



REPUBLIC OF RWANDA

*National Commission for the Fight
against Genocide*

CNLG

TESTIMONIES AND NEEDS OF GENOCIDE SURVIVORS

P.O Box 7035 Kigali . Hotline:3560
E-mail: administrator@cnlg.gov.rw Web site: www.cnlg.gov.rw

**TESTIMONIES AND NEEDS
OF GENOCIDE SURVIVORS**

Kigali, May 2017

Executive Summary

Over the course of one hundred days, from April to July 1994, over one million Tutsi were killed (MINALOC, 2004: 21) and hundreds of thousands of survivors were left orphaned, wounded, disabled, widowed, diseased, and/or homeless. Twenty-three years after the Genocide against the Tutsi, a study assessing the needs of its survivors, particularly those who participated in the *Gacaca* courts, is of paramount importance. The purpose of this study is to assess the effects of *Gacaca* courts on participants and to assess the needs of survivors who participated in the court hearings. In doing so, the study also seeks to document testimonies of the Genocide.

In line with this purpose, this study asks two questions: (1) How did the *Gacaca* courts impact those who participated? (2) What are the needs of genocide survivors who participated in the *Gacaca* court hearings? To address these questions, we interviewed 254 individuals from four sectors: Gikondo, Gahanga, and Masaka sectors in Kicukiro district and Mwurire sector in Rwamagana district. Interviews typically took

place in each participant's home. All interviews followed a semi-structured interview technique that allowed for standardized questions and for flexibility in answers and elaborations. The interview guide included questions about their lives before and during 1994, perceived effects of *Gacaca*, psychosocial wellbeing, and their needs today. After data transcription was complete and a coding scheme was developed, we coded the interviews in NVivo, a qualitative coding program that allowed us to explore key trends in the data.

This study sought to obtain first-hand accounts of how Rwandans interacted with justice, and to what extent their lives were affected by the justice process; the findings show that justice is of paramount importance to them. While their reactions are influenced by the nature of their particular experiences before, during, and after the Genocide, all interviewees demanded justice. Whether an impoverished peasant in a rural village or a highly educated professional in Kigali, every participant, male or female, young or old, emphasized the need for those who participated in the Genocide to be punished. Though the experiences, opinions, and hopes that have been highlighted by the survivors

we interviewed are not necessarily shared by all survivors, those we interviewed were generally consistent in highlighting experiences and challenges.

This study was conducted by the National Commission for the Fight against Genocide (CNLG) in collaboration with The Ohio State University and the University of Minnesota, both based in the United States of America. This study was conducted by Donatien Nikuze, Research Fellow at the Research and Documentation Center on Genocide (RDCG) under the supervision of Dr. Jean-Damascène Gasanabo, Director General of RDCG, Dr. Hollie Nyseth Brehm, an Assistant Professor of Sociology and Criminology at The Ohio State University, and Professor Christopher Uggen, the Distinguished McKnight Professor of Sociology and Criminology at the University of Minnesota.

Dr. Jean Damascène BIZIMANA
Executive Secretary

Acronyms

AERG	: Association des Elèves et Etudiants Rescapés du Génocide
CCM	: Centre for Conflict Management
CHUK	: Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Kigali
CMD	: Common Mental health Disorders
CNLG	: National Commission for the fight against Genocide
D	: Defendant
FARG	: Fond d'Assistance aux Rescapés du Génocide
GAERG	: Groupe des Anciens Etudiants Rescapés du Génocide
HIV/AIDS	: Human Immunodeficiency Virus/ Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
HNP	: Hôpital Neuro-Psychiatrique
ICTR	: International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
ID	: Identity
J	: Judge
NGO	: Non-Governmental Organization
NSGC	: National Service of Gacaca Courts
OMS	: Organisation Mondiale de la Santé
PTSD	: Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder
RDCG	: Research and Documentation Center on Genocide
RPA	: Rwandan Patriotic Army

RPF	: Rwandan Patriotic Front
SCPS	: Service de Consultations Psycho-Sociale
SES	: Socio-Economic Status
SRQ	: Self-Reporting Questionnaire
TIG	: Travaux d'Intérêts Général
TRC	: Truth and Reconciliation Commission
TRP	: Trauma Recovery Program
UN	: United Nations
UNICEF	: United Nations Children's Fund
W	: Witness
WHO	: World Health Organization

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Acronyms.....	7
Table of Contents.....	9
I. Introduction.....	13
II. Research Questions.....	17
III. Research methodology.....	23
3.1. Research Design.....	23
3.2. Research Sample and Sampling Techniques.....	24
3.3. Research Participants.....	25
3.4. Data Collection Techniques.....	28
3.5. Data Processing and Analysis.....	31
3.6. Ethical Considerations.....	32
IV. History and Consequences of the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi.....	33
V. Gacaca Courts in Post-Genocide Rwanda.....	35
VI. Genocide Survivors' Needs Before, During, and After the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi.....	41
6.1. Testimonies and Needs of Genocide Survivors before the Genocide.....	41

6.2.	Life during the Genocide.....	48
6.3.	Life in the Aftermath of Genocide.....	64
6.3.1.	Needs for Economic Security and Income-Generating Projects.....	55
6.3.2.	Need for Restitution of Property Destroyed During the Genocide.....	60
6.3.3.	Need for Recovery and Burial of Relatives' Bodies.....	64
6.3.4.	Need for Education.....	66
6.3.5.	Need for Healthcare.....	69
VII.	Genocide Survivors' Opinions of Gacaca.....	71
7.1.	Encouraging Truth and Forgiveness.....	71
7.2.	Perceived Problems with Gacaca Courts..	78
VIII.	Perceived Effects of Gacaca on Genocide Survivors who Served as Judges.....	84
8.1.	Becoming a Judge.....	84
8.2.	Doing Justice, Unifying Rwandans.....	88
8.3.	The Unintended Burden of Community Justice.....	94
IX.	Psychosocial Wellbeing of Genocide Survivors.....	101

General Conclusion.....	119
Policy Recommendations.....	121
References.....	123
APPENDICES.....	147
Appendix 1: Phone Script.....	148
Appendix 2: Informed Consent and Voluntary Participation.....	152
Appendix 3: Interview Guide.....	158
Appendix 4: Codebook.....	178

I. Introduction

Twenty-three years have passed since the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi. However, the psychological, economic, and social consequences of the Genocide continue to affect survivors. Unlike other victims of genocidal violence, survivors in Rwanda live alongside the same people who sought to exterminate them. This reality introduces layers of complexity and sensitivity.

To address this situation, the Government of National Unity initially sought to establish a truth and reconciliation commission, modeled after that which was set up in post-apartheid South Africa, but eventually rejected the notion because such a commission would not properly balance punitive and restorative justice for genocide victims (Clark, 2010). Thus, the Rwandan government sought to create a mechanism for transitional justice, which emphasizes the harm that was done to the victims during the conflict and which relies upon reconciliation between victims and perpetrators of the Genocide against the Tutsi (Dandur and, Griffiths, 2006) while also facilitating the punishment of offenders.

Broadly, transitional justice constitutes a process that “comprises a full range of judicial and non-judicial mechanisms and reforms that seeks to address past abuses, serve justice, and establish peace and reconciliation” (UN Secretary General, 2004: 4). Establishing justice after conflict is an integral step in creating a national platform for sustainable peace. When “systematic abuses of human rights are not adequately addressed,” they can become “a source of social unrest and often contribute to renewed violence” (United States Institute of Peace, 2008: 1). Thus, it is vital to establish strategies to address mass atrocities in an efficient and effective manner.

The transitional justice process involves the implementation of mechanisms that hold cultural and contextual legitimacy, enabling the peaceful settlement of disputes (UN Secretary General, 2004: 3). It was in this regard that the Rwandan government implemented the *Gacaca* courts as a transitional justice mechanism. *Gacaca* initially represented a traditional community-based justice system that the Rwandan government later revitalized to address crimes of genocide.

The *Gacaca* courts' original goals were to find out the truth about the events of 1994, to help try the massive number of suspects, and by so doing, to destroy the culture of impunity, to increase national unity, and to take advantage of a traditional dispute resolution system to accomplish these goals (NSGC, 2012). Clark's analysis of the courts defined the goals as the long-term establishment of six ideals: truth, peace, justice, healing, forgiveness, and reconciliation (Clark, 2010). While the courts would lay the foundation for these ideals to take hold, the Rwandan government also intended them to try and sentence the accused, improve living conditions in the prison system by reducing its inmate population, and reinforce burgeoning economic development by punishing some offenders with community service, using their labor to rebuild crumbling infrastructure. The theoretical basis of *Gacaca* helped to foster the restorative notion that judicial processes based on the past provide the greatest benefit when used to influence society constructively in the future – whether that be through truth learned from a confession or construction completed by convicted *génocidaires* (Wierzynska, 2004).

In general, *Gacaca* courts existed as a transitional justice mechanism to repair societal damages. However, the impact of *Gacaca* on participants and, specifically genocide survivors, is largely unknown, which is why this study was conducted.

II. Research Questions

Question 1: How did the Gacaca courts impact those who participated, specifically genocide survivors?

Divergent views have emerged regarding the purpose of *Gacaca*. For many, *Gacaca* courts were primarily a retributive institution that existed to punish perpetrators of genocide. Others, such as Karekezi (see, for example, Karekezi, Nshimiyimana, and Mutamba 2004), Drumbl (2000), and Clark (2010), argue that a view of *Gacaca* as strictly retributive is inherently limiting. Rather, in combining punishment and reconciliation, *Gacaca* courts blended elements of retributive and restorative justice. Indeed, according to the Government of Rwanda, the aims of *Gacaca* included contributing to unity and reconciliation (National Service of Gacaca Jurisdictions 2012). *Gacaca* was thus created as a key mechanism that allowed genocide survivors to confront and come to terms with violence and those who committed it, both at the individual, psychological level, and at the societal level.

Unlike strictly punitive justice mechanisms, which emphasize retribution and aim to deter potential criminals, restorative mechanisms like *Gacaca* place more emphasis on creating a record of events that occurred during a period of violence, often offering amnesty or reduced sentences in exchange for truth telling. A key reason for this emphasis is the idea that a restorative focus improves societal relationships and allows survivors to come to terms with and, in some ways, move beyond the violence. This is vital both for individual health but also for the stability of a society. Yet, the restorative effects of *Gacaca* have not been extensively examined. Accordingly, we examine the outcomes of the *Gacaca* courts with a focus on survivors.

Question 2: What are the needs of survivors who participated in the Gacaca court hearings?

A small body of scholarship has assessed how participation in the *Gacaca* courts influenced the lives of its participants. While several studies have analyzed the court processes themselves, few have examined their effects. In particular, Rimé

and his colleagues (Rimé et al. 2011) studied how exposure to *Gacaca* courts influenced prisoners' and victims' perceptions of themselves and others (in comparison to control groups of prisoners and victims who had not yet attended *Gacaca* court proceedings, as the courts were ongoing at the time of the study). In general, they found that participation in the courts enhanced shame among prisoners and decreased shame among victims. They also found that the courts aided social integration through *Gacaca*'s redemptive focus. Rather than simply punishing and demonizing perpetrators, the courts reintegrated them back into society.

These findings begin to speak to perceptions as well as to impacts on the lives of individuals who took part in the court processes. That said, studies have yet to examine the lasting effects of participation in the courts. Our research therefore examines the potential effects of *Gacaca* on the survivors who participated in trials. We focus on two main effects—the psychosocial wellbeing of participants and the specific effects of serving as a judge (*Inyangamugayo*) in the court system.

For the former, a growing body of scholarship has begun to examine how participation in truth-telling influences subsequent well-being. Truth-telling was a prominent part of the *Gacaca* court process. Desmond Tutu (quoted in Kiss 2000:72) and other prominent practitioners have suggested that “there is no healing without truth,” and many have similarly argued that truth-telling yields therapeutic benefits (see Mendeloff 2004, 2009). Yet, scholars have only recently examined this claim (Thomas et al. 2008; Robins 2012), with some finding no association between truth-telling and mental health (e.g., Kaminer et al. 2001) and others documenting a negative relationship.

Brounéus (2010) found, for instance, that *Gacaca* witnesses demonstrated higher levels of depression and PTSD than did non-witnesses. Sharing a story can be traumatizing, perhaps especially when recounting a narrative in a linear format with painstaking detail, as is required when testifying in a court. In line with this, Rimé and colleagues (2011) found that those who were victimized, and those who were accused of genocide-related crimes each demonstrated an increase in fear, sadness, and

anxiety following participation in *Gacaca*. Even listening to others' stories can generate negative mental health or psychosocial consequences and secondary trauma among those who staff transitional justice mechanisms (Hayner 2010), as well as among other participants (Stepakoff et al. 2015).

As noted above, we also focus on the impact that *Gacaca* had on the judges. Few studies of the judiciary have examined the role of judges in transitional justice. This is somewhat surprising, as courts are among the most prominent mechanisms of transitional justice (Sikkink 2011), spanning from local courts like the *Gacaca* courts to international courts like the ICTR.

Specific to Rwanda, hundreds of thousands of Rwandan community members were elected to serve as judges (*Inyangamugayo*), and these individuals volunteered their time to preside over trials each week between 2002 and 2012. Despite their vital role in both the *Gacaca* court system and in the broader reconciliation process, little is known about how serving in this role affected the *Inyangamugayo*'s lives.

This report begins with information about our research methodology. We then provide a brief history of Rwanda, the Genocide, and the *Gacaca* courts to contextualize our findings. Next, we present the findings. In an approach targeted towards answering initial research questions in a careful, efficient, and systematic fashion, transcribed interviews and field notes were analyzed together in order to ascertain coherent and consistent patterns. This analysis ultimately yielded the conclusions outlined later in this report, and the quotations presented were chosen because they were representative of the themes that were uncovered. These include experiences before, during, and after the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi, the genocide survivors' perceived effects of *Gacaca*, perceived effects of *Gacaca* on the *Inyangamugayo*, and finally the psychosocial well-being of survivors.

III. Research methodology

III.1. Research Design

This study interviewed individuals from three groups of people—those who testified at *Gacaca* court hearings (survivors), *Gacaca* judges (many of whom were survivors), and defendants in *Gacaca* cases. While defendants who stood trial were not survivors, it was nevertheless important to collect their testimony to provide a comparison group for survivors. It was also impossible to randomly sample people based on ethnicity, as we will further explain below. For this study, 254 interviews were conducted in total, using a semi-structured interview technique that allowed for standardized questions yet flexibility in answers and elaborations. As explained below, the 254 individuals were chosen using stratified random sampling.

III.2. Research Sample and Sampling Techniques

It is often expensive and time consuming to collect data from all individuals in the categories of targeted respondents. Additionally, random samples are generalizable to the population from which they are sampled. Thus, participants were selected using stratified random sampling. Specifically, we relied upon *Gacaca* court records to randomly select research participants from four sectors—the Gikondo, Gahanga, and Masaka sectors from the Kicukiro district and the Mwurire sector from the Rwamagana district. One sector—Gikondo—is urban and three—Gahanga, Masaka and Mwurire—are rural. This enabled us to consider differences between urban and rural areas when assessing results. Nevertheless, such differences did not manifest in our findings and thus are not highlighted in our results.

Using a list of all *Gacaca* trials, we selected 20 trials from each of the four sectors using a random number generator. Then, from the *Gacaca* court archives, we identified all judges, witnesses, and

defendants involved in the randomly-selected trials. After randomly identifying research participants, we worked with local government officials, including the executive secretaries of sectors and cells and village leaders, to obtain their addresses. We then contacted each individual and asked if they would be willing to participate in a voluntary study. Voluntary participation and anonymity were stressed, and a few individuals declined participation in the study.

III.3. Research Participants

As noted above, a small amount of the randomly selected participants declined participation. Additionally, others had moved or passed away, which resulted in a total sample of 254 individuals. Of these individuals, 136 were judges (*Inyangamugayo*), 36 were witnesses, and 82 were defendants. It is important to note, however, that most judges and defendants also served as witnesses in other trials.

Ninety-six of the interviewees were survivors. This number is smaller than anticipated for several

reasons. First, the *Gacaca* court records do not denote whether someone was a survivor, and while we anticipated that most judges and witnesses would be survivors, this was not the case. Only sixty-seven of the 136 judges were survivors. Among the 36 witnesses, 29 were survivors. None of the 82 defendants were survivors, however, as we expected.

One hundred and seventy-nine of the participants were men, while seventy-five were women. The average age of participants was 52 because we only interviewed adults who were alive during the Genocide, which shifted the age distribution of participants upwards. The youngest participant was 30 years old, and the oldest participant was 86 years old.

Ninety-eight interviews were conducted in 2015, and 156 interviews were conducted in 2016. Fifty-six interviews were conducted in Gahanga, forty-nine in Gikondo, fifty-six in Masaka, and fifty-five in Mwurire. An additional twenty were conducted in Rwamagana TIG Camp, twelve in Mageragere TIG camp, and six in Prison 1930. As this research

report focuses on the needs of survivors, we mostly present findings based on the 96 survivors we interviewed. Notably, for research publications, it will be vital to have comparisons with individuals who are not survivors, so these interviews and their corresponding data will be included in all publications resulting from this study.

Among survivors interviewed, 53 were men and 43 were women. The average age was 54, with an age range of 32 to 78. These interviews took place throughout the four sectors, though due to the random sampling technique, more were interviewed in sectors that have higher populations of survivors. Specifically, 39 survivors were interviewed in Gikondo, 18 were interviewed in Gahanga, 28 were interviewed in Mwurire, and 11 were interviewed in Masaka. Taken together, 42 survivors were interviewed in 2015, and 54 were interviewed in 2016.

III.4. Data Collection Techniques

In-depth interviews were used to allow respondents to express themselves clearly and expand on the topics of interest. Before each interview, the researcher introduced herself to the participant and told them a little about the general nature of the research and how the interview was going to be conducted. The researcher also spent time talking with the participant in order to develop rapport. Interviews were conducted from June 2015 to October 2016. Interviews typically took place in each participant's home, though some interviews with people convicted of genocide-related crimes took place in TIG camps or prisons. All interviews followed a semi-structured interview guide. This included questions about their lives before and during 1994, perceived effects of *Gacaca*, psychosocial wellbeing, and their needs today. The interviews typically lasted between one and two hours.

To assess psychosocial wellbeing, each interview also included a series of questions known as the Self-Reporting Questionnaires (SRQ-20).

The World Health Organization (WHO) developed the SRQ-20 during the 1980s as a screening tool for common mental disorders. It can be self-administered but is typically administered in interview form when participants are illiterate. We administered the questions orally at the end of each interview. Specifically, the instrument consists of 20 yes/no questions that address current mood, anxiety, and other indicators of psychosocial wellbeing. The SRQ-20 has been validated in other studies on Rwanda (Scholte, Verduin, Van Lammeren, Rutayisire, and Kamperman 2011).

To allow interviewees to express themselves as freely as possible, interviews (including the SRQ-20 portion) were conducted in Kinyarwanda, the native language of the study's participants. Nyseth Brehm and Uggen each worked with a local research assistant who assisted them with translation during the interviews. Research assistants were graduate students at the University of Rwanda's Center for Conflict Management and had been trained in proper research techniques and in research ethics. The research assistants assisted with making appointments with research participants due to

their fluency in Kinyarwanda. They did this via phone calls that followed a detailed phone script that introduced the study and explained that participation was completely voluntary. Notably, despite the different backgrounds of researchers conducting interviews, we did not see noticeable differences in respondents' accounts across interviewers.

