



PRI Research on *Gacaca* report
Rapport III

April – June 2002

With support from Department for International Development (DfID)

CONTENTS

Introduction	3
The <i>Gacaca</i> jurisdiction programme	3
Activities of the research team:	5
The first weeks of the <i>Gacaca</i> jurisdictions on a pilot basis	7
The selection of the pilot areas	7
The activities of the <i>Gacaca</i> Jurisdiction of the “ <i>cellule</i> ” during the first phase	8
The next meetings	13
Traumas	14
Some thoughts about the start of the <i>Gacaca</i> Jurisdictions	14
I have confessed, Pardon me !	16
Conclusions and some recommendations	26
The <i>blacksmith</i> who said NO: thoughts about genocide, power struggle and reconciliation	28
Large-scale participation:	29
Turning a new page: about <i>Gacaca</i> and reconciliation	31
Acknowledgements	33
Annexe	34

Introduction

This is the third in a series of reports¹ on the work carried out by the PRI research team, which covers the activities during the period April-June 2002.

This report briefly discusses the advances in the *Gacaca* jurisdiction programme, the beginning of the *Gacaca* programme on a pilot basis, the public confessions by detainees and the case of a man who refused to participate in the genocide.

The *Gacaca* jurisdiction programme

During the period April-June 2002 the activities of the Department of *Gacaca* Jurisdictions/DJG (or 6th Chamber) of the Supreme Court in the field of the *Gacaca* were speeded up even faster than many had expected, although the necessary funding for the DJG had not yet been secured²:

* The training in two phases of more than 250,000 *Gacaca* judges (the *Inyangamugayo*), organised by the 6th Chamber – with logistic help from the Belgian Technical Cooperation (BTC/CTB) had started all over the country on the 8th of April 2002 and ended in principle on the 17th of May, although in practice often some days later. Madame Cyanzayire, the president of the *Gacaca* department, said in June that the training programmes enacting the laws governing the courts and other preparatory work had run smoothly.

* It was followed by the official inauguration ceremony of the *Gacaca* jurisdictions programme itself, only one month later, on the 18th of June, by president Paul Kagame.³ The president of the 6th Chamber, Madame Cyanzayire⁴, announced that the first phase of the *Gacaca* programme, under the guidance of her department, would start the next day (June 19th) on a pilot basis in twelve selected sectors (one per province), in all the ‘*cellules*’ of each pilot sector. Mrs Cyanzayire said that these sectors (see Table 1 for the list) would provide insights about the expected difficulties with the trials. She expected the trials throughout the country to begin before the end of the year, following a review of the pilot phase.

During the first discussions about the *Gacaca* programme, which took place in 1999 between Rwandan officials working in the Justice sector and representatives of the international community (donors and NGOs), the Government representatives had been firmly opposed to the idea of starting this ambitious and innovative project, initially on a small scale in order to gain experience, to evaluate its functioning so that changes could be made if necessary, before starting to implement the *Gacaca* jurisdictions on a national scale.

¹ For earlier PRI reports, see Klaas de Jonge: “Interim report on research on *Gacaca* jurisdictions and its preparations (July-December 2001) [Report I]; Kigali/Paris, January 2002 and “Activities PRI research team, report: January-March 2002”; Kigali/Paris, April 2002[Report II].

² Neither the funding of the CS programme nor the Indemnisation have been secured yet, nor the money necessary for the functioning of the *Gacaca* Department itself, which is estimated to be of the order of about 48 billion FRW or 103 million US dollars for a period of three years (“Budget triennal du Département des Juridictions *Gacaca*/DJG” distributed on 13/06/2002). This is very cheap in comparison with the costs of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda in Arusha, but much more than the international community is – until now – willing to pay for the *Gacaca* programme.

³ See “Discours de Paul Kagame à l’occasion du lancement officiel des travaux des juridictions *Gacaca*, le 18 juin 2002.” Translated from Kinyarwanda by RCN (Annex 1).

