P: My father was a Hutu and my mother was a Tutsi. When the genocide began the other perpetrators came to kill my mother. I tried to defend my mother. To defend my mother I went to kill other Tutsis. I participated in the killings groups. I participated in the killings at the Isimbi Catholic Church. Many people were killed at that church. I took part in the killings and I killed people. Unfortunately, other perpetrators went behind my back and killed my mother, because she was a Tutsi.

I: Did you go to other places to kill?

P: Only at Isimbi.

P: Oh, sorry I told lies. I also stole and damaged the properties of Tutsis.

I: What do you mean you told me lies?

P: Sorry, I made a mistake. During the genocide I also looted and damaged Tutsi properties. After the RPF took power they arrested me, because I was accused of killing people and stealing properties. I went to prison. When we were in prison the government approached us and encouraged us to confess to our genocide crimes. I did it. Then after 9 years in prison President Paul Kagame gave us pardon, because we confessed to our genocide crimes.

P: And then when I got home Gacaca started. I was the first person to be tried in the Isimbi sector. I was sentenced to 8 years in prison. But because I had already spent 9 years in prison I did not go back to prison. After that I had to deal with the properties that I stole. At that time AMI (Association Modeste et Innocent) reached out to the perpetrators and told them that they had to pay back the properties. I was the first person to agree with AMI. I made a group of other perpetrators and told them that they should pay.

I: So you serve as a leader of that group?

P: Yes, there were 13 people in that group and we approached the victims of the genocide to tell them that we wanted to pay back their properties. We had no money. But we asked if we could cultivate for them in their lands or if we could cultivate in the lands of other people and get money to pay back the damaged properties. But the victims preferred that we pay the money, because they assumed we would cultivate in their land in a very bad way. However, later they were convinced to let us cultivate in their lands. This is how our group grew to 80 people, close to 100. We made 8 subgroups, 10 people per group.

I: I have two questions. You offered two options to the survivors. How did you come up with these options? Were they suggested to you or did you come up with them yourself?

P: The approaches were suggested by AMI to see how I can pay back the properties and get peace of mind. When I came home, I thought about it and came up with the idea of creating a group with other perpetrators who wanted to pay back the properties. I became the president of the group. The group's name is TUBASUBIZE ICYUBAHIRO. It means Give Back the Honour to the Victims. After the victims were convinced – not all of them, because one of them preferred to get paid – we cultivated in their lands as a way of paying reparation

I: How did that happen? What was the process of convincing them?

P: Earlier the survivors assumed we wouldn't cultivate in good way until we went and cultivated in the land of the president of the survivor group.

I: Did you do that with his permission?

P: Yes, he agreed.

I: So you said to him, let me show you what I can do and you can see that I can do a good job.

P: We started in the land of the president of the victims and we cultivated in good way. Once the president was convinced he went on to convince other survivors.

I: How did you convince the president?

P: I was the leader so I went to visit the president of survivor group. I was the first person to do this. But when I got close to his home, I doubted and went back home without meeting him, because I thought the president would beat me. I was scared. Once I got home, I thought again about what I should do and then realised that we must pay no matter what. The next day I went back to see him and his children opened the door. I was very scared at that moment, because I thought the president would beat me up. But the president greeted me warmly. He gave me a seat. He said, it is the first time you come here, what is your mission here? I became confident and suggested to him 2 approaches about paying reparation. I said we stole your properties, but we still have no money. So either let us cultivate in your land, or we go to cultivate in other lands and bring to you the money from the sale of our produce. Then he agreed to both approaches. We cultivated on Tuesdays and Fridays. But the first time we went to him we did not cultivate. We made bricks, because it was summertime and the president of Ibuka (survivor group) suggested that we make bricks. We made 1,200 bricks for one person on Tuesday. The second time, on Friday when we went back and cultivated in the president's land, he was impressed that we did a good job of cultivating in his land and he said he would help us by convincing other survivors to let us cultivate in their lands.

I: When did this happen? How many years after the genocide?

P: 2009.

I: And the year you were released from prison was?

P: It was 2007.

I: So two years.

P: Other survivors were convinced and they accepted to let us cultivate in their lands. Then our group expanded and we involved other perpetrators. There is also another group of women whose husbands are in prison for looting properties. There is another third group of children of the perpetrators who died before getting sentenced but the children have to pay on their behalf. These children joined us.

I: I am curious to know how the first group started? How did you convince other perpetrators to come together and form that group?