If the participant agreed, interviews were recorded using audio recorders in order to play them back for more thorough analysis and transcription. In the few cases where the participant did not agree to audio recording, we took notes in notebooks, though no notable differences between interviews that were audio-recorded and those that were transcribed manually were observed. Respondents were able to stop the interview at any time. Furthermore, if the respondent did not want to answer any questions, he or she was able to skip such questions in line with standard research practice.

III.5. Data Processing and Analysis

Data processing is organizing data for the purpose of presentation and analysis. After the interviews were completed, the collected data were transcribed and translated into English, the language chosen for this report and the language we will use for all subsequent peer-reviewed publications. All data were also anonymized, meaning that personally identifiable information was removed. Once transcribed, interviews were subsequently read for key themes. After developing a coding scheme through inductive coding, we coded the interviews in NVivo, which is a qualitative coding software that organizes, but does not code, data. This allowed us to explore key trends in the data. We also relied upon secondary sources. These included published books, reports, journals, newspapers, and the Internet. This helped us not only to be able to obtain the background information and read relevant literature but also to avoid the replication of data.

III.6. Ethical Considerations

Measures were taken while planning and conducting the study to ensure the rights of each subject were respected. Specifically, we ensured that nobody was harmed in any way during the research process. This involved ensuring that the questions would not cause undue stress to the participants and ensuring that participants' well-being was respected during the interview. At the beginning of each interview, each participant was read a consent form that included information about who was conducting the study, the study's background, the risks and benefits of participating in the study, and the anticipated length of the interview. The consent form also stressed that all participation was voluntary and that respondents could stop the interview at any time. In addition, it noted that there would not be compensation for participating in the interview and explained to all participants that the study was confidential. Accordingly, confidentiality was promised and was effectively adhered to because names and identifying information have been redacted from the transcribed interviews, while audio files have been destroyed.

IV. History and Consequences of the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi

Before colonization, Rwandans were collectively known as *Banyarwanda*. German, and later Belgian, colonial authorities, however, divided Rwandans into three main ethnic groups: Hutu, Tutsi, and Twa. In 1933, the Belgians issued ID cards that included bearers' ethnicity. This divisive system was maintained by post-independence governments, which further institutionalized the ethnic ideology introduced by colonialists (Magnarella, 2005:809). For example, the *Hutu Manifesto* (drafted in 1957 and widely distributed in 1959) called for Hutu-majority rule and the marginalization of the Tutsi (Magnarella, 2005:809). Throughout the First and Second Republics, violence against the Tutsi led many of them to flee to neighboring countries.

In 1990, the Rwandan Patriotic Army (RPA) invaded Rwanda, sparking a civil war. The Hutu government then began planning a genocide against the Tutsi. The death of the Rwandan and Burundian presidents in a plane crash on April 6, 1994 was used as a pretext to begin this genocide.

Hutu extremists took over the government, blamed the Tutsi for the assassination of the president, and started the slaughter. During the following 100 days, over one million Tutsi were killed nationwide, often by friends, colleagues, and even family members (Nikuze, 2014: 1094). This genocide left many Rwandans deprived of their property and physical and psychological well-being.

V. **Gacaca Courts in Post-Genocide Rwanda**

Established by Organic law N° 40/2000 of January 26/2001, modern *Gacaca* courts were based on a traditional form of resolving disputes between members of a community and were created as local justice mechanisms to try those suspected of genocide-related crimes.

The *Gacaca* process operated with five goals:

- To establish the truth about what happened during the genocide;
- To accelerate the legal proceedings for those accused of genocide crimes;
- To eradicate the culture of impunity;
- To reconcile Rwandans and reinforce their unity; and
- To use the capacity of Rwandan society to deal with conflict through a justice system based on Rwandan custom
(NSGC, Summary of the Report Presented at the Closing of Gacaca Court Activities, 2012: 29).

The *Gacaca* system invited ordinary citizens to give accounts of the atrocities committed in order to aid truth-telling and reconciliation and to encourage perpetrators to repent for their crimes.

Existing scholarship on the *Gacaca* courts has largely focused on scholars' and legal practitioners' assessments of *Gacaca*. The majority of this literature discusses the courts themselves, often examining general operating procedures or criticizing elements of the courts for failing to adhere to international legal standards. Many scholars have documented how the courts functioned in law and in practice (e.g., Longman, 2009; Schabas, 2005; Clark, 2010; Bornkamm, 2012, etc.). For instance, Werchick (2001) describes the structure and organization of the *Gacaca* courts, including a detailed examination of the offenses considered. Sarkin (2001) similarly examines the organization and objectives of the *Gacaca* courts before their actual implementation, identifying both potential benefits and problems that could arise from the court proceedings.

Daly (2002), Wierzynski (2004), Chakravarty (2006), and Schabas (2005) likewise have analyzed the form and structure of the *Gacaca* courts, providing varying assessments of their potential outcomes and pitfalls. Clark (2010) provides one of the most in-depth analyses of the courts, covering their structure and form while also assessing how they functioned in practice. Other scholars, including Brannigan and Jones (2009), have studied elements of the *Gacaca* courts and the influence that Rwanda's "amnesty rule" had on the courts. Kirkby (2006) assesses how the courts incorporated elements of both restorative and retributive justice, while Lahiri (2009) describes the conceptual system of *Gacaca* courts while also evaluating the courts in practice (see also Bonkamm 2012; Doughty, 2013; Joireman, 2013).

For instance, after considering the issues associated with prosecutions through international tribunals after genocide and mass atrocity, Drumbl (2002) outlined concerns about the structure of the courts before the trials began, questioning the lack of "rule of law" in the *Gacaca* court structure and suggesting that a shame-based approach may have

been more appropriate. Scholars also highlight the dangers and flaws of the trials themselves. For Tiemessen (2004), *Gacaca* courts increased ethnic tensions and divisionism, giving Tutsis power over Hutus—as those being tried were almost exclusively Hutu, while victims and witnesses were almost exclusively Tutsi. Critics have also discussed the courts' harmful effects, including the traumatization of victims and witnesses, and the potential renewal of conflicts and hostilities (Staub, 2004; Brounéus, 2008). Other literature focuses on the legality of *Gacaca* courts under international law. Fierens (2005) analyzes the *Gacaca* courts within the legal frameworks of national and international systems of law, criticizing the retroactive nature of the trials, the definitions of crimes, and the denial of fair trials to suspected perpetrators. Uvin (2003) also looked at the efficacy of the three courts prosecuting genocide perpetrators and found that, while the ICTR and domestic courts were ineffective, the *Gacaca* courts were successful in spite of certain drawbacks (see also Apuuli 2009 and Jones 2013).

Despite all of these critiques, few studies of *Gacaca* have focused on its participants. Notably, the Centre for Conflict Management of the National University of Rwanda (CCM 2010) conducted research to determine public perceptions regarding the extent to which the *Gacaca* courts attained its five objectives. Using maximum variation sampling, 351 were interviewed in Kigali City, 979 in Southern Province, 816 in Western Province, 619 in Northern Province and 762 in Eastern Province. This amounted to a total of 3,527 interviews across the country. Results found that over 80% of the respondents believed that each goal was met. At the high end, 95% believed that the courts demonstrated the capacity of Rwandans to resolve their own problems, while, at the low end, only 83.5% of respondents believed that the *Gacaca* courts were successful in revealing the truth about the genocide. Megwalu and Loizides (2010) also used surveys and interviews to provide qualitative insights into participants' attitudes towards and experiences of *Gacaca* courts. Megwalu and Loizides' survey was administered to approximately 220 participants in three regions, finding that while

there was a wide variety of opinions of the *Gacaca* courts, participants were generally positive about the *Gacaca* courts' ability to "contribute to justice and reconciliation efforts" (Megwalu and Loizides 2010: 20).

After the closing of the *Gacaca* courts, no other scholarship (to our knowledge) has examined participants (and, specifically, survivors) to assess how their involvement in the *Gacaca* court system influenced their respective life courses. It is in filling this gap that this research was relevant. As such, its purpose is to obtain testimonies on the needs of genocide survivors in the aftermath of *Gacaca* courts and to assess the effects of *Gacaca* courts on survivors.

VI. Genocide Survivors' Needs Before, During, and After the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi

Genocide survivors expressed having lived three lives: life before, during, and after the Genocide. As it is important to take survivors' full life histories into account when assessing their current needs, we begin with a brief examination of these three periods in their lives.

VI.1. Testimonies and Needs of Genocide Survivors before the Genocide

Many survivors viewed their lives before the Genocide as generally positive. For instance, one woman who had been a judge in the *Gacaca* courts explained:

The years before 1994 were not bad. I was born in an average family. I think we had an average income. We were not poor and my dad had the capacity to send his children to school. Then even when I got married, I didn't get married into a poor family, the life was good. My dad was working

with a company, a mining company called Somecha. It dealt in mining, and he was a chief ... A boss there. Life was good, we had cows, and we had money... (J1306371).

A male survivor similarly expressed, “My childhood was well off because I had my parents who had the cows. They had land so they were happy during childhood” (W0206349). A female survivor likewise explained:

“In my family, we were living off agriculture and from the harvest. We could even get dressed and get anything to eat and satisfy our needs from the production got from agricultural activities” (W1706214).

Indeed, many respondents shared stories of modest though happy childhoods. In these narratives, respondents often discussed community relations during their childhoods. For instance, a survivor from Gikondo noted:

I grew up when people were living in harmony. I remember here, households were a bit scattered, they were not next

to each other like now, but people were intermarrying and were interacting. You couldn't say that this cannot be my neighbor, so people were living in harmony and loved each other (J1706320).

Others similarly noted that communities lived in relative harmony, with countless interviewees discussing how they knew their neighbors and mentioning that there were not strict ethnic divisions in their childhoods. Nevertheless, as we explain in the next section, respondents also recalled experiences with discrimination, even from an early age.

Discrimination and Fear

The situation started to worsen in 1959 and continued to do so throughout the First and Second Republics. Many Tutsi went into exile, while those who remained in the country were typically denied access to public services, like education. A male judge recalled, “What I can say, division started sometime back when I was still young. Some relatives were not allowed to go to school, because they were Tutsi” (J0306351).

Even those who were able to attend school also recalled discriminatory experiences. A 70-year-old survivor from Masaka Sector expressed:

I started experiencing discrimination between Hutu and Tutsi in education when I joined school as a young girl. It was said in class to stand up and the number of the Tutsi was counted. That made pupils know that this one is a Tutsi and the other is a Hutu. We grew up amongst such discrimination. And after finishing secondary studies, it was very difficult for a Tutsi to get a good job. It was impossible; most of them used to be only teachers and nurses while those Hutu we studied with—who were not even more intelligent—were offered leadership positions, good jobs. The situation got worse from 1990 with local radio stations calling Tutsi “cockroaches” and “snakes” (J0606126).

A female survivor from Gikondo likewise shared:

During my childhood, we had no problems. We were living with harmony with people. We had no problem, but the problem come when we are at school. Teachers tell us to stand up by our ethnic groups. Only Tutsi stand up. If you conflict with your fellow student, you could be seriously abused because of your ethnic group. That hurt us (W110633).

In line with this, it is important to note that this discrimination also extended beyond the educational sector. Many survivors shared that even if they were able to attend school, it was difficult to obtain a job. Indeed, a male from Gikondo recalled:

I myself faced discrimination once I finished school. Because it was hard for a Tutsi to get a job. They were saying that Tutsi were favored before so that was the time for Hutu also to be favored (W1906220).

This discrimination in the education and employment sectors was often accompanied by fear, though participants noted a marked increase in fear around the time that the Liberation War began. As one survivor expressed:

I was often avoiding meeting with the groups in the community and my neighbors. By the time I was close to them, they kept quiet. They were hiding things from me, and so our relationship was filled with suspicion. I was fearful to join neighbors. I was lacking trust in anyone (J0206122).

Other survivors with whom we spoke similarly recalled becoming isolated in their villages and needing protection. As expressed by a man who was born in 1948 and resided in Gahanga Sector:

Even if my biological family did not give importance to ethnicity at first, due to sensitization meetings, my family members changed too. My wife and I were no longer going out to talks during the evening; we knew about the anti-Tutsi sentiment and didn't want to go to the community.

We therefore preferred isolation because the community didn't trust me anymore (W3105116).

Yet, even though tensions increased, none of the respondents expressed they thought that a genocide was about to happen and that fellow community members would be involved in the violence. A survivor in Masaka Sector stated:

I considered myself as a good citizen in that period, taking responsibility for my country. I didn't care much about ethnicity by then. I thought soldiers will fight soldiers and the community will not be involved. Even if hatred, propaganda, and sensitization against the Tutsi was intensified, personally I could not believe that genocide could happen the way it happened (J0906136).

Similarly, a survivor born in 1946 in Mwirire Sector, who was arrested and jailed in 1990 as accomplice of the RPF, shared:

Even if I was arrested and imprisoned, I confirm that, in rural areas, we were unable

to predict genocide. Genocide planners were very intelligent, hiding everything that could reveal their plan. For sure, there were no signs that could reveal to us that genocide could happen. If they existed we could have taken refuge before, as it had been in 1959. I remember the son of my younger brother who was about to get married; he came to me for advice, and I advised there is no problem with marrying a Hutu woman. If I had known there would be genocide, I would not have given this advice. I gave the advice because I didn't experience any problems between Hutu and Tutsi families (J1406153).

VI.2. Life during the Genocide

Of course, genocide did happen, forever changing the lives of these survivors. Every survivor has a unique story, and the people with whom we spoke shared numerous stories of sheer fear and despair. While this report does not focus on their testimonies, documenting their experiences is an important part of any research project. In addition, it is vital to

fully understand past experiences in order to have a complete picture of survivors' needs today.

Many respondents shared that they had lost all of their family members, essentially leaving them with nothing. A 36-year-old from Mwurire Sector expressed:

During the Genocide, it was risky staying at home; Tutsi were being killed in their homes and in the streets. So my family and I, as many other Tutsi families, were forced to run away from home and hide. I still remember how scared my parents were, but as children, my siblings and I thought the mayhem would stop soon. But that was not the case. We spent three months hiding in many different places and during this period many of my family members were murdered—including my father, my mother, my three brothers, my grandparents, my uncles, and many friends. My father was the first person to be killed, followed by my brothers. So my sister and I kept hiding without knowing whether

we were going to survive or not. I also remember hearing the people who took my father talking about how happy they were to have killed him. It was one of the worst times in my life. So we just kept praying and hiding, without knowing whether we would survive or not. However, even if we survived, we were crashed emotionally and psychologically. I was deeply wounded (J1506156).

A Genocide survivor in Gikondo likewise shared how his family members were killed, noting how the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi further compounded his prior experiences with loss:

I suffered a lot from my childhood. I was born in 1952, in Gikongoro prefecture. My father was killed in 1963 while my mother died before for illness. Despite all, I survived and pursue vocational training in Gatagara. I therefore moved in Kigali in 1968 for job purposes and worked in Gikondo sector. During the Genocide, I was in Gikondo sector. I lost almost all my family. My wife

and three children were killed. Only one child survived. I was thinking it was the end of the world. I was totally overwhelmed; I could not imagine that peace would come once again. I was hopeless; living alone, waiting for death to come (J1006101).

In Masaka, we interviewed a man who lost all his children and his wife in the Genocide. Accused of being accomplices of the RPF, ten of his children were killed by *Interahamwe* and by neighbors and the eleventh died fighting for the RPF during the Liberation War. Living alone at home, he articulated:

I witnessed the killing of my entire family as the militia attacked them viciously with their machetes. My 11 children and wife were killed and thrown in Nyabarongo River. They included my elder son who was in the last year at the University of Rwanda, and my second born who was already married. They were all killed. When the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi ended, I wanted to end my life – there was nothing

to live for. My entire family were murdered, my family destroyed. Even if I survived, my life is empty. Most of the time, when I am alone, I asked myself why I am not dead, because my life is meaningless. It is better if I would have dead with my family, because as you can see I am nothing (W30001).

For many survivors, it was understandably difficult to come to terms with such violence and destruction, especially violence that was carried out by former neighbors and friends. A survivor in Mwurire Sector explained:

During the Genocide, we decided to flee for a church thinking that people could survive when they get in the churches. After reaching that church, we had been intercepted by one nun, who was the sister of the former president. Then that nun said that she was scared because men were killed and the killers could come and kill us here. That nun sent just us away, saying, ‘Go away, I don’t want you to die here in this church.’ We went away from them. After

that, we came back home thinking that maybe we could find someone at the home. I found our house burnt. Observing killings of many Tutsi everywhere, including men, women, and children, I was overwhelmed, and became foolish. Even today, twenty-three years later, I still confused as to how I survived. I don't know what I can do to really understand why Hutu killed us. I am still confused (J1406428).

We heard many similar narratives from survivors in Masaka Sector. One survivor shared:

In 1994, people changed radically and became animals. Hutu killed us as if we were not human beings. Eighteen members of my family, including my husband, were killed during the Genocide. I survived with two children only. During the Genocide, Tutsi were hunted by neighbors they knew very well—people they used to share drinks with. I couldn't really understand what happened and made neighbors change from what they used to be (J1406152).

Yet, in the aftermath of the Genocide, these survivors were asked to come to terms with what happened via the *Gacaca* courts. Prior to turning to their opinions of the courts, however, we briefly provide an overview of the survivors’ “third life”—life after the Genocide.

VI.3. Life in the Aftermath of Genocide

Broadly, survivors with whom we spoke discussed how their lives today are much better than their lives in 1994. Taking a comparative lens against the genocide makes clear that things have improved, and it is likewise clear that Rwanda has made numerous social and economic gains over the past two decades. Nevertheless, as they discussed their lives today, survivors with whom we spoke expressed numerous needs. While we cannot review all of the needs that these individuals shared, below we summarize a few of the most pressing needs that survivors shared.

VI.3.1. Needs for Economic Security and Income-Generating Projects

In trying to obliterate the Tutsi during the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi, genocide perpetrators looted victims' homes and killed their livestock and crops. Therefore, many survivors remain forced to live in inadequate, unsafe, and overcrowded housing. As started by a survivor from Mwurire Sector:

After the Genocide, we found our house destroyed. This was common for most genocide survivors. We were therefore obliged to live together, with neighbors who also survived. In 2000, I got a house from FARG. But today, that house needs to be renovated because it is destroyed. And as you see, I am not in a position to renew it myself. And this is a common problem for many survivors in this sector. You must advocate for us so that our house can be renovated (W0206349).

Another survivor who had served as a witness in the *Gacaca* courts explained:

Life is not good because ... I can give you an example. I have no children. My wife was killed, and I never remarried again. My property was destroyed. Even if they compensated, they never managed to compensate us completely, so poverty is also a problem. Life is not good (W1306313).

In line with these examples, many people were never able to reclaim their property. Others were provided with new homes, but homes that were built for the survivors many years ago may now be in need of a repair. With difficulties in finding the means to renew their house, it was hard for them to move forward without more personal security. It is in this regard that, even today, ensuring secure housing is essential to genocide survivors' livelihoods and future.