⁴ See « *Gacaca* judicial system launched in Kigali », <http://www.rwanda1.com/government/061802.html>

Although the elections of the *Gacaca* judges that took place in October 2001 had been tried out on a pilot basis before the nationwide elections started, it still came as a surprise when the Government indicated at the beginning of June 2002 that it wished to start the *Gacaca* programme also on a pilot basis. The reactions from all sides to proceed in this way were unanimously positive.

Although May-June 2002 had already been proclaimed several months before as the time when the *Gacaca* would probably start – after several other dates were suggested at various moments, the first being end 2000 – this official announcement had not been anticipated by most of the observers, firstly because of its nature as a pilot programme and secondly because some of the preconditions for the eventual success of the *Gacaca* jurisdictions seemed not yet to be fulfilled:

- A reparation/indemnisation law had not yet been passed; the question of what kind of compensation would be made for victims of the genocide (financial – as promised by the Minister of Justice – probably a one-off lump sum for each genocide survivor, or other non-monetary compensation) had not yet been decided and the funding to implement such a law had not yet been procured. The implementation of this law should be acceptable for genocide survivors and their support associations, (such as Ibuka, Avega and others) in order to secure their constructive participation in the *Gacaca* programme;
- Neither the start-up funding for the national Community Service programme, nor the necessary infrastructure for the execution of this ambitious programme were available, although the Ministry of Justice – responsible for Community Service – had recently started an awareness-raising programme in this field (such as the information seminar held in Murambi on May 9-10 for mayors, prefects, representatives of civil society and human rights organisations), and a PRI consultant had started working on a strategic action plan for the implementation of the CS programme⁵;
- Doubts were also expressed concerning the quality and the duration of the training the *Gacaca* judges had received⁶;
- The process of registration of the confessions (a key element for the success of the *Gacaca* programme) was gaining momentum, but certain observers believed that more could be done before the start of the *Gacaca* programme to disseminate information about this procedure and to sensitise the general population;
- The '*fiches parquets*' established by the Office of the Prosecutor (*le Parquet*), which by law should be made available to inform the sessions of the *Gacaca* jurisdictions, were not yet available. Until June 2002 about 70,000 out of 87,000 were completed, but the majority still had to be computerised.
- An independent monitoring system for the *Gacaca* jurisdictions on a national scale – although in preparation – wasn't yet operational. It is the Rwandan *National*

⁵ See the forthcoming PRI report by Serge Rumin « Plan national de stratégie de mise en œuvre du Travail d'Intérêt Général comme peine alternative à l'emprisonnement », Kigali, juillet 2002.

⁶ See the internal report by M. Pierre St-Hilaire: "Critical Problems Emerging from the *Gacaca* 'Training of Trainers' Seminar", Kigali: USAID, March 2002.

Commission for Human Rights (CNDH/NCHR) which will coordinate the monitoring for the 6th Chamber, together with civil society organisations. Other ministries were due to take responsibility for mental health problems (Ministry of Health), security (Minister and Defence), sensitisation of the population (Minijust), and collecting data and research (Ministry of Youth, Sports, Culture and Professional Training). The whole process was planned to be coordinated by a special unit of the 6th Chamber.

But it was probably for the above reasons that the Government had decided to start on a pilot basis. For such a vast programme –set up to deal with the enormous consequences of the genocide –which had never been experienced anywhere else before, one could not be sure of being completely ready. Waiting much longer would also be problematic; people would start doubting if the *Gacaca*, which had already been postponed on several occasions, would ever take place and might risk becoming demotivated. Additionally, if the start of the *Gacaca* programme were further postponed, it could clash with other important political events, such as the presidential elections planned for 2003, the demobilisation programme and the drafting of the new Constitution.

Activities of the research team:

As mentioned in an earlier report, PRI had stopped its research in the field for almost two months, while waiting for a review meeting with the Minister of Justice concerning the first Report (Jan. 2002) and PRI's proposals to improve the mechanism for effective use of such reports, procedures for consultations and planning for the next phase of the field research. The research work in the field was resumed when PRI received formal permission from Minaloc⁷ to continue its research. This was later followed by similar permission⁸ from the President of the Department of *Gacaca* jurisdictions allowing PRI and the members of the research team observe, study and document the activities of the *Gacaca* programme, as stipulated in the instruction of the President of the Supreme Court.