P: After I confessed, went to prison and then during gacaca, I had something like half peace in my heart. I was sentenced for the killings, but still had to figure out how to pay reparation. I made the decision to approach the perpetrators. I went to them house by house and convinced them to make a group and pay back by all means.

I: How did this process of creating the group make you feel? It sounds like you have done something very big. You brought perpetrators together, made that group expand and then brought women and children together. How does this work make you feel?

P: It was hard work. We started with a group of 13 people. But we were supported by AMI. They came and visited us many times. Later we planted in the land of the president of Ibuka and he was convinced. He then recommended us to other survivors at meetings. He said, we have perpetrators who want to cultivate in your lands as a way to pay back. He recommended other survivors to agree with this process. Even the local authorities/leaders recommended us. In the meetings, they said, we have a very special group of perpetrators. He said, will you survivors please support the idea and let them pay you back by cultivating in your lands?

I: And how does that make you feel? Do you feel pride in having done something so big?

P: Very excited, confident, happy and proud, because every day other perpetrators who want to make payments come to me and request that I train their group.

I: Sounds like you take a lot of pride in your work.

P: I feel that reconciliation can be achieved through solidarity. Even the survivors come and join our groups. Other people who have nothing to do with the genocide come and join our groups. They support our group.

I: That is interesting, how do the survivors come to help you?

P: The survivors changed their minds when they saw us cultivate in their lands. Today, they come to cultivate in your land and the next day you go to cultivate in their lands to help them make reparation. They say, we are survivors and as we should come and support you. We supervise other perpetrators who want to deviate and don't wish to pay back. We supervise them to make sure they pay back the properties, even though they don't want to do so. We take responsibility for other



perpetrators. We try to convince them to pay. If they don't pay, we take something from their property and sell it to pay back to the survivors.

I: Can you tell me what reconciliation means to you?

P: Since the genocide we have reached a high level of reconciliation. The AMI staff came to our village and tried to make a group of survivors and perpetrators to come and have discussions. We are getting reconciliation now that we've made a group of survivors and perpetrators. I am the president of that group.

I: So you are a very busy man.

P: Yes, and all of this started with a group of 13 people. Others joined us later. This comes from people accepting to pay back and making the payments. This is a sign that we've achieved reconciliation.

I: Do you think that you are reconciled, because you made efforts to return what you took away?

P: I feel reconciled now that I am done with the payment. I have peace of mind. Those other perpetrators who made payments also have peace of mind now.

I: So it sounds like to you reconciliation means being in peace?

P: Now I have peace. The group in total had to pay 5 million and 6 hundred thousand RWF in reparation. As a result of my leadership, we have so far paid 4 million and 6 hundred thousand.

I: OK, so most of it is already paid. Who came up with that figure of 5 million?

P: Gacaca made a list of the perpetrators and every man had his own amount based on the property he damaged or stole. We summed up them and got the total.

I: I am getting a sense of community here, that people work together to pay the debt or pay compensation for other persons. Is that the case? Is the group of perpetrators paying another group of survivors rather than one perpetrator paying to one survivor?

P: Yes, now we pay as group. We support each other.

I: How important do you think it is that you are in group together, that there is a community of you rather than one person working by himself?

P: Sometimes the perpetrators get tempted when they have money. When they pass a bar they go in and buy beer. Then they tell lies to their wives. They tell them that they paid. We have many

examples of these things happen. When they have money it is difficult for them to not spend it on other things. But because we are in a group we help each other to make sure that we make the payments. We work until we finish the payments. It take a long time to make the payments, for example, say you have to make a payment of a hundred thousand and each time you can only pay 5 thousand.

I: So because there is a community you are able to make the payments quicker. And what was that about the wife?

P: The man gets tempted to take the money to the bar and buy beer. He tells lies to his wife, telling her that he paid while he did no such thing. So it is difficult to take the money and go straight to the survivors. We work as team and help each other to make the payments.

P: Even though we have a very big group of perpetrators there are still other perpetrators who aren't in our group. They prefer to pay the money on their own, because they have the money. But there are others who completely refuse to pay.

I: It sounds like what brought you together was that you could not pay reparation by yourselves.

P: Yes.

I: Now, one question I have is that, you took the properties during the genocide, why can't you just return the properties you took during the genocide? Why can't you return them? What did you take? Was it the lands or what properties did you take during the genocide?

P: We destroyed people's houses and we took the window, beds, mattresses and cows.

I: So you did not have the cows to return, you also did not have the money to pay back, and so you decided to find other ways to pay back.