Beyond housing, numerous survivors expressed other forms of economic vulnerability. A former judge in Gikondo explained, "I live with my daughter. She has finished university studies, but she is unemployed. You can imagine now the life we are now living. Everyone is unemployed in this

home (J1306207). Another survivor explained:

Yes, I stay with my grandchildren. They are seven. Five of them in school, but two are not school because I can't afford their school fees (J1306369).

Indeed, numerous survivors asked us for money at the end of the interviews, which we did not provide due to ethical issues. Nevertheless, even this is telling, as it illustrates the degree of need among survivors today.

Closely in line with the need for economic security is the need for income generating projects. In fact, one of the major prerequisites for post-genocide recovery is successful socio-economic development. It is also thought that economic development, through collaborative efforts, reduces ethnic conflict and increases respect for individual rights. According to Forbes (1997), people drawn into networks of cooperation and exchange become tied together by their practical economic interests. Under the influence of these new interests and engagements, they begin to see their clashing commitments in a new and clear

light. People gradually learn to see each other as individual members of a ‘family’ and to recognize their own interest in upholding a common set of basic rights for all (Forbes, 1997).

The majority of genocide survivors live in poverty. Therefore, they need to participate in income generating activities in order to enable them to become economically self-sufficient. In line with this, several survivors commented on the possible benefits of implementing more programs oriented towards helping survivors generate their own income. A 47-year-old man asserted, “If genocide survivors would gather in cooperatives, this would help them in improving their wellbeing” (J1406153). Such income generating activities may also provide spaces for mutual support and solidarity amongst genocide survivors, helping to alleviate their trauma. As Yakhyoev (2006) found, the creation of socio-economic opportunities reduces social tensions and restores interdependent relations.

Weighing these valuable arguments, this study considers socio-economic factors as a potential

complement to psychological and social dynamics. With the right support, genocide survivors can rebuild their lives, though there is a need for the foreseeable future to help those survivors who are too elderly or too isolated to help themselves.

Such suggestions were especially pronounced among survivors who served as judges in the *Gacaca* courts. For instance, a former female judge explained:

I remember after *Gacaca* people were laughing at us because we were backsliding economically. They were saying that we spent too much of our time working with *Gacaca* and we have gone home with nothing. Maybe it's like a question you as people who work in CNLG who know what we did, the number of years that we spent working in *Gacaca*. I know it's always difficult for people without help from the government (J1306371).

Another survivor who served as a judge suggested:

There are some judges who were honest but who have no job today. I don't know whether it would be possible to help them. Maybe to teach them roles, so as in the future they can serve as advisors of the population. If it's also possible to create a cooperative, that would improve their lives (J1306206).

In line with this, a former judge from Mwurire asked if the government could help “form a cooperative for them as the panelists, as the judges of the *Gacaca*” (J140654). We return to the specific theme of further compensating judges later in this report, though it is clear that such income-generating projects would serve all survivors.

VI.3.2. Need for Restitution of Property Destroyed During the Genocide

Also connected to economic insecurity is the fact that many interviewees expressed frustration about the lack of support from local leaders in the implementation of *Gacaca* verdicts regarding their property destroyed during the Genocide. Some of

them even expressed a belief that local leaders are accomplices of perpetrators. For instance, many participants claimed that executive secretaries of cells protect perpetrators, who are supposed to pay for destroyed property, or are reluctant to help survivors enforce *Gacaca* verdicts. As a research participant in Mwurire expressed:

Our house was completely destroyed during the Genocide after the murder of my husband and my four children. Yes, the one who killed them pleaded guilty and asked for forgiveness, and I forgave him. But, he must reimburse us for what he damaged, as per *Gacaca* court decisions. But, four years after the closing of *Gacaca* courts, nothing has been done. Our local leaders are not interested in the enforcement of *Gacaca* decisions. We always run to them but in vain. I don't know what we have to do? We really need CNLG support (W3105116).

Unfortunately, the theme of unpaid restitution for Category 3 crimes tried in *Gacaca* courts was an incredibly common theme in our interviews.

A survivor in Gikondo simply stated, “The government never followed up” (J1406316). Another survivor and former judge from Mwirire noted, “It’s [the government] not doing anything. We don’t know why.” Accordingly, a survivor who served as a judge likewise explained, “The problem I have is about that case whereby we are supposed to be compensated but we were not. I think you can help us in that. Another thing is about our cows which we were not compensated for. We were not compensated” (J1306369).

In line with this quotes, many survivors suggested that the government should enforce the payment of restitution for property. Another survivor and former judge from Gikondo noted:

What I think, top officials should intervene. I understand *Gacaca* did its job, but now it’s a job of the government to implement the decisions. I know the decisions are in hand of executive secretaries, but I think they are not doing anything. Top government officials should intervene and make sure that they are properly resolved (J1706320).

Notably, even individuals who were not survivors discussed the lack of restitution of property. For instance, someone who served as a defendant explained:

Compensation delayed because maybe enforcement was very weak. Someone would be charging to compensate like fifty thousand. Tomorrow he brings five thousand, the other day he brings one thousand, the other day five thousand. The people who needed to be compensated needed that money. Some of them don't have houses...There actually has not been enforcement on compensation to make sure that those who lost their property be given what they deserved (D0806361).

Thus, in general, genocide survivors who had Category 3 cases tried at *Gacaca* expressed frustration in regards to the lack of enforcement of *Gacaca* decisions. According to them, *Gacaca* courts' rulings often did not help survivors because they have not been executed—an important finding that should be kept in mind going forward.

VI.3.3. Need for Recovery and Burial of Relatives' Bodies

During the *Gacaca* courts, killers disclosed where some bodies of many genocide victims were. During our conversations, it was clear that many survivors saw this as a strength of *Gacaca*. For instance, a survivor explained:

Through that information I managed to learn how they were killed, where they were buried. We tried to bury them to pay our respects and bury them in memorial site. In fact, *Gacaca* tried to help us know the truth (W1706321).

Another shared:

Because I was not inside the country, I could not know how and why and when my family was killed, but because I attended *Gacaca* activities in my homeland, I came to know who killed them (J1406429).

Nevertheless, there still genocide victims that were never given a formal burial. As a survivor expressed:

Gacaca courts helped to know how and where our families were killed and thrown. I learned that my husband and my children were killed but don't know how and where they are for their formal burial. Twenty-three years later, I still have that problem, and I don't know how I will find them for adequate burial (J1406152).

Similarly, a survivor in Gikondo shared that some of their relatives' bodies had not been found. She recalled the role of neighbors in genocidal killings:

I remember my husband was killed together with another person called Ali. They were killed by a person called Haguma. They were then thrown in a big hole, but up to today I failed to even trace their bodies. I was told that he was thrown in a hole near a home of a person called Karengera. Up to now, I have never found their bodies. Up to today I don't know where he is (W110633).

Many bodies of victims of genocide still remain undiscovered in ditches, latrines, bushes and unmarked mass graves. And genocide survivors do

not even have hope that eventually they will be able to burial in dignity all the victims of the genocide. Most of the interviewed research participants expressed that:

What genocide survivors want most is to find the bodies of our loved ones and to rebury them with dignity. It is in this regard that sensitizing the population to tell the truth of the death of genocide victims for their burial in memorial sites will heal the wounds of genocide survivors, who are still waiting, 23 years later (J0606126).

Thus, while many individuals have been able to bury their families, many others are still waiting—another prominent need of genocide survivors today.

VI.3.4. Need for Education

Drawing on ethnographic research, interviews, and focus groups conducted with Rwandan youth from several urban and rural sites between 2006 and 2009, sociologist Kirilly Pells found that:

Education was associated with being able to get a job and so provide for themselves and their families. Inability to attend or to succeed in school creates a sense of despair for the future (Pells, 2011: 599).

For genocide survivors, education is their only hope for the future. Sometimes the difficulties are insurmountable. But, securing their access to education will aid in overcoming crippling economic problems, fear, and loneliness. Indeed, education provides survivors with the confidence and the skills to ultimately become independent.

During our fieldwork, we heard many narratives where genocide survivors acknowledge the role of their current educational support but simultaneously reveal the need for further support:

We know that our government has done a lot to support the education of our children. Most of them have finished secondary and university studies. But, for those who did not score well enough in secondary studies to go in university, they can't get a job with secondary studies only. They are not

living in good conditions, as they don't have a job. For their bright future, why can't our government support our children (J0906136).

Education plays a very important role in restoring hope among genocide survivors. A significant number of the generation of younger genocide survivors has received educational support from AERG and GAERG. One sign of hope for a bright future is that they are now providing support to more vulnerable survivors – both the young and old. However, there are many other genocide survivors who remain in dire need of support for voluntary training and university studies.

Many survivors see education as their only hope for a brighter and more productive future and the best chance to give meaning and order to their lives. For them, attending school invariably means overcoming crippling economic problems, disability, or ill health and combating haunting memories, prejudice, and loneliness.

VI.3.5. Need for Healthcare

Finally, many survivors endure many health challenges, resulting from injuries incurred as a result of the Genocide. They may also suffer from chronic diseases, disabilities, and mental health issues, all of which necessitate support. While we further address mental health below, it is important to note that numerous survivors shared health concerns during the interviews. As expressed by survivor in Gikondo Sector:

Even if we survived, our health was seriously damaged. We have been tortured a lot. We are now facing chronic headaches and trauma. Yes, we get treatment at a health center. But, do you think it is easy to get transferred to a district hospital? It is not easy. And as we don't have money for treatment at private hospitals, it becomes difficult most of the time to ensure our health. Yes, our government has done a lot, but we need more support, like money or advocacy for easy access to district hospitals without wasting time with a health center transfer (J0610175).

Many others shared similar sentiments, often discussing the intersection of physical health and trauma. For instance, a survivor who served as a judge noted the lasting effects, explaining “Always during the night I think about people who were killed. I think about that during the nighttime. I even wanted to cry when we were starting this conversation” (J1906326).

The most vulnerable genocide survivors are eligible to receive medical insurance “*Mutuelle de santé*” at no cost through the Government of Rwanda Assistance Fund for Survivors (FARG), allowing them to access primary healthcare through public clinics. However, even with insurance, many survivors find it difficult to cover the unavoidable costs of medicine, food, hygienic products, and transportation to and from clinics and hospitals. Patients are required to pay 10 percent of the cost of prescription drugs, which is beyond the financial means of many survivors.

Taken together, it is clear that the survivors with whom we spoke have many lasting needs. Chief among these are economic security and income generating projects, restitution of property, burial and recovery of relatives’ bodies, education, and healthcare.

VII. Genocide Survivors' Opinions of Gacaca

The survivors with whom we spoke generally viewed *Gacaca* in a positive light. Many suggested, for instance, that the courts encouraged truth and forgiveness, and most also stated that the courts facilitated unity and reconciliation in Rwanda.

Yet, *Gacaca* proceedings also introduced a number of problems. Those who testified went through the psychological stress of reliving atrocities they witnessed. In addition, after making public statements, survivors consequently feared for their safety. Some participants revealed that they have faced physical and verbal harassment after testifying during *Gacaca* trials. Below, we summarize these opinions and effects—starting with all survivors and then focusing solely on judges.

VII.1. Encouraging Truth and Forgiveness

Many survivors explained that truth was a central outcome of the *Gacaca* court process. A genocide survivor whose parents and two brothers were killed during the Genocide against the Tutsi expressed: “Discovery of the genocide truth was

important since we (victims) wanted to hear about the killings of our relatives and where they have been thrown” (W1006102). As noted above, many other survivors shared that the uncovering of truth, especially on the basis of guilty pleas, contributed to relief, as it allowed them to know the places where the bodies of their relatives had been thrown and to bury them with dignity. In an interview with a genocide survivor in *Masaka* Sector and whose wife and children were killed and thrown in Nyabarongo River, he shared:

During the *Gacaca* courts, I gave more testimonies on everything I witnessed during the Genocide and those who killed my family have confessed and pleaded guilty. What I can say is that, in general, the work done through the *Gacaca* courts had an impact on our everyday life. Most importantly, during the information gathering stage and during the *Gacaca* trials, we were able to locate bodies of our family members, friends, and neighbors that were killed during the Genocide, to give them a decent burial (WS_30002: WITNESS).

According to Clark, the truth-telling of victims would establish a narrative of their experiences and offer them a sense of empowerment, as community members acknowledge the victim's suffering (Clark, 2008: 316). Many other survivors discussed how the truth-seeking element of *Gacaca* encouraged the rebuilding of social relationships as well. For instance, a survivor from Gikondo shared, “*Gacaca* have brought in truth and even has united the people...there is no suspicion amongst them” (J1006202).

Others who were not survivors likewise emphasized the role of truth. For instance, a judge who was interviewed in 2016 explained:

Gacaca helped in unity and reconciliation, because during the Genocide, people were separated, but *Gacaca* made people tell the truth, after the *Gacaca* hearings, people came to reconcile to the extent that, today, they can participate and share; when someone has a wedding celebration, the Tutsi and Hutu participate, they can even marry each other. This is because of teaching and the activities of *Gacaca* court (J020646).

As these Rwandans suggest, truth telling during the *Gacaca* trials contributed to rebuilding the social bonds that had been destroyed. Genocide survivors expressed that the willingness of perpetrators to reveal their role in killings, acknowledge their responsibility, and express regret encouraged them to offer forgiveness. One survivor shared:

He [a genocide perpetrator] acknowledged what he did with more regrets, and I felt in my heart that I deserve to offer him forgiveness. Today, genocide perpetrators and victims of the Genocide live together, side by side and peacefully. I think Rwanda is, today, the only country where the victims of such hideous crimes live side by side with their perpetrators (W1106104).

Another survivor whose husband was killed during the Genocide expressed:

During the *Gacaca* court trials, genocide perpetrators were encouraged to seek forgiveness from the victim's family, and those who confessed and pleaded guilty were given shorter sentences in exchange

for confessing. This was a remarkable positive effect of *Gacaca* courts on genocide perpetrators and their family. This re-established relationships between genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors and also reinforced unity and reconciliation. In addition, *Gacaca* courts were of paramount importance, as they allowed genocide survivors to get the truth of what happened and finally discover how their loved ones were killed and where their bodies had been disposed of for a decent burial (J0206123).

For many, *Gacaca* was also vital because it brought about forgiveness. Put simply, a survivor explained:

Trying to summarize what *Gacaca* has achieved, I can say that *Gacaca* brought unity and peace among the Rwandans. Peace and unity are considered the reason for the act of asking for forgiveness and even forgiving (W0306410).

Another individual shared:

Because of Gacaca now we live in reconciliation and harmony among the neighbors, except those who have the bad mindsets. People are coming when they have committed crimes against someone and come and confess in front of you, you may forgive him (J1006201).

A former judge and survivor from Gikondo likewise explained:

You can see where Rwanda is now, Gacaca played a big role. It was the foundation stone for rebuilding Rwanda. *Gacaca* played a big role because it was the Rwandans, even for those who never confessed, we forgave them. We forgave many people. We are living together because of *Gacaca*, so *Gacaca* played a big role in reconciliation (J110634).

In line with this, a former judge from Gahanga expressed:

Gacaca has done great things because it made it possible for the perpetrator to approach the survivor and try to ask for forgiveness. Also those who were innocent and jailed are now happy today because they are not in jail. That is because of *Gacaca*. And those who finished their punishment also came back into the society, and the society tried to integrate them (J2106226).

However, as Richters et al. (2005: 214) wrote, many survivors believed apologies to be dishonest. This raises the question whether the apologies made during the trials were indeed honest—in the sense of being offered in a genuine spirit of remorse—or if they were merely made in order to receive a lighter sentence. Penal Reform International (2010: 50) quoted a genocide survivor’s argument:

“They are afraid of living out their lives in prison if they don’t ask for forgiveness. [...]. Once they’ve asked for forgiveness in front of the *Gacaca*, they think it’s all over.”

Of course, the degree to which apologies and truth-telling is difficult to assess, and was not examined

in this study. Nevertheless, for some, questions regarding the sincerity of truth-telling endeavors or apologies likely affected the potential benefits that could come from such processes, though most participants did not openly question the sincerity of *Gacaca* court participants and instead discussed the benefits of truth-telling.

VII.2. Perceived Problems with *Gacaca* Courts

Despite the importance of the *Gacaca* jurisdictions in post-genocide Rwanda, survivors shared that *Gacaca* proceedings introduced a number of problems. Some survivors experienced deep psychological suffering when testifying at the hearings. Those who testified first went through the psychological stress of narrating the atrocities they personally suffered or witnessed during the Genocide. After making public statements, genocide survivors consequently feared for their safety within their respective communities. This fear is logical, as some participants revealed that they faced physical and verbal harassment after testifying during *Gacaca* hearings.

In line with this, many respondents believed that the *Gacaca* courts sometimes had a negative psychological impact on survivors. As a research participant shared:

It was very difficult for her to hear how our family members were killed during the genocide. One day, when I was in *Gacaca* court, one of the genocide perpetrators who killed my husband told everything, how they killed my husband and my children. I felt very bad, very disturbed. I felt as if it was 1994. I saw *Interahamwe*, the clubs, the machetes, etcetera. I thought they would come to kill me again. I could not hear, because I fainted and fell on the ground (W30015).

When genocide survivors gave testimonies themselves, they could also become upset. A genocide survivor we met in Gahanga Sector expressed:

I gave more testimonies during *Gacaca* courts. But, when you gave a testimony surrounded by people who have killed your

family ... you feel ill; you feel insane.... It was very hard to share what happened and sometime you become overwhelmed and lose conscience (J0206120).

Judges who were survivors also shared that they faced many difficulties hearing the stories. For instance, a former judge explained,

Sometimes I feared to do anything after serving as after getting home [from *Gacaca*] because sometimes I feel as if I'm not mentally comfortable because of what I went through. When I got home, it was time to think about what I was in and serving, through my ears. That was like trauma, but after getting training in trauma, I became able to manage the pressure. When it comes back within my heart and my head, I try to calm myself (J1406428).

Additionally, many genocide survivors received threats of violence, were falsely accused of genocide-related crimes, and saw their property vandalized before or after they presented their narrative of events in the *Gacaca* proceedings. By

testifying in the proceedings against the alleged perpetrators, survivors were exposed to a high risk of being targeted for intimidation, physical harm, insults, verbal attacks, damage to their homes or property, harassment, or even murder. As Bizimana (2012: 57) noted, some of the perpetrators of these crimes want to retaliate against the witnesses who revealed their crimes and to intimidate future witnesses. In a number of cases, those suspected of such crimes were arrested, tried, and convicted. In the first half of 2006, 761 people were arrested for criminal acts they had committed against survivors, witnesses, and judges (NSGC, *Quarterly Report of Activities: January – June 2006*: 3).

Several respondents referenced these issues and discussed the fear and continued trauma that they caused, illustrating that the *Gacaca* courts were not free from problems. Despite these issues, however, respondents remained positive about the social benefits of the courts. A genocide survivor in Mwurire sector of Rwamagana District summed up the most common sentiment by explaining:

I never wanted to meet Hutu after the Genocide, but I changed slowly because I saw that a parent would testify against their son. This showed me that *Gacaca* was trying to reconcile Rwandans. Imagine testifying against your son, proving that your son participated in the genocide. This stopped suspicion among Rwandans. It was one of the approaches that helped in building unity and reconciliation in Rwanda after the Genocide (J1406152).