From the 19th of April, the PRI *Gacaca* research team tried to observe all these developments:

- By observing some training sessions for *Gacaca* judges and interviewing some of the trainers as well as the trainees and the future judges. A questionnaire has been prepared to evaluate the *Gacaca* judges' knowledge of *Gacaca* law in the pilot areas during the next research period;
- By observing the first of three planned phases of the *Gacaca* jurisdictions in all the pilot areas. The first phase, which is currently under way, consists in collecting the facts (the 'truth') concerning the genocide at the local level.
The second phase will consist in collecting information in order to establish the elements of accusation for the authors of genocide crimes. Both these phases will take place at the level of the 'cellule'. Depending on the nature of the crime, the third phase of the *Gacaca* procedure will take place at the cell level for the 4th category, the sector level for the 3rd category and the district level for the 2nd category.
- In addition, PRI researchers:

⁷ Letter of 18/04/2002

⁸ Attestation of 17/06/2002

- Observed the initiatives of some local authorities and prison directors who decided to run a trial of certain aspects of the *Gacaca* procedure prior to the official launch, such as organising meetings in the ‘*collines*’, during which detainees confessed their crimes before the population on the site where the crimes were committed. PRI also assisted this initiative logistically (sound equipment and transport);
- Interviewed some Rwandans who could have participated in the genocide in one way or the other (as killers, accomplices or bystanders) but decided against doing so. To reinforce reconciliation, which president Paul Kagame mentioned as one of the main objectives of *Gacaca*⁹, it could be useful to underline that, although the Hutu population participated massively in the genocide, not every Hutu was either an active participant or a passive onlooker, both of whom were at least morally guilty¹⁰. This means that the Government should perhaps develop some positive role models, some examples of men or women who made a difference, for those in the mass of the population who lost their self-esteem, as well as for those survivors who because of their shattered lives still distrust every Hutu.

⁹ “Unir les Rwandais sur la base de la justice tout en renforçant l’unité et la réconciliation”, see annexe 1.

¹⁰ Mamdani, Mahmood: “When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda”; Princeton: PUP, 2001: 266-270

The first weeks of the *Gacaca* jurisdictions on a pilot basis

As mentioned in the introduction above, the first of three phases of the *Gacaca* programme started on the 19th of June, as a pilot, in 12 selected sectors (see table 1 below), one per province. From the beginning, PRI had at least one local observer per sector on the spot. Hereafter follow some preliminary observations, without further analysis.

The selection of pilot areas

According to representatives of the 6th Chamber, the selection of pilot sectors was based on the following criteria:

- 1) a high number of confessions (main criterion);
- 2) the infrastructure available;
- 3) good results of the training of “*Inyangamugayo*” (persons of integrity), and
- 4) generally speaking, a well-disposed population.

The list of the selected sectors does not show a large number of confessions: with the exception of Gitarama (147) and Kibungo (65) all the other sectors have 50 or fewer cases. Although, on the average, each cell has only 6 persons who confessed, one has to bear in mind that – especially in the rural areas – even a small number of detainees may indicate a much larger number of accessories (see Report I). If one looks at the map of Rwanda¹¹, one can see that all the sectors chosen, with the exception of the one in Kigali-Town, are located in the more marginal rural areas of the country.

Table 1: The 12 pilot sectors where the *Gacaca* jurisdictions started:

N°	Province	District	Sector	Number of Cells per Sector	Number of Confessions
1	Kigali-Town	Kanombe	Nyarugunga	5	6
2	Kigali-Ngari/Rural	Ngenda	Kindama ¹²	(10)	(45)
3	Gitarama	Kabagari	Nkomero	11	147
4	Butare	Nyakizu	Gishamvu	3	26
5	Gikongoro	Mudasomwa	Nkumbure	9	11
6	Cyangugu	Bugarama	Nzahaha	6	10
7	Kibuye	Budaha	Nyange	8	20
8	Gisenyi	Kayove	Murama	6	40
9	Ruhengeri	Bukonya	Mataba	5	8
10	Byumba	Kisaro	Mutete	5	47
11	Kibungo	Kigarama	Birenga	5	65
12	Umutara	Rukara	Gahini	7	50
1-12	-	-	-	80 cells	475 confessions

¹¹ See ORTPN: “République Rwandaise- Carte Touristique », Kigali, Avril 2001

¹² Another version of this table gives the name of the sector as Nziranziza and not Kindama, and it is not sure to which sector the numbers of the cells and confessions apply.