P: Yes, for me personally, I had to pay back 134 thousand. Our looting group was made up of 10 people and we each had to pay 134 thousand, because the house that we destroyed was worth 1 million and 30 thousand. I didn't have money. We didn't have money so we worked in the field to pay back the money.

I: And you are still in the process of making those payments?

P: I finished the payments. But I still continue to help others who are still paying. My group is made up of 10 people. So even though I've finished payments I still go and cultivate in their lands and they come and cultivate in my land to help me with my everyday earnings.

I: So there is a very strong sense of community partnership and community solidarity.

I: How do you think reconciliation can be achieved in Rwanda?

P: The first step is to pay back the properties and secondly, to continue to mobilise and educate people as done by AMI. There are still families who do not accept that a member of their family committed genocide though the court sentenced that person for their crimes. We need strong organisations to approach these families and convince them to accept this.

I: How do you think we can do that and convince them?

P: Let's take an example of women whose husbands are in prison. These women say that their husbands are innocent and that they should not pay. The only solution is to educate them and approach them constantly, every day to convince them that their husbands took part in the genocide.

I: So you need persistence, you need to go again and again until you convince them.

I: If you know others who did not pay reparation, such as people who do not want to pay reparation or those that for whatever reason, such as financial reason can not pay reparation, do they think that these people are at peace and feel reconciled though they have not paid reparation?

P: Those who want to pay can't achieve reconciliation until they pay or get support to pay. And organisations should continue to approach those who don't want to pay. At the beginning we were against making payments until AMI came and visited us and advised us to pay. We slowly changed our minds. AMI should continue to approach those who do not wish to make reparation.

I: Do you think that there are other ways to achieve reconciliation besides making payments?

P: Yes, it is possible to get reconciliation in other ways. Firstly, by working together in the community and forming groups of people with different backgrounds, including perpetrators, survivors and children of perpetrators. Secondly, by forming groups such as the one that we formed where each person gives 5000 RWF a month to the group and with that money we buy a cow for someone in the group.

I: So each person in the group pays 5000 RWF each month, regardless of whether he is a perpetrator or survivor and they use that money to buy a cow for a member of the community.

P: We have so far given cows to 30 people. It is regardless of the person's background. It is very special to get a cow. When it is time for it we organize a party. When they give me the cow they also

give me money to buy banana beer and food for the party. We make jokes and we have a good time.

I: So this is a fun time for the community.

P: And this is a pillar of reconciliation besides reparation. In my philosophy, I suggested that we give cows to survivors as compensation to replace the cows that were stolen at the time of genocide. But this is besides the issue of the genocide.

I: What do you mean by compensation for the cows?

P: This is besides the assigned reparation. We give cows to everyone. This is besides us acting as perpetrators. It's about us acting as a community.

I: So everyone will give everyone a cow and it doesn't matter if the receiver is a perpetrator or a survivor. Do you think that having participated in giving the cow and being part of this community has helped you feel reconciled?

P: I made the group with the social affairs of my sector, the cell leader and AMI. I gave them my idea. They celebrated this achievement on Jan 31, 2013 by giving 12 cows to different people in our village. I have been recognised and awarded on the national level for this initiative to promote reconciliation and solidarity in the community.

I: So this is happening in other communities because of efforts that you started.

P: The same programme has been implemented in other areas.

I: In other areas.

P: These initiatives come from people who want to pay reparation. Every 23<sup>rd</sup> of a month we give one cow to one family. You may doubt this story. I wish you would come to visit us.

I: I believe you.

P: I also made another group made up of 40 people of survivors and perpetrators. They pay 1,500 RWF per month and buy mattresses for 25,000 every month. They buy beds for 15,000, bed covers for 3,000. They buy slippers and soap to clean your body. And this is a way to get reconciliation. I researched and it occurred to me that what we do, giving cows or giving things it is all in a transparent way. It is fair. We should make sure that the perpetrators and survivors have equal right. They live in harmony and this is a pillar of reconciliation.

I: Is there anything else besides forming these communities or making reparation, anything else that you think can help with reconciliation in Rwanda?

P: The most important thing in the country that has challenged the perpetrators is the issue of reparation. It is like a national challenge faced by them. It is the issues of reparation that challenges reconciliation and prevents it.

I: Can you tell me in which category you were placed in at the gacaca, first, second?

P: In the second category.

I: Is there anything else that you would like to tell me? Anything that we discussed today.

*Translator:* He wanted to tell me how his idea and initiative have been implemented in other communities.

I: Yes. Please.

P: After our achievements, other cells and sectors came to invite me to go and help them to start the same programme, namely the sector of Gisakura and Rwaniro. There is a volunteer group in the Maraba sector and the Kabusanga cell.