Taken together, it is clear that the *Gacaca* courts established after the Genocide were not free from problems. But, considering the circumstances in Rwanda, no other viable option was available. In this forum, genocide survivors shared their narratives of the atrocities, and they were often able to hear what happened to their deceased relatives. However, they believe that the truth-telling process led to psychological problems. Moreover, genocide survivors and witnesses were often intimidated and feared for their security.

More broadly, survivors noted that the courts addressed several issues, and without this approach,

the large numbers of suspects could not have been dealt with. The *Gacaca* courts have also empowered victims by providing them a space to share their narratives. Further, victims had the power to grant forgiveness that, in turn, increased the likelihood of recognition of the perpetrators by their societies.

VIII. Perceived Effects of *Gacaca* on Genocide Survivors who Served as Judges

VIII.1. Becoming a Judge

None of the judges with whom we spoke had a legal background or a formal legal education. Instead, they were laypeople who were elected to preside over trials for genocide. As such, many vividly remembered their election. For instance, a female judge from Gikondo recounted how her community had gathered when government officials asked for *Inyangamugayo* nominations. She recalled, “Somebody proposed my name . . . I had to go in front. I was even very nervous” (J2206332).

Following nominations, community members discussed the merits of the nominees and elected *Inyangamugayo* through popular vote. Like the woman quoted above, many of the respondents expressed their surprise at their nomination and subsequent election, suggesting that their neighbors must have seen them as trustworthy. For instance, a male judge from Gikondo explained, “I thought people had selected me as a person of integrity.

They trusted me . . .” (J100631). Another former *Inyangamugayo* similarly told us that, “... maybe people trusted me. They thought I would help,” later reminding us that *Inyangamugayo* translates directly as “person of great integrity.”

Hesitation and apprehension also raced through the newly elected judges’ minds. Some were concerned about the responsibilities associated with their position. An elderly woman from Gikondo shared, “For the first time, I was reluctant . . . I just wanted to sit there, be a witness, be a spectator. But I never wanted to be a judge” (J1706320). Others worried that serving as an *Inyangamugayo* would be dangerous. Only seven years had passed since the Genocide, and many of the judges had barely managed to escape the violence. The woman quoted above later explained, for instance, that she “wanted to resist at first” because she thought that members of the *Interahamwe* could kill her during a trial. A seventy-year-old former judge similarly stated that, upon his election, “I wasn’t too happy . . . because of the history; even those that you were going to sentence could kill you” (J120639).

Despite this pervasive apprehension, the respondents accepted their new positions, viewing their service as a patriotic duty to Rwanda. As such, many shared that they agreed to participate because Rwanda needed them. A woman from Gikondo explained, “I became very optimistic that I was going to contribute to my country” (J100632). Others similarly noted, “I had a job to do for Rwanda.” This job began quickly, as the newly elected *Inyangamugayo* underwent training just a few weeks later. At the training sessions, respondents learned about the laws governing the courts and how they needed to, in one judge’s words, “avoid being emotional” and “be fair to everybody.” Soon, information gathering and pilot trials began. The *Inyangamugayo* had essentially become judges overnight.

As such, relatively poor men and women slowly overcame their initial apprehension in judging “big men” of wealth and power in the community. As one former *Inyangamugayo* put it, “We came to realize that *we* were the judges.” For some, this meant studying the laws and striving to remain a person of integrity. For others, it involved contemplating

how their peers viewed them. Indeed, when asked how being elected as *Inyangamugayo* influenced what others thought of them, many responded that their community members saw them as trustworthy, capable people—a perception they hoped to maintain. Likewise, several proudly showed us certificates they had received for their service. For instance, one woman retrieved her certificate from a small chest, explaining that the certificate “showed that she was a person of integrity” (Fieldnotes, June 2015). Another interviewee handed us a copy of his certificate, illustrating that official affirmation of the position was important to taking on the role of a judge.

Thus, although originally surprised and apprehensive, each of the respondents gradually accepted their new position and took on the associated role. This involved formal training and validation, as well as introspection and ongoing assessments of how others viewed them—processes that continued as the *Inyangamugayo* began their duties.

VIII.2. **Doing Justice, Unifying Rwandans**

While these judges were grappling with their new role, they were also grappling with its associated duties. Some recalled eagerness to undertake these new tasks, though others expressed initial skepticism about the *Gacaca* court system. Early on, a female judge from Gikondo explained, “I couldn’t see any importance in *Gacaca*” (J100632). A former male judge from Gikondo likewise told us, “We never thought it could achieve anything” (J1306312). Many other *Inyangamugayo* initially doubted whether thousands of courts run by community members could bring any positive change in the aftermath of a devastating genocide.

Over time, however, each of these participants came to view the *Gacaca* court system—and their role within it—as necessary and important, joining others who had expressed initial support. A female *Inyangamugayo* exemplified this when she explained, “As time went on, I kept on doing it, and thinking that it was the right thing to be done.” All of the *Inyangamugayo* similarly shared that, after presiding over trials, they saw the potential of

Gacaca to bring fractured communities together. In fact, when asked about the duties that accompanied their position, many named reconciling and rebuilding Rwanda as their primary jobs. A female judge from Gikondo explained:

The mission was reconciliation. I was supposed to play a big role in reconciliation. Listen to those who had committed crimes, help to integrate them into the community, and even listen to other parties of the victims. That was the major role and the major duty as a person involved in *Gacaca* (J110634).

Another female judge likewise felt that her primary duty as a judge was to “rebuild Rwanda,” illustrating the seriousness with which she approached her job and echoing the comments of others who came to view the duties of the *Inyangamugayo* as paramount to successfully rebuilding their country.

The *Inyangamugayo* sought to accomplish these goals through weekly tasks which included gathering, organizing, and assessing information; requesting the presence of the accused; finding witnesses; meeting with other judges; presiding

over weekly trials; and keeping trial records, among many others. Although initially hesitant, respondents shared that they soon became comfortable with their duties and that, when things became difficult, they reminded themselves of the importance of the task at hand.

Although not within their official duties as outlined in the Organic Laws, several participants felt responsible for convincing others of the value of *Gacaca*. That is, as they became more involved with the *Gacaca* court system, they also became its ambassadors. A woman judge explained, for instance, that many survivors disliked the short prison sentences that would bring perpetrators of genocide back into their communities within the next decade or two. Likewise, accused perpetrators were often hesitant to discuss their crimes with the community, which, in her view, was necessary for reconciliation. This participant thus felt that it was her duty as a judge to teach both survivors and perpetrators about the merits of reconciliation, explaining, “So, we taught those who committed genocide and those who were victims.”

Inyangamugayo meted out punishments ranging from restitution to prison sentences. They were tasked with exonerating the wrongfully accused, holding individual perpetrators accountable, and providing a general deterrent that could prevent future atrocities. A former *Inyangamugayo* from Gikondo, for instance, saw the *Gacaca* courts as a needed corrective after previous massacres and atrocities had met with impunity:

In Rwandan history, 1994 wasn't the first time people were killed. It had happened in 1959, 1964, 1970^s. People were killed and, surprisingly enough, there was impunity during all those years. It was a good lesson to teach people that impunity shouldn't prevail in the community. So if you kill, you will be punished. It was a good strategy to stop killing (J100631).

Another former *Inyangamugayo* similarly suggested that “even the younger generation should learn ... it was necessary to punish” (J2206332). Many others how restorative sanctions could partially compensate victims and survivors for

what they had lost, noting that while they could not bring back the dead, restitution through *Gacaca* could help to make things right.

In distinguishing *Gacaca* courts from Western-style tribunals, many respondents stressed the active participation of the community. As a seventy-year-old former *Inyangamugayo* explained, “People were judged by other community members who had information—by people who knew them—which is different from taking them to other courts” (J120639). All community members were expected to attend the *Gacaca* court trials, and they were encouraged to participate as much as possible. This meant that trials typically involved conversations about the past, and many *Inyangamugayo* believed that these conversations were key to reconciliation in Rwanda.

To be clear, while the *Inyangamugayo* came to view their duties in a positive light and champion the *Gacaca* court system, almost every person with whom we spoke offered critical comments. One participant, for instance, recalled the difficulties his court faced when its vice president was accused

of killing a community member's husband during the Genocide, noting, "Of course we had to stop that man from...trying cases." Another participant highlighted the problem of corruption in *Gacaca*, suggesting that the poverty of many *Inyangamugayo* made them vulnerable to bribery. Similarly, a male judge characterized *Gacaca* as "ninety percent fair" and fair for "ordinary people," but told us that wealthy and famous persons could sometimes escape punishment. Several judges referenced such corruption—though not in their own courts. When asked how the courts could be improved, another former judge explained,

Some cases were not judged on time. And another thing is about compensation for the loss in the Genocide. Many people were not compensated on time and even [up to] now some are not yet compensated. (J1306369).

Many respondents shared these sentiments, suggesting that some of these problems—such as the lack of compensation for victims whose belongings were stolen—continue today.

Despite their initial misgivings and these enduring flaws, however, the respondents each viewed their duties as *Inyangamugayo* as necessary for their country. For many, *Gacaca* was—as one participant put it—“a foundation stone on which Rwanda was built,” and their work was integral to laying this foundation. Others offered more personal reflections on their time in *Gacaca*, such as another participant, who said that “my entire burden has been lifted” (J2206229) when he completed his work as *Inyangamugayo*.

VIII.3. The Unintended Burden of Community Justice

Most participants stopped serving as *Inyangamugayo* approximately three years prior to our interviews, as the *Gacaca* courts closed in June 2012. Looking back, they typically saw their work as integral to rebuilding the country. Nevertheless, their subsequent experiences diverged greatly from one another.

For some, these outcomes were positive. For example, a former *Inyangamugayo* explained that,

“It’s like I’m respected...People ask me many things now” (J1706319). Several respondents are likewise now mediators or leaders within their communities, and they attribute their new positions to their role within the *Gacaca* court system. In fact, many shared that they are now mediators because of their role in the *Gacaca* court system. Others felt that they had become a person of integrity through the process of serving as an *Inyangamugayo*. A former judge from Masaka, for example, described how she decided to adopt orphans because, “that is what a person of integrity would do,” crediting the *Gacaca* courts for helping her realize that she was indeed a person of integrity (J2106329). In line with this, others shared that they continually try to live up to how they believed their neighbors viewed them. One former judge explained, “I am always careful. I don’t want to lose my integrity” (J2206332). In this way, they are still *Inyangamugayo* despite the fact that they are no longer presiding over trials.

In addition to these generally positive stories, we also heard how the *Inyangamugayo* bore the weight of community justice during and after the

trials. Discussing the amount of time that it took to serve as a judge, many explained that weekly trials and meetings with their fellow judges took their toll, especially since they were not compensated. One participant lamented, “They could summon us anytime they wanted. Even when it was not scheduled...and without even a compensation” (J1406316). Some *Inyangamugayo* likewise explained that they felt their careers or time with their family suffered. After devoting so much time to unpaid work, for example, some of the participants are now unemployed and only have intermittent employment doing landscaping or construction work.

As such, several respondents felt underappreciated. While they had volunteered their time, they explained that they were also promised financial assistance following the courts closure. For most, this assistance never came. After discussing his fear about being evicted, for instance, one former *Inyangamugayo* explained, “I thought that after *Gacaca* courts, the government would intervene and help survivors and even judges. But nothing was done” (J1306314). Other *Inyangamugayo*

explained that the government had promised to help form cooperatives of former *Inyangamugayo* but that too few such cooperatives had been created.

Many participants expected to dedicate their time to the courts and did not feel unduly burdened, reminding us that they had committed to this volunteer position and had been honored to serve. Most did not, however, anticipate the negative reactions they received—and continued to receive—from their neighbors. Many *Inyangamugayo* shared that their friends or neighbors held grudges against them due to their decisions while on the bench. As one former *Inyangamugayo* explained, “Imagine judging or trying your neighbor. You could create many enemies” (J1706320), later stating that had contemplating moving because her neighbors held her responsible for putting their family members in prison. A former *Inyangamugayo* explained:

As a judge, I’m experiencing a grudge from two sides. One is from the family of the perpetrator who took us as refusing to help. On the other side, there are victims who are keeping grudges saying that you have

caused the perpetrator to be given an unfair trial (J1406210).

Another judge was fearful about the grudges held by her neighbors and her own family's well-being. She explained:

There can be conflicts among neighbors, but the root of the conflict is because of my contribution in the court, I have never been comfortable. I even decided to send my child [away] ... trying to avoid the child being poisoned. [The child] has no security because the family that has kept a grudge against me is searching for where my child studies. It's a big problem because I cannot relocate and that family can't move from here because it has a business here near my home (J1706319).

Many judges expressed similar sentiment. For instance, one participant explained how he received warnings when perpetrators were released from prison.

Some keep a grudge against us and their families, because you have been truthful. We always think of being hurt, of being victimized, by the families who were accusing us of doing wrong things against their families. So you always get ahead news from prison, from those who are not satisfied by what the court has done, thinking that the judges were not fair ... if they get the opportunity, we (judges) can be killed for sure. (J1306206).

As these stories suggest, such grudges undermined the personal security of the *Inyangamugayo*. One participant explained, “It was very difficult to try a neighbor’s case. That neighbor could do something bad to you or even kill you” (J1306312). Indeed, several respondents told us of death threats. A court secretary explained, for instance, that she needed a police escort when she left court. Another woman judge told us about a threat she received from a man who called her and said, “I was told you are among the judges who decided that my house be... used to compensate for the victims of genocide... and if you don’t stop that, I will come and attack you” (J110634).

Thus, while these positions certainly opened doors for many judges who spoke with us, they also took (and are continuing to take) a significant personal toll. In particular, many spoke of the grudges held by the individuals and family members of those they tried. Unlike judges many other parts of the world, the *Inyangamugayo* continued to live and work in extremely close proximity to those they sentenced – and almost every one of those neighbors had been deeply touched by the genocide, the justice system response, and the specific work they had done as judges. This fact and their often marginal social and economic circumstances placed the *Inyangamugayo* in an especially vulnerable position. Their great commitment to *Gacaca* and courage in navigating these tensions is testament to the wisdom of their fellow citizens in electing them judges – and, perhaps, to the viability of *Gacaca*-like justice systems to respond to other mass atrocities.

IX. Psychosocial Wellbeing of Genocide Survivors

Research conducted in post-conflict societies indicates that war and violence cause serious psychological damage to individuals and social damage to their communities (Métraux, 2004), leading to the continued deterioration of the mental health of individuals and communities (Pupavac, 2004) when such issues are not carefully assessed and addressed.

It is well known that witnessing of mass violence, experiencing sexual assault, and losing personal property have a devastating impact on the physical, psychological, and social well-being of individuals and communities (Lumsden, 1997; Pedersen, 2002). Violence erodes peoples' sense of identity and belonging (Leaning, Arie, Holleufer, and Bruderlein, 2003). Life in places where mass violence occurred can often involve feelings of fear, anger, and deep sadness (Honwana, 1997). Being trapped in cycles of structural and physical violence can also generate renewed resentment, fear, complex forms of maladaptive relationships,

and aggression (Hatzfeld, 2005; Leaning et al., 2003).

In post-genocide Rwanda, both the nature and the magnitude of the survivors' exposure to killings and violence place them at increased risk for developing long-term psychological problems. According to Karunakara et al. (2004), survivors are often vulnerable to post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). PTSD is classified as an anxiety disorder and usually develops as a result of a terribly frightening, life-threatening, or otherwise highly alarming experience. Recognized as a formal diagnosis since 1980, people suffering from PTSD re-experience the traumatic event or events in some way, tend to avoid places, people, or other things that remind them of the event (avoidance), and are exquisitely sensitive to normal life experiences (hyperarousal).

Some scholars and practitioners suggest that the *Gacaca* courts may have aided such trauma. Indeed, research we cite above notes that truth-telling may have a healing dimension. While it is virtually impossible to disentangle the precise effect that

participation in *Gacaca* had on survivors' well-being, focusing on survivors who participated in *Gacaca* allows us to examine the psychosocial wellbeing of survivors who research would suggest may have comparatively better levels of psycho-social wellbeing than survivors who did not participate in the *Gacaca* court trials.

To assess psychosocial wellbeing, we relied upon the Self-Reporting Questionnaire (SRQ-20), an instrument that was created by the World Health Organization to assess wellbeing (Beusenberg and Orley, 1994). It consists of 20 short yes/no questions. Scholte and colleagues (2011) psychometrically validated the use of the SRQ-20 in Rwanda through their study of the effectiveness of psychosocial therapy on mental health improvement, including conducting confirmatory factor analyses. While their study demonstrated that the SRQ-20 is an appropriate screener to detect mental health disorders (Scholte et al., 2011: 7), they note that Rwandan men and women have different cut-off scores (8 for men, 10 for women). Put another way, a score at 8 or above suggests that a man is psychologically distressed, while a score of 10 or

above suggests that a woman is psychologically distressed. Notably, this psychological distress is manifested as common mental health disorders (CMD), which is what the scale is trying to assess.

The 20 questions are as follows:

1. Do you often have headaches?
2. Is your appetite poor?
3. Do you sleep badly?
4. Are you easily frightened?
5. Do your hands shake?
6. Do you feel nervous, tense, or worried?
7. Is your digestion poor?
8. Do you have trouble thinking clearly?
9. Do you feel unhappy?
10. Do you cry more than usual?
11. Do you find it difficult to enjoy your daily activities?
12. Do you find it difficult to make decisions?
13. Is your daily work suffering?
14. Are you unable to play a useful part in life?
15. Have you lost interest in things?
16. Do you feel you are a worthless person?

17.Has the thought of ending your life been on your mind?

18.Do you feel tired all the time?

19.Do you have uncomfortable feelings in your stomach?

20.Are you easily tired?

The following two tables include the descriptive analysis for the SRSQ-20 items for the 96 individuals we interviewed.