The activities of the *Gacaca* Jurisdiction of the “*cellule*” during the first phase

During the first phase (*étape*) of the *Gacaca* Jurisdiction of the Cell, the facts about the genocide and the massacres will be collected at the local level – during the public meetings of the Seat (*Siège*) and the General Assembly – by preparing the following documents within a time span of at least seven sessions (once a week):

- a list of persons per household who lived in the cell before the genocide (population census before the 6th of April 1994/*recensement*);
- a list of persons who were killed (*liste de personnes décédées*) in the cell as a result of the genocide and massacres, and of the persons from the cell who were killed elsewhere;
- forms concerning the damage suffered by the victims during the genocide, per household (*fiche partie civile par ménage*);
- a list of the accused (*liste des accusés*), after which an individual form is made up for each defendant (*fiche individuelle de l'accusé*) – which in principle is the first step of the 2nd phase of the *Gacaca* Jurisdictions.

Preparing these lists is a considerable task for people without much formal education and knowledge of the *Gacaca* law and its procedures, eight years after the events happened. Only the 19 judges¹³ of the *Gacaca* Jurisdiction (the Seat/*Siège*) received some training in this field and only the 5 members among them who constitute the Coordination Committee of the *Siège* are literate. Difficulties and obstacles were to be expected during this exercise to establish the ‘truth’ of what happened during the genocide (see also Report I).

The population was to some extent sensitized during the two weeks before the *Gacaca* really started through meetings with the public, given the appearance before the *Gacaca* jurisdiction of some detainees who had already confessed, and through the efforts of the authorities. Government authorities explained what the *Gacaca* was about (why *Gacaca*, its origins, the categorization of the crimes etc.) and responded to questions from the public. The messages of these sessions were for the people to come to the sessions of the *Gacaca* courts on time, not to be afraid, to tell the ‘truth’ and to respect others.

The *Gacaca* jurisdictions started from the 19th of June in each one of the 80 *cellules* of these sectors.

The first meetings

The judges, or at least the Coordination Committee, seemed to have all the necessary material for their task: copies (in *Kinyarwanda*) of the manual explaining the *Gacaca* law¹⁴, a small pamphlet¹⁵ used for the introduction of the programme, papers, pens, etc. and a lockable wooden box to store the documents and reports. However, there were complaints from the

¹³ 44% of judges involved in the *Gacaca* at cell level have not completed primary school (see Report I:41).

¹⁴ An almost literal translation of the *Département des Juridictions Gacaca de la Cour Suprême* (DJG) : “Manuel Explicatif sur la loi organique portant création des Juridictions *Gacaca*”, Kigali, 2001. Only the part about the confession procedure seems to be shortened.

¹⁵ DJG: “Gahunda y’imirimo y’urukiko-gacaca rw’akagari”, Kigali, 07/06/2002

population that there wasn't enough documentation available explaining the *Gacaca* programme.

When the *Gacaca* started at Cell level, the population turned up almost everywhere in large numbers, far above the minimum requirement of 100 adults per cell, and in general they showed a lot of interest and curiosity. The judges, who were obviously motivated, were the first to be present, often an hour ahead of time. Many authorities and observers were also present, especially during these first meetings. In general they did not intervene.

However, the population would sometimes show up partly for the wrong reasons (as did many foreign correspondents): they thought that the trials were about to start, not being aware of all the preparation needed before the third phase (*étape*) could begin.

For example K. (in Butare), whose whole family had been murdered, said at the end of the first meeting that he wanted to denounce C. – one of the killers who was still at large – and have him arrested. When he was told that denunciations would only take place later (when listing the accused) he became very angry, started to cry, took his bicycle and rode off.

Moreover, when the population heard that the judges could investigate what had happened in the past, the enthusiasm of some of them diminished considerably¹⁶.