I: And all of these are near Butare or are these in other parts of the country?

*Translator:* Very close to their sector.

I: Do you know of similar kind of programmes in other parts of the country?

P: No.

I: Is anything else that you would like to tell me and that I should know?

P: I acknowledge the support of AMI in my initiatives. I am very excited and happy to meet someone who is interested in our story. It is better to come to the field where you can see the results. We were ready to receive you there yesterday.

I: There was a miscommunication yesterday and I am sorry for that. I really like to come but I have very limited time. I will do my very best to come but I can't promise.

P: You might think that I am telling lies. So I suggest that you to come to interview the survivors.

I: I do believe you. I am very impressed by the work you've been doing for your community. I have very short time and my study is very narrow, but I do want to come back and do another thorough research. I want to do a PhD on this.

P: I have a visitor's book. If you visit I will give you the book. I enjoy your thoughts and how you appreciate my actions. I have been invited by different radios to talk about reconciliation.

I: Very impressive. I would love to come and I will do my very best to come. Murakoze cayne.

P: I am happy.

I: Same here.

**Global theme III: factors facilitating the role of reparation in reconciliation**

**Sub-global theme I: Dialogue and social capital bonding**

**Organising theme I: Group of perpetrators**

Basic theme	Code	Quotation
solidarity	share the same stories and problems	"The perpetrators themselves should go to confess to other perpetrators, because they know each other's stories and they know the crimes they have committed. I prefer that perpetrators go and convince other perpetrators to pay." Int6
empowerment	perpetrator's leadership	"The group in total had to pay 5 million and 6 hundred thousand RWF in reparation. As a result of my leadership, we have so far paid 4 million and 6 hundred thousand." Int1
peer education	education about importance of reparation	"So reconciliation is not an achievement, it is not an end, it is a process, so we continue to teach them, we continue to explain to them, we continue to educate them on the importance of paying reparation." Int16; "We have not achieved full reconciliation in Rwanda because there some people who are still stubborn about paying reparations while they have means to pay but we continue to visiting them and teach them." Int6
	education about understanding survivors	AMI brings together perpetrators to understand the perspective of survivors. Int6; "[Forming perpetrator and survivor group] was very difficult, so AMI came and met with perpetrators to understand their perspective of survivors." Int2
peer pressure	about making reparation	Sometimes the perpetrators get tempted when they have money. When they pass a bar they go in and buy beer. Then they tell lies to their wives. They tell them that they paid. We have many examples of these things happen. When they have money it is difficult for them to not spend it on other things. But because we are in a group we help each other to make sure that we make the payments. We work until we finish the payments. Int1; "We supervise other perpetrators who want to deviate and don't wish to pay back. We supervise them to make sure they pay back the properties, even though they don't want to do so. We take responsibility for other perpetrators. We try to convince them to pay. If they don't pay, we take something from their property and sell it to pay back to the survivors." Int1; "...and it happens that we sometimes know when [perpetrators] are getting money. They go to the store to spend it. We see that and ask them to pay reparation when they have money, so they go and do it." Int6
Peer support	assurance of support and encouragement	We continue to persuade perpetrators join perpetrator group. We continue to persuade them to pay, even if it takes 100 days they should pay. We say to them, 'just get focused, get committed, we shall help you. It is a long process, it is also hard work, you need to persevere, you need to be strong, not to be discouraged by it.'" Int16; "Even though I am now about to finish paying my reparations, I must support other perpetrators who have not yet finished paying their reparations." Int16; "...we are in a group, we help each other to make sure that we make the payments. We work until we finish the payments." Int1
	approach survivors together in group	sometimes one perpetrator in our group come and asks us to accompany him to ask pardon [from a survivor], then we take our cultivating tools and go to cultivate in the survivor's land. After work the survivor gives pardon to the perpetrator. Int6
	cultivate together to make reparation	...with the help of AMI we have taken full responsibility to mobilise perpetrators and help each other to pay reparation. Int6; "But I still continue to help others who are still paying. My group is made up of 10 people. So even though I've finished payments I still go and cultivate in their lands and they come and cultivate in my land to help me with my everyday earnings." Int1
	pay as a group	We pay [reparation] as a group. We support each other." Int1; "Even though I am now about to finish paying my reparations, I must support other perpetrators who have not yet finished paying their reparations." Int16