Table 1: SRQ-20 Responses for the 96 Survivors

Items		Survivors' responses (N=96)		
		Total number of "Yes" answers	Total number of "Some-times" answers	Total number of "No" answers
1	Headaches?	60	0	36
2	Poor appetite?	44	6	46
3	Sleep badly?	47	3	46
4	Easily frightened?	52	1	43
5	Hands shake?	21	3	72
6	Nervous, tense, worried?	57	2	37

7	Poor digestion?	47	3	46
8	Trouble thinking?	47	1	48
9	Unhappy?	49	2	45
10	Cry more than usual?	24	0	72
11	Difficult to enjoy daily activities?	35	0	61
12	Difficult to make decisions?	42	1	53
13	Daily work suffering?	56	3	37
14	Unable to play useful part in life?	40	1	55
15	Lost interest in things?	44	1	51
16	Feel like worthless person?	12	2	82
17	Thought of ending life?	12	0	84
18	Tired all of the time?	43	2	51
19	Uncomfortable feelings in stomach?	57	2	37
20	Easily tired?	55	1	40

Table 2: SRQ 20 Scores by Participant (N=96)

Interview ID		Position	Gender	Age	SRQ - 20 Scores
1	J1706212	Judge	Female	37	14
2	J0610176	Judge	Female	63	12.5
3	J1006201	Judge	Female	50	12
4	J100632	Judge	Female	60	11
5	J0906136	Judge	Female	69	8
6	J1406152	Judge	Female	57	15
7	J020647	Judge	Female	54	18
8	J1306427	Judge	Female	56	6
9	J1406428	Judge	Female	56	10
10	J0106118	Judge	Female	53	9
11	J0206350	Judge	Female	50	10
12	J2006223	Judge	Female	53	10
13	J110634	Judge	Female	72	7.5
14	J1306208	Judge	Female	60	17
15	J010644	Judge	Female	39	15
16	J1706213	Judge	Female	50	6.5
17	J0106117	Judge	Female	39	13
18	J1706320	Judge	Female	46	14
19	J0906138	Judge	Female	42	14
20	J1906222	Judge	Female	62	2
21	J2206332	Judge	Female	56	5
22	J1606378	Judge	Female	46	17
23	J1206310	Judge	Female	34	17
24	J0206120	Judge	Female	39	13

Testimonies and Needs of Genocide Survivors

25	J0206123	Judge	Female	48	3
26	J140653	Judge	Female	38	12
27	J2106226	Judge	Female	64	7
28	J1306371	Judge	Female	56	17
29	J0606126	Judge	Female	69	1
30	J0206122	Judge	Female	39	16
31	J1306207	Judge	Female	59	13.5
32	J1306311	Judge	Female	47	5
33	J1306314	Judge	Male	64	7.5
34	J1706516	Judge	Male	42	0
35	J1306148	Judge	Male	49	2
36	J1706380	Judge	Male	66	8
37	J1506156	Judge	Male	37	10
38	J0306351	Judge	Male	54	10
39	W3105116	Judge	Male	68	1
40	J130651	Judge	Male	54	1
41	J3105114	Judge	Male	53	7
42	J1306147	Judge	Male	61	5
43	J1306312	Judge	Male	61	9
44	J1406151	Judge	Male	37	2
45	J1406153	Judge	Male	70	8
46	J1406316	Judge	Male	65	6
47	J0206121	Judge	Male	43	9
48	J100631	Judge	Male	47	7.5
49	J0410173	Judge	Male	36	6
50	J1106105	Judge	Male	42	8
51	J1506430	Judge	Male	50	4
52	J1306206	Judge	Male	48	7.5

53	J1306369	Judge	Male	68	9
54	J1406429	Judge	Male	48	3
55	J1906326	Judge	Male	61	7
56	J1506432	Judge	Male	45	6
57	J1406150	Judge	Male	37	10
58	J2206230	Judge	Male	64	9.5
59	J0706413	Judge	Male	75	12
60	J0610174	Judge	Male	45	2
61	J1706381	Judge	Male	54	14
62	J1606510	Judge	Male	49	5
63	J1306426	Judge	Male	45	5.5
64	J1706513	Judge	Male	41	4
65	J120637	Judge	Male	50	3.5
66	J1106203	Judge	Male	35	10
67	J140654	Judge	Male	46	12
68	J1006101	Judge	Male	63	11
69	W1406209	Witness	Female	59	12.5
70	W120638	Witness	Female	48	14
71	W030649	Witness	Female	53	12.5
72	W1706321	Witness	Female	63	11
73	W110636	Witness	Female	60	3
74	W1706514	Witness	Female	46	4
75	W0706131	Witness	Female	59	13
76	W1906221	Witness	Female	42	8.5
77	WS_30015	Witness	Female	59	15
78	W1206205	Witness	Female	45	12.5
79	W110633	Witness	Female	53	13
80	W140655	Witness	Male	61	7

81	W1306313	Witness	Male	47	9.5
82	W1406211	Witness	Male	40	10.5
83	W1406315	Witness	Male	56	7
84	W0806416	Witness	Male	62	13
85	W110635	Witness	Male	73	6.5
86	W2809167	Witness	Male	52	8
87	W1306425	Witness	Male	57	4
88	W1006102	Witness	Male	32	7
89	W0306410	Witness	Male	43	3
90	W1706515	Witness	Male	78	13
91	W1906220	Witness	Male	75	2
92	W0206349	Witness	Male	76	14
93	W0706360	Witness	Male	51	7
94	W010643	Witness	Male	45	3
95	W2809167	Witness	Male	52	8
96	WS_30002	Witness	Male	69	4

The SRSQ-20 items are scored “0” for symptom absent, “.5” for symptom sometimes present and “1” for symptom present. Item scores are then summarized to obtain a final index score. “Yes” answers thus result in a higher score and indicate a poorer mental health condition. Cutoff points vary considerably depending on the international setting and the culture. A cutoff point of 7 or 8 is widely used (Harpham et al., 2003).

In our assessment of the SRQ-20 scores for the 96 survivors interviewed, the scale reliability coefficient for total SRQ-20 score is 0.8270,¹ which is very good and suggests that Scholte et al. are correct in their assertion that the instrument is valid in Rwanda. For these survivors, the SRQ-20 score was, on average, 8.73. This is right above the widely-used cut-off point of 7 or 8 and suggests that respondents were, on average, displaying symptoms of common mental health disorders. Indeed, 15 respondents had scores of 14 or higher, indicating a high level of distress.

Gender, age, and position in the *Gacaca* courts also have an effect on SRQ-20 scores. Specifically, the average score for women was 10.93, and the average score for men was 6.95 (see Table 3). This difference could be due to socially constructed, gendered ideas about expressing pain or sorrow, though it could also suggest that women struggle

¹ This coefficient ranges from 0 to 1 and provides an overall assessment of a measure's reliability. If all 20 of the scale items are entirely independent from one another, then the coefficient is closer to zero. If they are closely related, the coefficient is closer to 1. In other words, the higher the coefficient, the more likely it is that measures of the scale are measuring a similar underlying concept. Coefficients above .7 are typically best.

more with the aftermath of genocide. Given the widespread gender-based violence during the Genocide, this is possible, though additional analyses would be needed to better understand this difference in scores.

Survivors who served as judges in the *Gacaca* courts had slightly lower scores, with an average score of 8.72, than those who were witnesses, who had an average score of 8.77 (see Table 4). These scores contrast sharply with defendants that we interviewed, whose average scores were several points lower and, on the whole, below the threshold for psychosocial distress.

**Table 3: Cumulative SRQ-20 Score:
Interviewee Genders**

Item	Men	Women	Total
Total Number of Interviews	53	43	96
SRQ-20 Scale Average	6.95	10.93	8.73

**Table 4: Cumulative SRQ-20 Score:
Interviewee Groups**

Item	Judges	Witnesses	Total
Total Number of Interviews	68	28	96
SRQ-20 Scale Average	8.72	8.77	8.73

Respondents in their thirties actually had their highest scores, with an average of 11.15. This is partially driven by the number of women respondents in this category, but it is clear that respondents at both ends of the age distribution had high scores overall. While the SRQ-20 score can

be analyzed as a cumulative score, it can also be analyzed with one question. Specifically, Question 17 has often been used as a measure of suicidal ideation. In this case, 12 (12.5% of interviewees) of the survivors interviewed responded yes to this question. While the SRQ-20 is intended to capture poor general mental health status across multiple dimensions, suicidal ideation alone—as measured by Question 17—by itself can capture a potentially severe mental health problem and indicates actual risk for actual self-harm. This, this high prevalence is quite alarming.

Taken together, 54 of the 96 survivors had a score of either 8 or above, and an additional 2 individuals answered yes to Question 17 but did not have a score above 8. This results in 56 of the 96 survivors showing clear signs of common mental disorders. If we take the cut-off of 10 for women, this drops to 51 of the 96 survivors plus the additional 2 individuals, or 53 of 96 survivors showing clear signs of common mental disorders. This is thus either 58.33% (with a cut-off of 8 for men or women) or 55.21% (with a cut-off of 8 for men or 10 for women), and either way, survivors clearly exhibit high signs of mental distress.

Taken together, this suggests that survivors in Rwanda are dealing with high levels of mental distress. To be clear, we do not suggest that *Gacaca* caused these issues. Rather, given the anticipated relationship between participation and healing, it is clear that even those who participated in the *Gacaca* courts have low levels of psycho-social wellbeing.

Disappointingly, survivors had difficulty in expressing their continued distress. What makes matters worse is the lack of understanding and support at the grassroots level for survivors suffering from trauma, leading many survivors to feel isolated. The continued threats, taunts, and reprisals faced by some survivors, particularly in rural areas, compounds their existing mental disorders. Some genocide survivors continue to see their livestock killed and receive leaflets warning them that they will be massacred in addition to other forms of intimidation. Some of the threats have also led to economic problems for survivors, who have stopped cultivating their fields because they feel unsafe outside their homes. Thus, a comprehensive approach to psycho-social

wellbeing among survivors will be important to ensuring that the needs of survivors are met going forward.

To be clear, dealing with the psychosocial effects that resulted from the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi is a particularly difficult task, and some specific programs have been put in place. Specifically, in October 1994, UNICEF and the Rwandan government, in collaboration with several NGOs, instituted a Trauma Recovery Program (TRP). This program included capacity building for relief of post-traumatic symptoms at the community level and the creation of a National Trauma Center in Kigali, which offers outpatient services for severely traumatized survivors.

November of 1994 saw the birth of the Mental Health Coordination Office (under the Ministry of Health) and Trauma Center to respond to mental issues resulting from genocide. In addition, HNP Careas Ndera Psychiatric Hospital began offering specific services to patients suffering from genocide-related mental health problems; previously, the hospital had received patients with psychological problems but had not made specific efforts to help survivors.

Therefore, the Ministry of Health quickly realized that the issue of trauma management for post-genocide victims should be integrated into the general framework of a mental health program. In 1995, the Ministry of Health undertook coordinated activities aimed at designing a health care and prevention system in mental health through the establishment of a national policy on mental health and a mental health program, responsible for the implementation and the execution of this policy.

Today, mental health care is provided through two referral institutions: Ndera Neuropsychiatric Hospital and Psychosocial Centre (SCPS), which became the Mental Health Department of CHUK in 2012. Such programs have also been integrated in the primary health care system and decentralized at the district hospital level and some local associations working in this field. Counseling helps to identify underlying problems and issues, and helps in finding the best ways to cope. Such counseling services respond to psychological problems, such as the haunting genocide memories and life difficulties that were consequences of the genocide. In general, counseling services help to

identify constructive ways to deal with a situation that is beyond your personal control. According to the British Association for Counseling (1997), the overall aim of counseling is to provide an opportunity for the client to work towards living in a way that he or she experiences as more satisfying and resourceful.

Thus, while some services have certainly put in place, the results of the SRQ-20 analysis indicate the lasting psychological toll among genocide survivors who participated in *Gacaca* courts. To ensure psychological support for genocide survivors, a more extensive mental health care system should consequently be established.

General Conclusion

This study used qualitative interviews to analyze genocide survivors' experiences in testifying in *Gacaca* courts. Survivors echoed each other's main concerns. First, it is clear that survivors believe that their lives today are better than their lives of the past. Nevertheless, survivors also shared numerous needs, including but not limited to economic security and income generating projects, restitution of property, burial and recovery of relatives' bodies, education, and healthcare.

Findings show that genocide survivors were initially hopeful about the *Gacaca* process and were heartened by the information which enabled them to discover about how their loved ones died and where they were buried. Genocide survivors acknowledged the role of *Gacaca* courts in punishing genocide perpetrators and in bringing about forgiveness. Many genocide survivors expressed concerns. Chief among these were that survivors continue to struggle, sometimes in vain, for restitution for their property destroyed during the Genocide. Findings also reveal that the *Gacaca*

courts had particularly detrimental effects on judges, who suffer from grudges even today.

Furthermore, this study outlines the psychological problems that are intertwined with survivors' experiences of genocide and justice as well as the hope and sense of satisfaction that has very occasionally resulted from *Gacaca* courts. The SRQ-20 analysis highlights the extent of psychological issues among survivors who participated in the *Gacaca* courts. Survivors of the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi are amongst the most vulnerable groups in Rwanda and have very specific needs. Even though the post-genocide government has heavily invested in solving the challenges faced by genocide survivors, their needs are still overwhelming. For this reason, we offer a number of recommendations.

Policy Recommendations

Based on the research findings, the government of Rwanda must address the problems of genocide survivors. To help survivors rebuild a sense of self and trust in humanity and meet post- genocide challenges, efforts should include the following steps:

- a) Identify vulnerable genocide survivors and monitor their protection;
- b) Secure housing for genocide survivors;
- c) Provide more comprehensive health care for survivors;
- d) Continue to assist with the burial of genocide victims in memorial sites;
- e) Consider providing educational support to genocide survivors;
- f) Consider income generating projects, especially among survivors who were judges; and

- g) Allocate additional resources to the psychosocial wellbeing of survivors.

Ensuring that vulnerable survivors obtain much-needed support should be everyone's responsibility; it should not be left for government alone. And every Rwandan can make a personal contribution to this cause.

References

001. Adelman, H. and Suhrke, A. (1999). *The path of a genocide*. 1st ed. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
002. African Rights. (2003). Rwanda: Gacaca justice - a shared responsibility, Kigali.
003. African Rights. (2004). *Rwanda Broken Bodies, Torn Spirits, Living with Genocide, Rape and HIV/AIDS*, Publication of African Rights, Kigali.
004. Apuuli, Kasaija Phillip. (2009). "Procedural due Process and the Prosecution of Genocide Suspects in Rwanda." *Journal of Genocide Research* 11(1), 11-30. *ProQuest*. Web. 9 July 2013.
005. Beusenbergh, M., John H. Orley, and the World Health Organization. (1994). "A User's Guide to the Self Reporting Questionnaire (SRQ).
006. Bizimana Jean Damascène (2014). *L'itinéraire du génocide commis contre les Tutsi*. Edit. Imprimerie Muhima, Kigali.

007. Bornkamm, Paul Christoph. (2012). *Rwanda's Gacaca courts: Between Retribution and Reparation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
008. Brannigan, Augustine, and Nicholas A. Jones. (2009). "Genocide and the Legal Process in Rwanda." *International Criminal Justice Review* 19 (2), 192-207. *ProQuest*. Web. 9 July 2013.
009. Briggs, Philip and Janice Booth. (2010). *Rwanda*. 1st ed., US, The Glove Pequot Press Inc.
010. Brounéus, Karen (2008). "Truth-telling as talking cure? Insecurity and retraumatization in the Rwandan Gacaca courts." *Security Dialogue* 39 (1): 55-76.
011. Buckley-zistel, S., (2006). "Dividing and uniting: the use of citizenship discourses in conflict and reconciliation in Rwanda", *Global Society* 20 (1), 101-113

012. Burgess, H. (2003). “Stereotypes/ Characterization Frames. Beyond intractability”, Eds. Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess, retrieved from www.beyondintractability.org/essay/stereotypes, posted: October 2003
013. Carney, J.J., (2013). “Building a Catholic Kingdom in Central Africa, 1900-1950”, *Rwanda*
014. Catherine, B. (1995). “Le viol des femmes survivantes du génocide des femmes du Rwanda”, in Verdier, R., Decaux, E. and Chrétien, J.P. (Eds.), Rwanda. Un génocide du vingtième siècle, L’Harmattan.
015. Center for Conflict Management. (2012). Research on *Gacaca* Courts, Kigali
016. Chakravarty, Anuradha. (2006). “Gacaca courts in Rwanda: Explaining Divisions within the Human Rights Community.” *Yale Journal of International Affairs* 1 (2), 132-45. ProQuest. Web. 9 July 2013.

017. Chamberlain, M.E., (2010). “The Victorian Image of Africa”, in *The Scramble for Africa: 3rd Edition*, London, Pearson Education
018. Cherif (2008). *International Criminal Law Volume 3: International Enforcement 3rd Edition*, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Leiden.
019. Clark, John (2009). “Rwanda: Tragic Land of Dual Nationalisms”, in Barrington, Lowell (ed.), *After Independence: Making and Protecting the Nation in Postcolonial and Postcommunist States*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 71-106
020. Clark, Phil (2010). *The Gacaca courts, Post Genocide-Justice and Reconciliation in Rwanda: Justice Without Lawyers*. Oxford University Press.
021. Clark, Phil and Kaufman, Z. (Eds). (2008). *After Genocide: Transitional Justice, Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Reconciliation in Rwanda and Beyond*. London: Hurst.

022. Crummey, Donald (1986). *Banditry, Rebellion, and Social Protest in Africa*. 1st ed., London, J. Currey.
023. Dallaire, R. and Beardsley, B., (2005). *Shake Hands with the Devil*. 1st ed. New York, NY: Carroll & Graf.
024. Daly, Erin (2002). “Between punitive and reconstructive justice: The Gacaca courts in Rwanda.” *New York University Journal of International Law and Politics (JILP)* 34, 355-396.
025. Dandur, Yvon, Curt T. Griffiths. (2006). *Handbook on Restorative Justice Programmes*. New York: United Nations, UNODC. Print.
026. Des Forges, A. (1999). *Leave None to Tell the Story: Genocide in Rwanda*. Human Rights Watch: New York, London, Brussels.
027. Destexhe, Alain, Marschner, Alison, Shawcross, William (1996). *Rwanda and Genocide in the Twentieth Century*. New York University Press: New York.

028. Diplomatic Archives Brussels. 1964.
029. Doughty, Kristin (2015). “Law and the Architecture of Social Repair: *Gacaca* Days in Post-Genocide Rwanda.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 21(2), 419–437. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9655.12213>.
030. Doughty, Kristin C. (2013). “Contesting Community: Legalized Reconciliation Efforts in the Aftermath of Genocide in Rwanda.” Order No. AAI3463001 *ProQuest*. Web. 9 July 2013.
031. Drumbl, M. (2002). “Restorative Justice and Collective Responsibility: Lessons for and from the Rwandan Genocide.” *Contemporary Justice Review*, 5(1), 5–22. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10282580210831>.
032. Emerson, R., (1962). ‘Pan-Africanism’, *International Organization*, 16 (2), 275-290.
033. Eze, M. O., (2013). “Pan-Africanism and the Politics of History.” *History Compass*, 11 (9), 675-687.

034. Fierens, Jacques (2005). “*Gacaca Courts: Between Fantasy and Reality.*” *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, 3(4), 896-919.
035. Gasibirege, Simon (2002). “*The Election of Inyangamugayo Judges: Break Up or Continuity?*” Notes of the Conflict Management Centre, 6, 93-127.
036. Harrell, P. (2003). *Rwanda’s Gamble*. 1st ed. New York: Writers Club Press.
037. Harroy Jean-Paul (1984). *Rwanda: souvenirs d’un compagnon de la marche du Rwanda vers la démocratie et l’indépendance*. Hayez, Académie des Sciences d’Outre-Mer: Bruxelles.
038. Hatzfeld, J. (2005). *Into the Quick of Life: The Rwandan Genocide: The Survivors Speak*. London: Serpent’s Trail.
039. Hobbs, Joseph J. (2009). *World Regional Geography*. 1st ed., Belmont, CA, Brooks/Cole, Cengage Learning.