Although in the beginning almost no coercion was needed to get the population to go to the *Gacaca* meetings, the use or threat of force [bringing the 'local defence force' into action or imposing fines] increased rapidly when people stopped showing up or arrived hours late. But even during the first meeting, when the date for the following meetings was discussed, one could hear arguments (for example in Cyangugu), such as: "Let us hold the *Gacaca* meeting at the same day as the '*umuganda*'; two days' work for the Government in one week is too much", showing that some people do not perceive these jurisdictions as their own, but as something they are obliged to do.¹⁷

Only in a few cells, notably in Byumba (*cellules* Kimisugi and Muhororo of Mutete sector), did the population hesitate to go to the planned meetings because they were afraid that something terrible would happen. In the case of Byumba, there were rumours circulating that the Tutsi would kill the Hutu.¹⁸ The source of this rumor was a woman who had experienced a vision, in which she had "seen many dead bodies of Hutu who were killed on the 19th of June 2002, starting at 15:00 hs". Some families ran away and others sold their belongings. When the authorities were informed of the problems in these cells they organized meetings (21/06) to calm the population. These cells organized their first session the day after (22/06). In Gitarama there were also some 'difficult' cells (such as Nyakabungo, Nyacyoma and Nzuki). Some of these cells are small, which made it more difficult to reach the quorum.

¹⁶ Many people had hardly ever heard about *Gacaca* or had no idea what it was all about.

¹⁷ This raises an interesting question about the 'obedience to authority' of the Rwandan population, an argument often used to explain the Genocide (see 'the *blacksmith*'), but probably somewhat exaggerated.

¹⁸ These fears are probably also partly based on a historic event (that we were unable to verify), which took place in 1994, in Zoko, where during a meeting with the population, the RPF is said to have killed many civilians. According to our local observer, the Mutete (Byumba) sector not only had many more genocide victims than any other sector of this province, but it also experienced great loss of human lives as a consequence of the 1994 war: 90% of the families living there today have lost at least one person.

At the first planned meeting (19/06) in Nyacyoma only 87 out of 130 persons showed up because of the death of a child and the funeral. At the following session (27/06) there were 113 persons present, including the judges, but this was only possible after threatening the population with sanctions (fines). Nobody in the public asked any questions.

Nyakabungo seems to be the most difficult 'cellule': Many people showed up for the first meeting, but on the 24th of June at 10:00 hs only five persons had come, of whom three were judges. After the local authority, assisted by members of the 'local defence force' made an effort to mobilize the population, by 11:45 they had only managed to gather together 72 persons out of the 160 adults of this cell. The meeting had to be postponed.

According to a '*conseiller*' the reason was the incompetence of most of the judges, but according to one of the judges – an elderly woman – the cause was the ethnic composition and control of the *Siège*.

The structure of the meetings

The structure of these first meetings was nearly identical throughout the country and clearly well prepared. After a short word of welcome and introduction by the president of the *Gacaca* court, he or she counted the number of those present from the Cell. If the quorum of at least 100 was reached, the president opened the assembly and invited the population to maintain a minute's silence to remember the victims of the genocide and to think about national reconciliation. Sometimes there was a prayer, in some sectors the national anthem was sung.

Then the president checked whether all the *Gacaca* judges¹⁹ were present (at least 15 out of 19) and the possible reasons for their absence. In some sectors some judges had to be replaced, in one case because he was in prison, in others because they had died, etc.) and the new ones had to be sworn in.

Using the small pamphlet mentioned above, the president read out the 8 regulations that must be respected for the smooth functioning of the *Gacaca* meetings, such as that everyone must ask the president for permission to speak and that any speech must be relevant to the subject of the meeting.

After that the assembly discussed which day of the week, place and time, the meetings would take place. The president clarified what the tasks of the General Assembly would be and explained the topic of the next meeting (census etc., as mentioned above) Before closing the meeting the president called for questions, which were answered as clearly as possible, but not always satisfactorily. The categorisation of crimes of genocide proved difficult to explain and understand. For example, a president of the *Gacaca* court (Cyangugu) told the public that all the authorities who were present during the genocide would fall under the first Category.