## Organising theme II: Group of survivors and perpetrators

Basic theme	Code	Quotation
support with reparation	support with mediation and reparation negotiation	I still have a big debt. I requested the man (leader of perp & surv group) to convince the survivor family to meet with me and negotiate with me about how we can reduce the cost or if I can pay slow by slow. Int8
	work together to make reparation	The survivors changed their minds when they saw us cultivate in their lands. Today, they come to cultivate in your land and the next day you go to cultivate in their lands to help [perpetrators] make reparation. They say, we are survivors and as we should come and support you. Int2; "...[the] group ...was made up of perpetrators and survivors...they helped each other to pay, or to help other member of the group to cultivate their land." Int2
dialogue for reconciliation	dialogue for reconciliation	We work as mediators for people who still have fear of each other to make the first step of reconciliation. We invited both of them and facilitated dialogue between them and to help them on how reparation can be made. Int7

## Organising theme III: Group of all community members

Basic theme	Code	Quotation
working together to make money	form co-ops and savings-clubs, cultivate together, give loans/cow/health insurance	The group includes, survivors, perpetrators and everyone else...[The group] has now become a co-operative. Int14; "The group was formed by AMI...our first purpose is unity and reconciliation...We help each other. We have 7 smaller groups. Each one has 10 persons in it. We cultivate together and we have a co-operative." Int10; "[In the group] we formed...each person gives 5000 RWF a month to the group and with that money we buy a cow for someone in the group... We have so far given cows to 30 people. It is regardless of the person's background. It is very special to get a cow." Int1; "They share the money. So every month they will give money to one of the members...if you want to pay reparations, if you want to use that money for your own business, to grow crop, you do what you want with it." Int16
working together to make money	form co-ops and savings-clubs, cultivate together, give loans/cow/health insurance	The group includes, survivors, perpetrators and everyone else...[The group] has now become a co-operative. Int14; "The group was formed by AMI...our first purpose is unity and reconciliation...We help each other. We have 7 smaller groups. Each one has 10 persons in it. We cultivate together and we have a co-operative." Int10; "[In the group] we formed...each person gives 5000 RWF a month to the group and with that money we buy a cow for someone in the group... We have so far given cows to 30 people. It is regardless of the person's background. It is very special to get a cow." Int1; "They share the money. So every month they will give money to one of the members...if you want to pay reparations, if you want to use that money for your own business, to grow crop, you do what you want with it." Int16
working together to make money	form co-ops and savings-clubs, cultivate together, give loans/cow/health insurance	The group includes, survivors, perpetrators and everyone else...[The group] has now become a co-operative. Int14; "The group was formed by AMI...our first purpose is unity and reconciliation...We help each other. We have 7 smaller groups. Each one has 10 persons in it. We cultivate together and we have a co-operative." Int10; "[In the group] we formed...each person gives 5000 RWF a month to the group and with that money we buy a cow for someone in the group... We have so far given cows to 30 people. It is regardless of the person's background. It is very special to get a cow." Int1; "They share the money. So every month they will give money to one of the members...if you want to pay reparations, if you want to use that money for your own business, to grow crop, you do what you want with it." Int16



## Sub-global theme II: Dialogue and social capital bridging

### Organising theme I: Community-based organisation (AMI)

Basic theme	Code	Quotation
mobilise to make reparation	suggest alternatives to reparation payment	The approaches [e.g., to cultivate in survivor's land] were suggested by AMI to see how I can pay back the properties and get peace of mind. Int2
	mediation of reparation negotiation	"I appreciate how AMI supports dialogue...to see how [survivors] can be flexible with payments." Int10; "AMI facilitates dialogue with survivors and some of them forgive reparations." Int12
	mobilise perpetrators to make reparation and support them	The group that AMI made...it was survivors and perpetrators. The purpose was to pay reparation with support of community. They helped each other to pay or help members to cultivate. Int2; "We the help of AMI we have taken full responsibility to mobilise perpetrators and help each other to pay reparation." Int6
bringing survivors and perpetrators together	educate survivors and perpetrators about unity and equality using Ubuntu and religious frameworks	AMI tells us we are all created in the image of God. It simply means that you respect me and I should respect you. If you kill me, you then kill the image of God, you kill God. If you see in my eye, you see yourself. This means we are all together. When you kill me, keep in mind that we have the same blood...the AMI lessons helped me identify myself as human. Int2
	dialogue between survivors and perpetrators	AMI came and met with perpetrators to understand their perspective of survivors. Then AMI met with survivors to understand their perspective on perpetrators. AMI then brought the two groups together. Int2; "I appreciate how AMI supports dialogue and tries to unite us with survivors." Int10