040. Honeyman, C., Hudani, S., Tiruneh, A., Hierta, J., Chirayath, L., Iliff, A., & Meierhenrich, J. (2004). “Establishing Collective Norms: Potentials for Participatory Justice in Rwanda.” *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 10(1), 1–24. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327949pac1001_1.
041. Honwana, A. (1997). Healing for peace: Traditional healers and post-war reconstruction in Southern Mozambique. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 3(3), 293-305. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327949pac0303.6>
042. Human Rights Watch. (2011). Justice Compromised. The Legacy of Rwanda’s Community-Based Gacaca courts, New York, NY 10118-3299 USA
043. Ingelaere, Bert. (2008). “The Gacaca courts in Rwanda” in *Traditional Justice and Reconciliation after Violent Conflict: Learning from African Experiences*, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, Strömsborg, 103 34 Stockholm, Sweden

044. Inkiko-Gacaca.gov.rw, “Structures”. Retrieved at <http://www.inkiko-Gacaca.gov.rw/en/enstructures.htm> on March 25, 2012.
045. Insaidoo, Kwame. (2006). *Can the Black Man Rule Himself?* Authorhouse.
046. Jefremovas, Villia. (1997). “Contested Identities: Power and The Fictions Of Ethnicity, Ethnography And History In Rwanda.” *Anthropologica*, 39(1/2), 91-94. JSTOR. DOI: 10.2307/25605855.
047. Joireman, Sandra F. (2003). “Justice for a Genocide?” *The Global Review of Ethnopolitics* 2 (2): 65-6. *ProQuest*. Web. 9 July 2013.
048. Jones, Nicholas A. (2013). “Adjudicating the Perpetrators of Genocide: A Preliminary Investigation into the Judicial Response to Genocide in Rwanda.” *ProQuest*. Web. 9 July 2013.
049. Karunakara, U., Neuner, F., Schauer, M., Singh, K., Hill, K., Elbert, T., et al. (2004). “Traumatic events and symptoms of post-

traumatic stress disorder amongst Sudanese nationals, refugees and Ugandan nationals in the West Nile.” *African Health Sciences*, 4, 83–93.

050. King, Elizabeth (2014). *From Classrooms to Conflict in Rwanda*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

051. Kirkby, Coel. (2006). “Rwanda’s Gacaca courts: A preliminary critique.” *Journal of African Law* 50 (2), 94-117.

052. Laband, J. (2007). *Daily Lives of Civilians in Wartime Africa*. 1st ed. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

053. Lahiri, Karan. (2009). “Rwanda’s ‘Gacaca’ Courts: A Possible Model for Local Justice in International Crime?” *International Criminal Law Review* 9 (2), 321-32. ProQuest. Web. 9 July 2013.

054. Leaning, J., Sam, Arie, Gilbert, Holleufer, & Claude, Bruderlein (2003). Human security and conflict: A comprehensive approach. In L.

Chen, J. Leaning, & V. Narasimhan, *Global health challenges for human security* (pp. 13-30). Harvard University Press: Cambridge.

055. Longman, Timothy. (2009). "An Assessment of Rwanda's Gacaca courts." *Peace Review* 21(3): 304-312.
056. Lugan, Bernard (2007). *Rwanda, contre-enquête sur le génocide*. Edition Privat.
057. Lumsden, M. (1997). "Breaking The cycle of Violence." *Journal of Peace Research*, 34(4), 377-383. doi:10.1177/0022343397034004001
058. Magnarella, P. (2005). "The Background and Causes of the Genocide in Rwanda." *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, 3 (4), 801-822.
059. Mamdani, M., (1996). "From Conquest to Consent as the Basis of State Formation: Reflections on Rwanda." *New Left Review*, 216, 3-36
060. Mamdani, Mahmood (2001). *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda*. Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

061. Mason, D. (2003). "Structures of Ethnic Conflict: Revolution versus secession in Rwanda and Sri Lanka." *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 15 (4), 83-113.
062. Megwalu, A., & Loizides, N. (2010). "Dilemmas of Justice and Reconciliation: Rwandans and the *Gacaca* courts." *African Journal of International and Comparative Law*, 18(1), 1–23. <http://doi.org/10.3366/E0954889009000486>
063. Melvern, L. (2000). *A People Betrayed*. 1st ed. NAEP: Cape Town.
064. Métraux, J.-C. (2004). *Deuils collectives et création sociale*. Paris: La Dispute.
065. Mitchell, M. (2012). *Hope for a Better World*. 1st ed. iUniverse Inc.
066. Moghalu, K. (2005). *Rwanda's Genocide. The Politics of Global Justice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
067. Molenaar, A. (2005). *Gacaca: Grassroots Justice after Genocide: The Key to Reconciliation in Rwanda*. African Studies Centre: Leiden.

068. Mugesera Antoine (2004). *Imibereho y'Abatutsi kuri Repubulika ya mbere n'iya Kabiri (1959-1990)*. Les Editions Rwandaises: Kigali.
069. Munyandamutsa, Nasson (2001). *Question du sens et des repères dans le traumatisme psychique: Réflexions autour de l'observation clinique d'enfants et d'adolescents survivants du génocide Rwandais de 1994*. Edition Médecine et Hygiène: Genève.
070. Mwakikagile, Godfrey (2013). *Civil Wars in Rwanda and Burundi: Conflict Resolution in Africa*. New Africa Press: Pretoria.
071. Nagan, W., Cartner, J. and Munro, R. (2016). *Human rights and dynamic humanism*. 1st ed.
072. National Service of Gacaca courts. (2012). *Summary of the Report Presented at the Closing of Gacaca Courts Activities*. Kigali.
073. National Service of Gacaca courts. 2012. *Gacaca Courts in Rwanda*. Kigali.

074. Ndahiro, A., Rwagatare, J., Nkusi, A. (eds.), (2015). “Chapter 3: Post-Colonial Rwanda”, *Rwanda: Rebuilding of a Nation*. Fountain Publishers: Kigali.
075. Newbury, C., (1998). “Ethnicity and the Politics of History in Rwanda.” *Africa Today*, 45(1), 7-24.
076. Newbury, David. (2001). “Precolonial Burundi and Rwanda: Local Loyalties, Regional Royalties.” *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 34(2), 255-314. JSTOR, DOI: 10.2307/3097483.
077. Nikuze, Donatien. (2014). “The Genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda: Origins, Causes, Implementation, Consequences, and the Post-Genocide Era”, *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 3 (5), 1086-1098.
078. Oberschall, Anthony (2012). ‘Chapter 5: Propaganda, Hate Speech and Mass Killings’, in Predrag, Dojcinovic (ed.), *Propaganda, War Crimes Trials and International Law: From*

Speakers' Corner to War Crimes. Routledge:
New York.

079. Office of the President of the Republic of Rwanda. (1999). *Report on the Reflection Meetings Held in the Office of the President of the Republic from May 1998 to March 1999*. Kigali.
080. Ohaegbulam, F. (2004). *U.S. Policy in Postcolonial Africa*. 1st ed. New York: P. Lang.
081. Pedersen, D. (2002). Political Violence, Ethnic Conflict, and Contemporary Wars: Broad Implications for Health and Social Well-Being. *Social Science & Medicine*, 55(2), 175-190. DOI:10.1016/S0277-9536(01)00261-1
082. Penal Reform International (2010). *Eight Years On: A Record of Gacaca Monitoring in Rwanda*. Bell and Bain: London.
083. Prunier, G. (1997). *The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide*. 1st ed. London: Hurst
084. Prunier, Gerard (1995). "Chapter 1: Rwandese Society and the Colonial Impact: The

Making of A Cultural Mythology (1894-1959),
The Rwanda Crisis: History of A Genocide.
Hurst and Company: United Kingdom.

085. Prunier, Gérard. (1995). *The Rwanda Crisis, 1959-1994: History of a Genocide.* 1st ed. C. Hurst & Co. Publishers.

086. Pupavac, V. (2004). International Therapeutic Peace and Justice in Bosnia. *Social & Legal Studies*, 13(3), 377-401. DOI:10.1177/0964663904045000

087. Reyntjens, Filip (1985). *Pouvoir et Droit. Droit public et évolution politique, 1916-1973.* M.R.A.C: Terveuren

088. Richters, A., Dekker, C., de Jonge, K. (2005). “Reconciliation in the aftermath of violent conflict in Rwanda.” *Intervention*, 3, 203-221.

089. Riddell, J.G. (2005). “Addressing Crimes Against International Law: Rwanda’s Gacaca in Practice” MA Dissertation, University of Aberdeen.

090. Riot, T., (2015). “A Roundabout Revolution: Rethinking the Decolonization of Rwanda by the Practices of the Catholic Scouting Movement 1954-1964.” *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 32 (7), 939-951.
091. Rugengamanzi, E., (1999). *Evolution politique du Rwanda 1959-1973*. Butare.
092. Rumiya, Jean (1992). *Le Rwanda sous le régime du mandant belge (1916-1931)*. L’Harmattan : Paris.
093. Samuel, T. (2009). *Plight and Fate of Women during and Following Genocide. Genocide: A Critical Bibliographic Review*, Vol. 7, Transaction Publishers: New Brunswick and London.
094. Sarkin, Jeremy (2001). “The Tension between Justice and Reconciliation in Rwanda: Politics, Human Rights, Due Process and the Role of the Gacaca Courts in Dealing with the Genocide.” *Journal of African Law*: 143-172.
095. Schabas, William A. (2005). “Genocide Trials and Gacaca courts.” *Journal of International Criminal Justice* 3(4): 879-895.

096. Scherrer, Christian (2002). *Genocide and Crisis in Central Africa: Conflict Roots, Mass Violence, and Regional War*. Praeger: Connecticut.
097. Scholte, Willem. F., Fernke Verduin, Astrid M. Kamperman, Theoneste Rutayisir, Aeilko H. Zwinderman, and Karien Stronks. (2011). “The Effect on Mental Health of a Large Scale Psychosocial Intervention for Survivors of Mass Violence: A Quasi-Experimental Study in Rwanda.” *PLoS ONE* 6(8), 1–8.
098. Sikkink, Kathryn. (2011). *The Justice Cascade: How Human Rights Prosecutions are Changing World Politics*. W.W. Norton & Co.
099. Sinema, Kyrsten., (2015). “Three: Pre-Colonial Rwanda Meets Belgian Rule”, *Who Must Die in Rwanda’s Genocide?: The State of Exception Realized*. Lexington Books: Lanham.
100. Staub, Ervin. (2004). “Justice, Healing, and Reconciliation: How the People’s Courts in Rwanda Can Promote Them.” *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 10(1), 25-32. *ProQuest*. Web. 9 July 2013.

101. Stettenheim, J. (2002), “The Arusha Accords and the Failure of International Intervention in Rwanda.” *Words over War: Mediation and Arbitration to Prevent Deadly Conflict*, edited by J.H. Barton, M.C. Greenberg and M.E. McGuinness, New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 213-236.
102. Thompson, A. (2007). *The Media and the Rwanda Genocide*. 1st ed. Pluto: London.
103. Tiemessen, Alana (2004). “After Arusha: Gacaca Justice in Post-Genocide Rwanda.” *African Studies Quarterly: The Online Journal of African Studies* 8 (1), 57-76. ProQuest. Web. 9 July 2013.
104. Totten, S. and Ubaldo, R. (2011). *We Cannot Forget*. 1st ed. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
105. Twagilimana, Aimable and Learthen Dorsey (2007). *Historical Dictionary Of Rwanda*. 1st ed., Lanham, Md., Scarecrow Press.
106. United Nations and Decolonization: International Trusteeship System”, *United*

Nations, <http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/its.shtml>, last accessed 23 December 2016

107. United Nations Security Council. August 23, 2004. "Report of the Secretary-General on the Rule of Law and Transitional Justice in Conflict and Post-Conflict Societies."
108. United States Institute for Peace. (September 2008). "Transitional Justice: Information Handbook."
109. Uvin, Peter (1988). *Aiding Violence*. 1st ed., West Hartford, CT, Kumarian Press.
110. Uvin, Peter, and Charles Mironko (2003). "Western and local approaches to justice in Rwanda." *Global Governance* 1(9): 219-231.
111. Van Hoyweghen, S., (1996). "The Disintegration of the Catholic Church of Rwanda: A Study of the Fragmentation of Political and Religious Authority", *African Affairs*, 95 (380), 379-401
112. Vansina, Jan (2004). *Antecedents to Modern Africa: The Nyiginya Kingdom*. University of Wisconsin Press: Madison.

113. Verduin, Femke, Geert E. Smid, Tim R. Wind, and Willem F. Scholte. (2014). “In Search of Links Between Social Capital, Mental Health and Socioterapy: A Longitudinal Study in Rwanda.” *Social Science & Medicine*, 121, 1-9.
114. Wells, M. (2016). *History for the IB Diploma Paper 1*. 1st ed. Cambridge Univ Press.
115. Werchick, Leah (2001). “Prospects for justice in Rwanda’s citizen tribunals.” *Human Rights Brief* 8 (3), 5.
116. Wierzynski, Aneta (2004). “Consolidating democracy through transitional justice: Rwanda’s Gacaca courts.” *NYUL Rev.* 79, 1934.
117. Young, C., (2006). “The Heart of the African Conflict Zone: Democratization, Ethnicity, Civil Conflict and the Great Lakes Crisis”, *Annual Review Political Science*, 9, 301-328

Other documents:

1. Rwanda: Organic Law No. 8/96 of 30 August 1996 Organizing Prosecutions for Offences Constituting the Crime of Genocide or Crimes against Humanity Committed since October 1, 1990.
2. Rwanda: Organic Law No 40/2000 of 26 January 2001 setting up Gacaca Jurisdictions and Organising Prosecutions for Offences Constituting the Crime of Genocide or Crimes against Humanity, Committed between October 1, 1990 and December 31, 1994
3. Rwanda: Organic Law No 33/2001 of 22 June 2001 Modifying and Complementing Organic Law No 40/2000 of 26 January 2001 setting up Gacaca Jurisdictions and Organising Prosecutions for Offences Constituting the Crime of Genocide or Crimes against Humanity, Committed between October 1, 1990 and December 31, 1994

4. Rwanda: Organic Law N° 16/2004 of 19 June 2004 establishing the Organisation, Competence and Functioning of Gacaca courts charged with prosecuting and trying the perpetrators of the crime of genocide and other crimes against humanity, committed between October 1st, 1990 and December 31, 1994.

5. Rwanda: Organic Law No 28/2006 of 27 June 2006 Modifying and Complementing Organic Law No 16/2004 establishing the Organisation, Competence and Functioning of Gacaca courts Charged with Prosecuting and Trying the Perpetrators of the Crime of Genocide and other Crimes against Humanity, Committed between October 1, 1990 and December 31, 1994.

6. Rwanda: Organic Law No 13/2008 of 19 May 2008 modifying and Complementing Organic Law No 16/2004 Establishing the Organisation, Competence and Functioning of Gacaca courts Charged with Prosecuting and Trying the Perpetrators of

the Crime of Genocide and other Crimes
against Humanity, Committed between
October 1, 1990 and December 31, 1994
as Modified and Complemented to date.

APPENDICES



REPUBLIC OF RWANDA
*National Commission for the Fight
against Genocide*
CNLG



Appendix 1: Phone Script

May I speak with _____?

Good (morning, afternoon, or evening), my name is (name), and I am calling on behalf of Dr. Jean-Damascène Gasanabo and Donatien Nikuze of CNLG as well as Dr. Hollie Nyseth Brehm and Dr. Christopher Uggen, two professors from the United States who are in Rwanda conducting research. We are calling you to ask if you will participate in their study, which is focusing on collecting testimonies of the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi and assessing the impacts of the *Gacaca* courts and the current needs of survivors. I hope you will give me five minutes of your time to discuss this study. Is this ok? Thank you.

First, participation in this study is voluntary. If you do agree to participate in their research study, they would ask you to do the following things:

1) Participate in a meeting with Dr. Jean-Damascène Gasanabo, Donatien Nikuze, Dr. Hollie Nyseth Brehm, or Dr. Christopher Uggen, during which time they will present you with an overview of the project and answer any and all questions about the project. They will also make sure that you fully understand the nature, goals, risks, and benefits of the project.

2) Then, if you agree to participate, they would conduct an interview. The interview should last from 1 to 2 hours in length and will be audio recorded, if you agree to recording it. It is possible that your conversation will include topics that may be sensitive. If there are any questions you do not want to answer, that is fine, and you will be able to say this is the case. In addition, you do not have to participate in this study, and you will not receive any direct benefits if you do participate. And, if you *do* decide to participate, you are still free to stop the interview at any time.

Would you be willing to participate in this study?

If yes: Thank you! At this time, I would like to schedule the meeting and the location that is most

convenient for you. (Notes: Schedule location, language, and date/time.) If you need to get in contact with the research team for any reason, we can be contacted at:

- Dr. Jean-Damascene Gasanabo, Director General of the Research and Documentation Centre on Genocide/CNLG, Email: jd.gasanabo@cnlg.gov.rw, Phone Number: 0786648776
- Donatien Nikuze, Research Fellow at the Research and Documentation Centre on Genocide/CNLG, Email: donatien.nikuze@cnlg.gov.rw , Phone Number: 0788815032
- Hollie Nyseth Brehm, a professor at The Ohio State University, 238 Townshend Hall, 1885 Neil Ave Mall, Columbus, OH 43210. Email: brehm.84@osu.edu,
- Dr. Christopher Uggen, McKnight Professor of Sociology and Criminology at the University of Minnesota, USA, Email: uggen001@umn.edu
- *CNLG at:* administrator@cnlg.gov.rw or 3560 (Hotline)

Do you have any other questions? Thank you so much for your consideration and your time.

If no: Thank you for considering this request and for your time. Do you have any other questions? Thank you again so much for your time.

P.O. Box : 7035 Kigali - Hotline: 3560

E-mail: administrator@cnlg.gov.rw -Web site: www.cnlg.gov.rw



REPUBLIC OF RWANDA
*National Commission for the Fight
against Genocide*
CNLG



Appendix 2: Informed Consent and Voluntary Participation²

You are invited to participate in a research study. You were selected as a possible participant in the study because of your participation in the *Gacaca* court process. We ask that you listen to some information about this study. Afterward, you will have a chance to ask any questions that you have about the project.

This study is being conducted by Donatien Nikuze, Research Fellow at the Research and Documentation Centre on Genocide/CNLG, Dr. Jean-Damascene Gasanabo, Director General of the Research and Documentation Centre on Genocide/

² Consent was discussed and obtained at the time and location of the interview. Each interviewee was the only person able to provide consent for himself or herself. Specifically, we obtained consent prior to asking any questions and before we ask about recording the interview but after we have explained the study (which will have also been explained when the interview was scheduled).

CNLG, Hollie Nyseth Brehm, a Professor at The Ohio State University, and Dr. Christopher Uggen, McKnight Professor of Sociology and Criminology at the University of Minnesota, USA.

Background Information:

The purpose of this study is to obtain testimonies about the Genocide and to assess the effects of *Gacaca* courts on participants.

Procedures:

If you agree to take part in this study, we would ask you to participate in one interview that will last between one and two hours. During the interview, we will ask you questions about your background, your participation in the *Gacaca* courts, your opinion of the courts, and your life today.

Risks and Benefits of Participating in the Study:

The study has several risks. First, you may feel some of the topics we discuss are sensitive, as we will be discussing the events connected to the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi. If you are

uncomfortable with any question, please tell me, and we can skip the question. You are also free to stop the interview at any time.