Questions asked

Participation in the discussion varied from cell to cell; in some nobody asked any questions, in others there was a lively debate. The questions asked give a good idea of the population's concerns. The answers given, mostly by the president or one of the vice-presidents, showed that they often possessed insufficient knowledge of the *Gacaca* law and the process itself. This is understandable given that they all had at most only 36 hours of training and sometimes much less or even none at all, such as in the case of some judges who had replaced others.

¹⁹ For the composition of judges, see report I.

Also, many judges agreed with their trainers (for example in Umutara, Gitarama, Gikongoro and even in Kigali-town) that there hadn't been enough time to master the *Gacaca*-law and the organization and procedures of the process.²⁰

Recommendations

1. To carry out more training on the topics of the law and the organization of the *Gacaca* courts and its procedures before the *Gacaca* jurisdictions begin on a national level and to use instruments, such as the manual, already during training (previously, only the trainers had copies, but they should also be used by the student-judges) especially the ones chosen as members of the Coordination Committee;
2. To document successful techniques for the training sessions.
3. To organize training sessions on a continuous basis throughout the *Gacaca* process. The training should include discussions of successful techniques that judges elsewhere have used so they can learn from each other.
4. To use skilled judges for some of these training sessions.

The situation among the general population is a cause for greater concern; complaints such as the following are very common: “*I don't understand the functioning of the Gacaca jurisdiction, and I don't see its usefulness*”, and most of our local observers noted that indeed the majority of the population doesn't understand much and couldn't answer any question concerning these jurisdictions.

Some examples of questions asked by the population during the *Gacaca* meetings

Basic concepts:

- What is the difference between genocide and massacres?
- Concerning the period (Persons who died in attacks by *Interahamwe* in the North-West during 1998): Why are certain deaths more important than others?
- How will human rights violations before and after the genocide be dealt with?

Compensation (indemnités):

- If somebody who participated in the genocide died, how do we resolve the reparation question?
- Are you, the *Inyangamugayo*, going to fix the damages to be paid?
- When will compensation be paid?
- Does the *Gacaca* court have the power to force somebody who destroyed or plundered to reimburse the survivor/*rescapé*? And if this person is unable to repay, what then?
- When people returned in 1996, many paid for the damage they had caused. Do we now have to refund the victims a second time?

Gacaca Judges:

- If we discover – after the elections – that a *Gacaca* judge committed crimes during the genocide, what should we do?
- If the spouse of one of the judges is in prison because she or he killed, can that judge play a role during his spouse's trial?
- If a judge doesn't speak the truth, how will he/she be punished?
- Can judges testify?

Categorization:

- If somebody had a position of authority during the genocide, is he/she automatically guilty or only if he/she participated in the genocide?

Living together and reconciliation:

- How can we live together with the prisoners who are going to be released?

²⁰ For the next research period we plan to conduct a small survey to evaluate the knowledge of *Gacaca* judges in the pilot areas where the *Gacaca* law is implemented.

- If criminals don't ask for forgiveness, how can we know that they won't begin again?

Security:

- When we hear about *Gacaca* we are afraid, thinking about the persons who will leave prison. What can be done?
- Some people are afraid to testify, because by doing so they could risk their lives. What will be done?

Ethnicity:

- Why is *Gacaca* only concerned with one ethnic group?
- Why can't we discuss the Hutu who were killed in 1994 [by the FPR] at the same time as all the others?
- In April 1994 some [Tutsi] were on the run, only to return later. Others [Hutu] fled in July 1994. When the first group returned they plundered our stocks of sowing-seed. Can we get something back?

Confessions, denouncements and pardon:

- If you confess, do you talk only about what you did yourself or do you also have to talk about others?

Testimonies and witnesses:

- Is a detainee or survivor [*rescapé(e)*] allowed to react immediately if the case concerns him/her, to respond or to give testimony?
- How many witnesses or testimonies are needed to condemn a defendant?
- What should we do if a defendant lives elsewhere and his family hides him/her? If there is only one witness for the prosecution (*à charge*), how will the judges be able to establish the truth?
- Will everybody be obliged to tell what he/she knows about the death of his neighbours?
- How do we ask for witnesses who moved elsewhere?
- Are false testimonies prosecuted?
- How will somebody with a paid job be able to get time off work to accuse somebody or to testify? Rape and sexual torture:
 - Do women or girls who have been raped give their testimony in public?
 - Will they also receive compensation?
 - How can you testify against the man who raped you if it was done in secret and you are the only witness?