Second, you may disagree with our final interpretations of the interview data, though we will do our best to represent the perspectives of all research participants as accurately as possible.

There are no direct benefits to participation in the study.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the Rwandan National Commission for the Fight Against Genocide, The Ohio State University, or the University of Minnesota. If you decide to participate, you are free to choose not to answer any question and can withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

Participating in the interview demonstrates that you have been informed of your rights and are continuing voluntarily.

Compensation:

There will be no payment or other form of compensation for participation in the study. It is our hope that you will want to participate in order to share your views on the subject matter with researchers who value the importance of this topic.

Confidentiality:

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report or document we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify you.

It is our hope that you will allow us to tape record our conversation. Research records will be stored securely, and our research team will be the only people who will have access to the audio recordings. All audio recordings will be destroyed after they are transcribed.

Contacts and Questions:

You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you are encouraged to contact:

- Donatien Nikuze, Research Fellow at the Research and Documentation Centre on Genocide/ CNLG, Email: donatien.nikuze@cnlg.gov.rw , Phone Number: 0788815032
- Dr. Jean-Damascene Gasanabo, Director General of the Research and Documentation Centre on Genocide/ CNLG, Email: jd.gasanabo@cnlg.gov.rw, Phone Number: 0786648776
- Hollie Nyseth Brehm, a professor at The Ohio State University, 238 Townshend Hall, 1885 Neil Ave Mall, Columbus, OH 43210. Email: brehm.84@osu.edu,
- Dr. Christopher Uggen, McKnight Professor of Sociology and Criminology at the University of Minnesota, USA, Email: uggen001@umn.edu

Consent:

Have you understood this document, and do you consent to this interview?

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Respondent's name and signature.....

Contact details

P.O. Box : 7035 Kigali - Hotline: 3560

E-mail: administrator@cnlg.gov.rw -Web site: www.cnlg.gov.rw



REPUBLIC OF RWANDA
*National Commission for the Fight
against Genocide*
CNLG



Appendix 3: Interview Guide

Thank you so much for agreeing to speak with me. Before we start, I'll give you a little background. *[Insert background that each interviewer gives. Provide details about position, etc.]*

I would like to remind you that the study is completely voluntary. Also, if you do not want to answer any questions, that is fine.

[Ask about audio recording if it was not included when the consent form was reviewed.]

Thank you. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Before and During 1994

My questions today will mostly focus on the *Gacaca* courts and your role. Before talking about those, we have a few questions about life before 1994. *[Turaganira muri rusange ku*

bibazo birebana n'Inkiko Gacaca. Mbere y'uko dutangira turabanza tunganire ku mibereho yawe mbere ya Jenocide yakorewe Abatutsi mu 1994.]

1. We will start with a few questions about your childhood. *[Nakubaza utubazo duke tunganisha mu gihe cy'ubwana bwawe?]*

Where and when did you grow up? *[Wavukiye he?], [Wavutse ryari?], [Wakuriye he?]*

Did you attend school? *[Wabashije kujya mu ishuri?]*

2. What was your community like during your childhood? *[Aho wabaga imibanire n'abaturanyi yari imeze ite muri icyo gihe?]*

3. Can you tell me about your life in the years before 1994? *[Watubwira uko imibereho yari imeze mbere ya 1994?]*

4. How did things change for you in 1994? *[Kuri wowe, ni gute ibintu byahindutse mu 1994]*

Probes: Are you comfortable telling us a little bit about what happened? *[Birashoboka ko wadusangiza ibyakubayeho mu buryo burambuye?]*

After the Genocide [*Nyuma ya Jenocide*]

5. What was your life like in the months after the violence ended? [*Imibereho yari imeze ite nyuma y'ihagarikwa rya Jenocide?*]

Probes: Where did you go after the Genocide?
Who was with you? What did you do?
[*Wagiye kuba he nyuma ya Jenocide?*] Wari
kumwe nande? [*Wakoraga iki?*]

6. What were relationships like between people who were considered Hutu and Tutsi after 1994?
[*Wabonaga imibanire hagati y'Abahutu n'Abatutsi imeze ite nyuma ya 1994*]

7. What did people say about what should be done to respond to the perpetrators of the Genocide?
[*Abantu bavugaga ko abakoze Jenocide bakorerwa iki?*]

Follow-up: When the violence ended, what did you think should be done to respond to the perpetrators? [*Jenoside imaze guhagarikwa, ni ibihe bitekerezo wagize ku cyakorerwa abakoze Jenocide?*]

8. Apart from *Gacaca*, can you tell me about what has been done in response to the effects of the Genocide? [*Uretse Gacaca, hari ikindi cyaba cyarakozwe mu guhangana n'ingaruka za Jenocide?*]

Now I would like to ask you about the *Gacaca* court trials and the reconciliation process. [*Ubu tugiye kuganira ku Nkiko Gacaca hamwe n'Ubumwe n'Ubwiyunge*]

9. What did you think about the *Gacaca* courts when you first heard about them? [*Watekereje iki ku Nkiko Gacaca mu gihe wazumvaga bwa mbere?*]

10. When did you become involved with the *Gacaca* courts, and what was your role? [*Ni ryari watangiye kugira uruhare mu mirimo y'Inkiko Gacaca? Wari ufitemo uwuhe mwanya?*]

Probe: Were you ever an officer, like a president or a secretary? [*waba warigeze uba umuyobozi (mu kagari, mu murenge)?*]

Judge [*Inyangamugayo mu Nkiko Gacaca*]:

11. When were you elected to serve as a judge? [*Niryari watorewe kuba Inyangamugayo mu Nkiko Gacaca?*]

Follow-ups: Can you tell me about the day you were elected? What did you think when you were elected? Why do you think you were elected? [*Wambwira uko byari bimeze ku munsu watorwaga? Watekereje iki cyangwa wakiriye ute gutorerwa kuba Inyangamugayo?*] [*Ubona ari iki cyatumye uturwa?*]

12. Can you tell me about your duties as a judge? [*Watubwira izari inshingano zawe nk'Inyangamugayo mu Nkiko Gacaca?*]

Probes: How many hours a week did you volunteer your time as a judge? What did a typical day look like? Was it difficult to find time away from your other activities? [*Wakoraga amasaha angaha mu cyumweru nk'Inyangamugayo? Hari umunsu wibuka*

*watubwira imiterere y'akazi kakozwe?
Byaba byari bigoye kubona undi mwanya
wo gukora akandi kazi kawe?]*

Follow-up: What were your tasks before the trials began? [*Watubwira izari inshingano zawe mbere y'iburanisha?*]

13. I know you saw many trials, but can you tell me about one that remains in your memory today? [*Ntazi neza ko waburanishije imanza nyinshi. Hari urwo waba wibuka uko rwagenze?*]

14. How did you decide if someone was guilty? [*Mwafataga umwanzuro mute ko umuntu runaka ahamwa n'ibyaha?*]

Follow-ups: Can you tell me about the process of coming to a consensus? What happened when consensus was not reached? [Ask these two previous questions only if time.] How did you decide their punishment? Did this seem fair? What made this difficult? Did any punishments seem too light or too heavy? [*Mwatubwira uburyo mwakoreshaga*

*kugirango mwemeranywe ku mwanzuro?
Byagendaga bite mu gihe mutumvikanye?
Ni gute mwafataga umwanzuro ku gihano?
Mubona byarakorwaga mu mucyo? Haba
hari icyagoranaga muri byo?, Ikihe? Haba
hari ibihano wabonaga byoroheje n'ibyo
wabonaga biremereye?]*

15. Why did people need to be punished? [*Kuki abantu bagomba guhanwa?*]

16. Was it important for people to have an opportunity to appeal judgments? [*Ubona byari ngombwa ko abantu bagira umwanya wo kujuririra umwanzuro wafashwe?*]

17. Apart from serving as a judge, did you ever provide testimony for a trial? [*Uretse kuba Inyangamugayo, haba hari urubanza wigeze utangamo ubuhamya?*]

Note: [If yes, ask some of the witness questions as appropriate. {Niba ari YEGO, mubaze ibibazo bigenewe Umutangabuhamya nk'uko byateguwe}]

Witness [*Umutangabuhamy*]:

11. How did you become a witness? [*Ni gute waje kuba umutangabuhamy?*]

Probe : Did the court summon you ? Were you nervous? [*waba warahamagajwe n'Urukiko? Byaba byarakubabaje?*]

12. How many times did you provide testimony? Why? [*Wakundaga gutanga amakuru? Nk'inshuro zingahe? Kubera iki?*]

Follow-ups: Did you testify in every case that you had information about? Was there any reason not to testify? [*Watangaga ubuhamy mu manza zose ufiteho amakuru? Hari impamvu yashoboraga gutuma udatanga ubuhamy?*]

13. Please tell me about the first experience you had as a witness. [*Ni irihe somo wadusangiza waba waragize nk'umutangabuhamy ku munsu wawe wa mbere wo gutanga ubuhamy?*]

Follow-ups: Were you satisfied with the process? Did anything about the process make you unhappy? Did the judges consider your testimony? Were the other times you provided testimony similar? [*Uburyo bwakoreshwaga burahagije? Haba hari ikitaragushimishije? Ubuhamya bwawe bwahabwaga agaciro? Aho watangaga ubuhamya hose bwakirwaga kimwe?*]

14. What was the outcome of the trial(s) that you testified at? [*Ni iyihe myanzuro yavuye mu manza watanzemo ubuhamya?*]

Follow-ups: Do you think it was the right outcome? Why or why not? [If no], Did you appeal the decision? Why or why not? [*Ubona imyanzuro yafashwe ariyo yari ikwiye? Niba ari OYA, warajuriye?*]

[If they testified in many cases, ask]: Can you share an example of a case where you thought the outcome was right and one where you did not think the outcome was right? [*Haba hari urugero rw'urubanza mwibuka rwafatiwe imyanzuro ikwiye? Haba hari*

urugero rw'urubanza mwibuka rwafatiwe imyanzuro idakwiye?]

15. Was it difficult to provide testimony against people you knew? [*Ubona byari bigoye gutanga ubuhamya ku bantu wari usanzwe uzi?*]

Probe: Did you experience any repercussions from providing testimony? [*Haba hari ihohoterwa wakorewe kubera gutanga ubuhamya?*]

16. Apart from providing testimony, how often did you attend the trials? [*Uretse kujya gutanga ubuhamya, wakundaga kwitabira Inkiko Gacaca?*]

Probe: Why? [*Kubera iki?*]

Defendant [uregwa]:

11. How did you first find out you would have a trial? [*Wamenye ute ko ugomba kuburana mu Nkiko Gacaca ku nshuro ya mbere?*]

Probes: Where were you? What did you think about this? [*Wabaga he? Wabyakiriye ute?*]

12. When was the trial, and where did you stay before it took place? [*Urubanza rwabaye ryari? Mbere yo kuburana wabaga he?*]

13. Can you tell me about the trial? [*Wagira icyo utubwira ku rubanza?*]

Probes: What happened? How did you feel during it? Did your family attend? Did you know people there or know any of the judges? Were the procedures fair? [*Byagenze bite? Wumvaga umeze ute mu gihe cy'urubanza? Umuryango wawe wakurikiranaga urubanza? Hari abantu baho waburaniraga wari uzi? Haba hari uwo wari uzi mu nyangamugayo zaburanishaga? Urubanza rwagenze neze?*]

14. Did you confess? Why/why not? [*Waba waremeye icyaha ugasaha imbabazi? Niba ari YEGO: Kubera iki? Niba ari OYA: Kubera iki?*]

15. What happened after the trial? [*Byagenze bite nyuma y'urubanza?*]

Probes: Did you receive a punishment? Did this seem fair? [*Wahawe igihano? Wabonaga cyafashwe mu mucyo, kitabogamyeye?*]

16. Did you have other trials? Can you tell me about them? [*Haba hari izindi manza wagize? Hari icyo wazitubwiraho?*]

17. Did you attend any other trials in another capacity? Why? [*Haba hari urundi rubanza witabiriye? Kubera iki?*]

18. Since the trial, have you been involved with projects to help improve your community? [*Nyuma y'urubanza, haba hari imishinga y'iterambere wagizemo uruhare mu rwego rwo kuzamura umuryango nyarwanda?*] Can you tell me about them? [*Hari icyo wayitubwiraho?*]

Probes: Did you participate in TIG or related projects to build infrastructure? [*Waba warakoze TIG cyangwa indi mishinga yibanda ku isanwa ry'ibikorwa remezo?*]

Gacaca Opinions and Effects

19. When did you last participate in the *Gacaca* court trials? [*Wagiye mu Nkiko Gacaca bwa nyuma ryari?*]

Follow-up: If it was before June 2012: Why did you stop participating in the trials? [*Niba ari mbere ya Kamena 2012, kuki waharagaritse kugira uruhare mu manza?*]

20. How did participating in the *Gacaca* court trials impact your life? [*Ubona kuba waragize uruhare mu manza zaciwe n'Inkiko Gacaca byaragize izihe ngaruka ku buzima bwawe?*]

Follow-up: How do you think your participation influenced what your family and neighbors think of you? Have you experienced any negative effects from participating? Does anyone hold a grudge against you today because of *Gacaca*? Have there been any positive effects? [*Ukeka ko kuba waragize uruhare mu Nkiko Gacaca byaragize izihe ngaruka ku isura wahabwaga*

*n'umuryango wawe ndetse n'abaturanyi?
Hari ingorane wagize kubera kugira uruhare
mu Nkiko Gacaca? Haba hari ukubwira nabi
cyangwa utakwishimira kubera Gacaca?
Haba hari ingaruka nziza wakuye mu kugira
uruhare mu Nkiko Gacaca?]*

21. Can you tell me about your life today?
[Watubwira imibereho yawe muri iki gihe?]

Probe: How do you spend your day? *[Mukora
iki buri munsi?]*

22. Overall, what do you think the *Gacaca* courts
achieved? *[Muri rusange ubona Inkiko Gacaca
hari icyo zagezeho?]*

23. What were some of the courts' strengths
and things that could have been improved? *[Ni
ibihe byiza wabonye ku Nkiko Gacaca? Ni ibihe
byakabaye byaranonosowe mu Nkiko Gacaca?]*

Probes: How do the courts compare to
other courts? *[Ubona Gacaca yarakoze ite
ugereranije n'izindi Nkiko?]*

If a judge: Did you hear about problems in other Gacaca courts? [*Haba hari ibibazo wumvise mu zindi Nteko z'Inkiko Gacaca?*]

24. In your experience, how fair were the rules and procedures used in the Gacaca courts? [*Ku bwawe, ubona Inkiko gacaca zarakoze imirimo yazo mu mucyo no mu bwisanzure?*]

25. Apart from the fairness of the procedures, how satisfied were you with the decisions and outcomes of the court? [*Waba waranyuzwe n'imyanzuro ndetse n'ibyavuye mu Nkiko Gacaca?*]

26. What did you think about the courts' use of TIG? [*Utekereza iki ku gihano nsimburagifungo cya TIG?*]

Probe: Do you think TIG was fair? [*Ubona igihano nsimburagifungo cya TIG cyari gikwiye?*]

27. Did the courts help unity and reconciliation? [*Ni mu buhe buryo Inkiko Gacaca zaba zarafashije mu bumwe n'ubwiyunge?*]

If yes (and time): What about the courts facilitated this? [*Niba ari YEGO, ubona Inkiko Gacaca zarafashije zite?*]

If no (and time): Can you explain why not? [*Niba ari OYA, watumbwira impamvu?*]

28. Is there anything else about your experience with the *Gacaca* courts that we have not asked about or anything else that you would like to say? [*Haba hari ikindi mwatubwira kijyanye n'Inkiko Gacaca?*]

Psycho-Social Wellbeing

Lastly, I would like to finish with a few YES or NO questions about your wellbeing today. These questions were created by the World Health Organization, and we are asking them of everyone we are interviewing to understand the needs of people who participated in *Gacaca* and as a pilot project for a future study. [*Urakoze cyane kuganira nanjye. Mbere yo gusoza ikiganiro cyacu, reka tuganire no ku buzima bwawe muri iki*

gihe. Hari ibibazo tugiye kwifashisha byateguwe n'Umuryango Mpuzamahanga wita ku Buzima (OMS), tukaba turi kubibazo uwo ariwe wese tugiranye ikiganiro kugirango tubashe kumenya imibereho y'abantu bagize uruhare mu Nkiko Gacaca]

For each question, if you choose to answer, you should answer with a “yes” or a “no.” *[Ku kibazo nkubaza, mu gihe wemeye gusubiza, urasubiza ukoresheje YEGO cyangwa OYA]*

29. Do you often have headaches? *[Waba ujya ubabara umutwe?]*

30. Is your appetite poor? *[Waba ugiri ibibazo byo kumva udashaka kurya?]*

31. Do you sleep badly? *[Waba ujya udasinzira neza?]*

32. Are you easily frightened? *[Waba ukunda kwikanga, kugira ubwoba?]*

33. Do your hands shake? [*Waba utitira ibiganza?*]

34. Do you feel nervous, tense, or worried?
[*Waba ukunda kurakara, kumva utishimye, kumva ubabaye?*]

35. Is your digestion poor? [*Waba ugira ibibazo by'igogora?*]

36. Do you have trouble thinking clearly? [*Waba ugira ibibazo mu mitekerereze yawe?*]

37. Do you feel unhappy? [*Waba ujya wumva ubabaye?*]

38. Do you cry more than usual? [*Waba usakuza mu buryo budasanzwe?*]

39. Do you find it difficult to enjoy your daily activities? [*Ubona bikugora kwishimira ibikorwa cyangwa akazi kawe ka buri muni?*]

40. Do you find it difficult to make decisions?
[*Byaba bikugora gufata umwanzuro?*]

41. Is your daily work suffering? [*Akazi kawe karakugora?*]

42. Are you unable to play a useful part in life? [*Waba ubona utagishoboye kugira uruhare mu mibereho yawe?*]

43. Have you lost interest in things? [*Waba utagishishikazwa n'ibintu?*]

44. Do you feel you are a worthless person? [*Ubona uri umuntu udafite akamaro?*]

45. Has the thought of ending your life been on your mind? [*Waba warigeze utekereza kwiyahura?*]

46. Do you feel tired all the time? [*Wumva uhora unaniwe buri gihe?*]

47. Do you have uncomfortable feelings in your stomach? [*Ujya wumva utamerewe neza mu gifu?*]

48. Are you easily tired? [*Waba unanirwa vuba?*]

Resolution

Those are all of the questions that I have for you.
Do you have any questions for me?

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this project.



REPUBLIC OF RWANDA
*National Commission for the Fight
against Genocide*
CNLG



Appendix 4: Codebook

Life experiences before 1994, experiences during the Genocide, emotional labor and well-being, and life today speak mostly to survivor's needs

Life Before 1994

Childhood family: Any discussion of participant's childhood family.

Childhood: Salient childhood memories (apart from family or discrimination).

Married (pre-1994): Participant's marriage before the Genocide. Here we essentially want to know if they were married before the Genocide.

Children (pre-1994): Participant's children before the Genocide.

Gender: Participant's gender.

Age: The year the participant was born or their age.

Education: Participant's level of education or discussion of schooling.

Farmer (before 1994): Participant was a farmer before the Genocide.

Employment (before 1994): Participant's employment before the Genocide (apart from farming).

Socioeconomic (pre-1994): Other markers of socioeconomic status before 1994. This could involve homes/property, family jobs, etc.

Leader (pre-1994): Was a leader or held another position that was respected prior to the Genocide.

Region (before 1994): Region where participant lived before Genocide.

Fled (before 1994): Fled home or the country prior to 1994.

Discrimination: Experiences with discrimination. This could be as a child or any time prior to 1994.

Religion: Participant's religion.

Violence (before 1994): Discussions of exposure to violence (or general violence) prior to 1994. This includes violence in 1959 and subsequent years, for instance.

Cause of violence: Participant's stated cause (or causes) of the Genocide.

Political party: Political party affiliation.

Other (pre-1994): Other discussions of life before 1994 that seem pertinent but are not captured above.

Utopian past: Discussions of pre-conflict harmony and togetherness, typically in a utopian fashion.

Ethnic tensions: Bad feelings between Hutu and Tutsi.

Experiences During and Discussion of the Genocide

Cause of Genocide: Participant's stated cause (causes) of the Genocide.

Targeted group: The participant was a member of the targeted group during the Genocide.

Family targeted group: Participant notes that s/he was not targeted but that immediate family member (e.g., spouse) was member of targeted group.

Not targeted group: The participant was not a member of the targeted group.

Victimization: Personal victimization during the Genocide.

Family victimization: Discussions of family members being killed or victimized during the Genocide.

Other loss: Apart from the killing of family members, use this for descriptions of other loss during the Genocide (including family separation). This could also include damage to property or loss of a home.

Genocide: Use this code to capture other dimensions of the participant's experience during the Genocide.

Rescue efforts: Discussions of participant's efforts to rescue Tutsi (successful or failed).

Rescued: Participant was rescued (or someone tried to rescue or help the participant).

Ethnicity: Use this code to capture discussions of ethnicity and race. How does the participant discuss difference?

Violence label: Use this code to capture participants' labeling of the Genocide. How specifically does the participant label the violence (e.g., war, civil war, violence, Genocide against the Tutsi, etc.)?

Life After 1994

Consequences of Genocide: Discuss about the consequences of Genocide

Fled home: Fled home during or after 1994. This is meant to capture internal displacement processes (broadly).

Fled Rwanda: Left Rwanda during or after 1994.

Social relationship: Discuss about the interpersonal relationship following the Genocide

Fear Hutu: Expresses fear or distrust of Hutu following the Genocide.

Distrust: Expresses general societal distrust following the Genocide. Use this code for general discussions of distrust or fear that do not mention Hutu or perpetrators in particular.

Fear for life: Feared for life following Genocide (but not in direct connection to *Gacaca*).

Living conditions: How the life looked like in the aftermath of Genocide?

Punishment idea: Participant's ideas about what should have been done to respond to those who participated in the Genocide.

Gacaca

Traditional Gacaca: Any mention of traditional *Gacaca* (use this both for involvement as well as general mentions).

First impression: First impression of *Gacaca* court (what they thought when they first heard about it; whether they thought it would work).

Judge: Served as judge (not mutually exclusive). Code specific statements that tell you this person is a judge.

Witness: Served as witness (not mutually exclusive). Code specific statements that tell you this person served as a witness.

Defendant: served as defendant (not mutually exclusive). Code specific statements that tell you this person served as a defendant.

Purpose: Perceived purpose of *Gacaca*.

Trial description: Any descriptions of the *Gacaca* trials (setting in particular). This includes rich descriptions of what trials looked like (e.g., where they took place, who was there, etc.) Think of this as the setting itself if you were to paint a photo of what the trial looked like.

Trial process: Any descriptions of the *Gacaca* process (the steps the court took and how trials unfolded. This includes descriptions that emphasize the *process/steps* the courts took over time.

Legitimacy: Perceived legitimacy of *Gacaca*. Here include any discussions that would signify legal cynicism (perceptions of those implementing the law or the law itself as illegitimate) as well as

statements arguing that *Gacaca* courts and those involved had the right to authority. This involves both the legitimacy of those involved and of the broader system.

Necessity: Anything regarding the necessity of *Gacaca*. Use this for descriptions of whether and why *Gacaca* was necessary or why certain decisions were necessary. (Here we are typically interested in the use of the word necessary as well as in discussions of why *Gacaca* was needed.)

Process_fair: Process court followed was fair (general or for a specific case).

Process_unfair: Process court followed was not fair (general or for a specific case).

Outcomes_fair: Outcomes of courts were fair (general or for a specific case).

Outcomes_unfair: Outcomes of courts were not fair (general or for a specific case).

Accuracy: Beyond fairness, we are also interested in whether outcomes were seen as accurate. Use this code for discussions of the accuracy of the court.

Power_court: Illustrations or discussions of the role of power (economic, social, political) in operations or decisions of court. (E.g., did those who were more privileged benefit from that privilege when standing trial?)

Power_community: Illustrations or discussions of the role of power (economic, social, political) in the *implementation* of court decisions. (E.g., Those in power prevented decisions from being carried out.)

Laws: References to the specific laws that governed the courts.

Rule of law: Discussion of the importance that law holds in protecting people from arbitrary or unjust abuses of power. Essentially, here we are interested in views for why the law is important (especially as it pertains to helping people) apart from those captured by other codes.

Punishments: Any mention of the punishments as too light, too heavy, or other related assessments.

Evidence: Discussions of the use of evidence in the

courtroom. We are specifically interested in notions of hearsay evidence. That said, any discussion of evidence would be interesting here.

TIG general: General conceptions of TIG (apart from defendant experiences).

Unity and reconciliation: Mentions of “unity and reconciliation” (together).

Reconciliation: Any other mentions of reconciliation.

Justice: Discussions of justice. This includes conceptions of justice and how it related to the courts.

Forgiveness: Discussions of forgiveness.

Healing: Conceptions of *Gacaca* as healing (e.g., healing emotional trauma).

Other achievements: Other perceived achievements (e.g., freeing innocents, deciding cases efficiently, etc.).

Religious references: References to religion or God when discussing *Gacaca*.

Prevention: Discussion of *Gacaca* as important for preventing future violence.

Challenges: General challenges facing *Gacaca*. Use this code for external factors that caused challenges (e.g., too many cases).

Weaknesses: Weaknesses of *Gacaca*. Use this code for internal factors that were seen as weaknesses. This would be things relevant to the *Gacaca* laws or process itself.

Nothing could be improved: Nothing could be improved about *Gacaca*; *Gacaca* was perfect.

Wrongful imprisonment: Discusses general cases of wrongful imprisonment (do not use this code if someone claims personal wrongful imprisonment).

Compensation for judges: Discussions of whether judges should have been compensated.

Compensation for victims: Discussions of issues with victim compensation.

Confession: General discussions of the importance of confession (do not use this code if someone personally confessed).

Sensitization: Anything regarding sensitization. This precise word would typically be used, and it involves teaching the public about *Gacaca*.

Sexual victimization: Discussions of how *Gacaca* dealt with sexual violence cases.

Truth: Anything about the importance of truth or truth-telling.

Deterrence: Punishment important for deterrence; any other discussions that invoke the notion of deterrence.

Impunity: Punishment important to prevent impunity; any other discussions that invoke the notion of impunity.

Speed: Discussions of the speed of trials or general swift justice.

Compensation: Punishment important for compensation; any other discussions that invoke the notion of repaying what was lost. Also use this code when respondent discusses the impossibility of compensating for what was lost.

Rwandan solution: Gacaca as a Rwandan solution (often in conjunction with noting that it was a solution to Rwandan problem).

Foreign involvement: Discussion of foreign help or lack of foreign help with *Gacaca* or in Rwanda more broadly.

Trial attendance: Use this code for discussions of how often the respondent attended the trial outside of roles, such as judges. Include reasons for attendance as well (e.g., attended because she was curious or because it was mandatory).

Last participation: Last participation in *Gacaca* court trials.

Other bias: Descriptions or accounts in which people characterize courts as biased in some other way.

Gacaca personal: Discussion of personal gains or outcomes related to *Gacaca*. How did *Gacaca* help the individual (if at all)?

Ordinary courts: Discussions of the ordinary courts (typically a comparison between *Gacaca* and ordinary courts).

ICTR: Conception or mention of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.

Other settings: Discussions of *Gacaca* in other settings, such as whether *Gacaca* would work in other countries and why. Here include advice for other countries engaging in *Gacaca*.

Community today: Use this code for discussions of their community today (e.g., community cohesion).

Government: References to the government in any capacity. This includes both local government officials and top officials, such as Paul Kagame.

Judges

***Note: If something here also applies to a defendant or a witness but is not covered in another code, definitely feel free to use the code below!**

Cell: Served in a cell court. These courts tried property crime cases, so use this code for discussions of property crime cases.

Sector: Served in a sector court. These courts tried

cases of violence against people. Note that some judges served in both cell and sector courts over time.

Appeals Court: Served in an appeals court.

Secretary: Served as a secretary.

Vice President: Served as a vice president.

President: Served as a president.

Election process: Descriptions of the election process.

Positive election: Displays positive feelings about election.

Negative election: Displays negative feelings about election.

Hesitancy: Hesitancy to be a judge following election. This involves fear or anxiety regarding serving as a judge.

Why elected: Why participant believes s/he was elected as a judge.

Integrity: Discussions of integrity.

Training: Any description of the training process. This includes the amount of time trained, what was learned, who conducted the training, what was useful, etc. This also includes whether the participant believes that training should have been more thorough.

Impartial: Discussions regarding the importance of impartiality.

Information gathering: Descriptions of the information gathering process.

Meeting as panel: Descriptions of duties when met together as a panel of judges.

Decision process: Descriptions of the decision process.

Consensus: Descriptions or opinions of coming to a consensus as a panel of judges.

Appeal process: Descriptions of the appeals process.

Memorable trial: Trial that remains in the judge's memory. Also include specific stories of trials that stand out.

Exerting authority: Descriptions of whether and how the participant had to exert authority as a judge. Here we are not interested in being an authority (expert knowledge) but rather when there are instances in which the judge is an authority figure.

Time: Descriptions of time spent as a judge (hours worked, days met, etc.).

Duties: Other duties as a judge (general and specific).

Family strain: Family strain from being a judge.

Economic strain: Economic strain from being a judge (e.g., could not work). This includes any way that *Gacaca* interfered with work or trouble with work.

Burden: Discussions of whether *Gacaca* was a burden (in terms of time or other factors unrelated to economic strain).

Code of ethics: Mentions of the code of ethics of judges. This includes both formal codes of ethics as well as ethical behavior of judges (though specific discussions of corruption are coded separately).

Difficult trial: Trials, or aspects of trials, that were particularly difficult, including discussions of what made them difficult. This can include emotional trials.

Policing behavior: Discussion of the policing of the behavior of other judges (e.g., removing a judge from the bench due to corruption).

Expert knowledge: Anything that particularly illustrates that the individual has gained expert knowledge.

Autonomy: Illustrations or discussions of autonomy or independence from the state. Many criticisms of *Gacaca* suggest that it was simply ran completely by the state. Thus, we are interested in capturing when the judges display autonomy in their processes, decision-making, etc.

Bribes: Someone tried to bribe participant or participant heard of other bribes.

Corruption: Anything about corruption more broadly (examples, issues, etc.)

Women on court: Discussion of the role of women judges on the court.

Patriotism: Serving as a judge as a duty to the country; statements that invoke patriotic notions of being a judge. Here include other notions of duty, such as duty for the future generation.

Rwanda as parent: Mentions of Rwanda or the government as a parent.

Perfect laws: Discussion of *gacaca* law as perfect or from God.

Traveling court: Discussions of a traveling court. (Some courts traveled around.)

Conflict of interest: Discussion of conflicts of interest—both what were supposed to happen when you knew someone well on the bench as well as specific examples.

Trying neighbors: Anything about trying neighbors (examples, difficulties, etc.) except for grudges afterward, which is captured in another code.

Police assistance: Police assisted in some way (e.g., safety, gathering evidence). Use this code for general discussions of security assistance as well.

Reliance on state: Beyond police assistance and training, there was other state involvement in the courts. (E.g., the state had to intervene in a difficult trial.)

Confidence: Use this for discussions of confidence in role. Use this also for signs of increased comfort or confidence in role as judge over time.

Recognition: Participant mentions recognition for serving as a judge. This could involve a medal or certificate for serving as judge, though it could also involve perceptions of recognition for the work they completed.

Other compensation: Mentions other things judges were given (e.g. radio, food, etc.) This also involves discussions of co-ops or other less tangible forms of compensation that judges expected or were promised.

Pride: Statements that display pride in her or his work as a judge.

Other positive: Other statements that display positive feelings about serving as a judge.

Other negative: Other statements that display negative feelings about serving as a judge.

Judgements: Perception of judgments. Relationship between punishment and the crimes committed?

Witness

Testimony: Description of the testimony that the witness provided.

Single witness: Testified one time.

Multiple witness experiences: Testified multiple times.

Outcome_w: Outcome of case where served as witness.

Difficult_w: Any difficulties as a witness.

Nervous_w: Nervousness as a witness.

Appeal_w: Witness appealed case. (This was possible but very unlikely.)

Impact_w: Impact or Effects of being a witness (e.g., how serving as a witness affected subsequent interactions or opportunities, psychological disorders (trauma,.....)).

Satisfaction_w: Witness satisfaction with process or outcome of specific case.

Defendant

Prison: Discussions of prison, including participation in it and the process that it took. Use this to also capture rifts that occurred between those who confessed and those who did not confess in *Gacaca*.

Claims innocence: Defendant maintains innocence.

Changing story: Defendant's story (of what he or she did) changes throughout the interview.

Number of trials: Number of trials the defendant had.

Found guilty: Defendant was found guilty.

Crime: Description of the crime the defendant committed (or was accused of committing).

Category of Crime: Category the defendant was placed in. There were three categories. If they do not tell the category, we can tell this by knowing if they were in a property case or a case of violence against people.

Pre-trial detention: Defendant was detained before trial.

Confession_d: Defendant confessed to crime.

Preparation for trial: How defendant was prepared for trial. This includes formal preparation given by prisons or TIG as well as informal preparation by friends.

Shame: Defendant (or anyone else) discusses the shame of standing trial in front of the community. This would also include notions of reintegrative shaming.

Rejection: Defendant discusses fear of social rejection.

Feelings during trial: How defendant felt during the trial (apart from shame and fear of rejection).

Prison: Defendant spent time in prison.

TIG: Defendant spent time in TIG. (Note that many were in both prison and TIG.)

Sentence: Years sentenced. Use this code for initial sentences and sentences upon appeal.

Appeal_d: Defendant appealed case.

Meaningful work: Defendant found work at TIG to be meaningful.

Visiting family: Defendant discusses family visiting while in TIG or prison.

Time reduced: Defendants' time was reduced. Include the reason for reduced time as well (e.g., general amnesty, good behavior, prison overcrowding, etc.).

Paperwork issue: Defendant discusses a paperwork issue or related issue with their sentencing and time in prison/TIG. For instance, the defendant was in TIG or prison longer than was needed because of an issue.

Preparation for reentry: Personal or institutional preparation for reentry.

Reentry: Other expectations regarding or discussions of reentry.

TIG experience: Other elements of the TIG experience. What they did, courses they took, conditions of life, etc.

Prison Experience: Other elements of the prison experience. What they did, courses they took, prison conditions, etc.

Appeals to good character: Defendant's language tries to illustrate that the defendant is a good person, either through referencing his or her character or by referencing good deeds.

Other neutralization techniques: Defendant employs other techniques to neutralize behavior. This could include denying responsibility of violence he/she was involved in, saying that they had to participate for whatever reason, or denying personal discrimination against Tutsis.

Emotional Labor and Well-being

Control/Demand: Any discussion of the *Gacaca* participant's perception of *control* over their experience in *Gacaca* and any discussion of the *demands* asked of them. This is a general flag for things that are not already captured above. Job demands have often been operationalized in terms of role conflict and time pressure, while job control a person's ability to control his or her work

activities. These are mostly captured elsewhere, but if there are discussions that fit in this framework that are not, please flag them with this code.

Needs: Use this code for discussion of the effects of *Gacaca* on basic human needs, including autonomy, belonging, and competence. Here, we are interested in how *Gacaca* influenced the judge outside of the time serving as a judge.

Hiding or faking emotion: Discussion of hiding emotion during the trial.

Managing emotion at home: Discussion of managing emotion at home. Did the participant discuss feelings with his or her family? Go straight to bed? Did the emotion affect their ability to interact with peers?

Nightmares: Nightmares linked to *Gacaca* experience.

Crying: Crying linked to *Gacaca* experience.

Distress: Participant displays distress during the interview (e.g., crying).

Hard stories: Other discussions (apart from other codes) about the difficulty of heading stories during trial.

Grudges: Grudges with neighbors or others based on *Gacaca* trial.

Other problems: Other problems as a result of *Gacaca* that are not captured in other codes.

No issue: Participant explicitly notes no issue with people today.

Fearful: Any fear linked to *Gacaca*. This involves worries about things that have not materialized (e.g., worried about a grudge).

Threatened: Any discussion of participants (judges, witnesses, defendants) who were threatened.

Judges killed: Any discussion of judges who were killed.

Witnesses killed: Any discussion of witnesses who were killed.

Other emotion management: Other discussions relevant to emotion management or emotional labor.

Life Today (Other)

Farmer: Participant is a farmer today.

No livelihood: Participant has no livelihood today.

Formal employment: Participant's formal employment today.

Widow: Participant is a widow or widower.

Head of household: Participant discusses providing for family or being the breadwinner (both the ability to provide or troubles doing so).

Married: Participant is married today.

Divorced: Participant is divorced.

Marital problems: Participant links marital problems to *Gacaca*. (This seemed to come mostly with defendants who were in prison for long periods of time.)

Children: Participants' children today. Use this for mentions of children, including their well being.

School fees: Mentions of inability to pay school fees.

Asked for money: Asks for compensation for interview.

Financial struggle: Indicators or discussions of financial struggle.

Socioeconomic status: Any other markers of SES today. (We will discuss how to assess this one.)

Well-being: Other discussions or indicators of well-being (including health) today.

Mediator: Participant is now a mediator.

Leader: Participant holds a position of power or is a leader today (apart from serving as a mediator).

Well-respected: Participant believes he or she is well-respected or trusted today.

Good person today: Use this for comments about a participant trying to be a good or trustworthy

person today (and living up to the name of *Inyangamugayo*).

Reputation: Apart from others listed, other mentions of reputation today. This includes their perception of what their family, friends, or neighbors think of them and any other social impacts of serving as a judge that are not captured elsewhere.

Trauma: Use this code for other signs of trauma not mentioned above.

Forgotten: Participant mentions they felt forgotten.

Sense of self: Other statements that signify participant's sense of self. This includes how the respondent views himself or herself. This will mostly be captured by discussions of whether the participant views herself as well-respected, though here we are interested in other discussions of one's sense of self-worth, levels of confidence today, etc.

Other support: Other support that the participant receives or discussions (e.g., widow's association).

Prejudice: Participant demonstrates prejudice against a group of people (such as bias against Hutu).