Difficulties to find certain perpetrators:

- How do we get at the truth if we don't know the names of the killers who came from other places; and how can we know anything about who killed victims far from where they normally lived?
- Among the *génocidaires* there were refugees from Burundi. We don't know where they are now, how can we try them?
- How can we know the names if the killers were soldiers (FAR)?
- If in a sector that was only inhabited by Hutus, Tutsis who came from elsewhere were all killed; who will denounce the killers?
- How do we get the *génocidaires* who don't live in this '*cellule*'?

Judicial Advisers:

- If there are problems which are difficult to resolve, can we ask for advice elsewhere?

Community Service:

- Does a condemned person have the choice of remaining in prison instead of doing Community Service?

Regarding the drawing up of lists:

- Concerning the persons who lived in the *cellule* just before the genocide started: do we have to name only the heads of households, the husband and wife, or every person living there?
- I wasn't registered; on what basis has somebody been put on the list or not?
- M is registered as dead while she lives in Kibungo; how is this possible?
- My child died and you put him down as still being alive. Why?
- The wife of T hasn't been registered. Why not?

The next meetings

During the next meetings the *Gacaca* jurisdictions started to prepare lists of persons per household who lived there just before the Genocide. It isn't an easy task to reconstruct the past, eight years later, especially if one cannot be sure whether being listed or not may have consequences later on. Some people refused to cooperate. In some *cellules* a fair number of people turned up, in others fewer came on each subsequent occasion, as in Gitarama.

In general we saw two methods used to establish such lists:

- By reconstructing the situation together, household by household, during the Assembly itself, which often led to endless discussions. People came with small pieces of paper, with a few (incomplete) names scribbled down which were often difficult to read, to recall the persons living in each household. Full names and ages were often unknown and memory gaps were frequent.
- By asking the leaders of the Ten-House groups (*nyumbakumi*) to prepare a list of households and the persons who lived there before the genocide began and to discuss these lists with the population during the Assembly in order to correct them and make additions. This last method seemed to be more effective and faster.

If the work couldn't be finished during one session (which was often the case because of long discussions on how to fill in the lists), the next session of the General Assembly and the *Siège* had to continue with the same activity. However it could be observed that many persons stayed away or came hours too late, which put the quorum of 100 at risk and the hour set (often 9:00 am) by the Assembly to start proceedings. Persons stayed away or arrived very late (11:30 –12:00) for several reasons, such as:

- Essential farming activities (the sorghum harvest): *“these meetings will bring us famine...”*
- Not wanting to sit for 4 hours or more in the burning sun (probably the reason why women with babies or small children often left earlier), without being given a chance to speak, listening to the prepared lists being read out loud;
- Parts of the Hutu population who lost family members as a consequence of retaliatory action in 1994 by RPF soldiers or others lost interest in participating in the *Gacaca* jurisdictions when it became clear that their dead relatives were not being taken into account;
- Once registered, people saw no reason to continue coming, and
- Because of the fear of being arrested (population) when showing any knowledge about certain events or a growing feeling of insecurity (*rescapés*), thinking back to what had happened. F (Butare): *“I have had enough of these meetings, I don't like to have to recall the names of my children who died, perhaps the ones who killed them are even now among us. The Gacaca frightens me. I am afraid that when the trials are over, we – the survivors – are all going to die”*.

In brief, we observed a growing lack of interest on the part of the population (often with the exception of many *survivors*) in this phase of the process, which is also shown by the fact that many participants gradually contributed less and less.

Recommendations

1. Despite these obstacles the work gets done, but this could rapidly change in the near future if nothing is done to improve the situation. Using force to make people participate goes against the spirit of the *Gacaca* jurisdictions and doesn't seem the right solution;

2. To speed up the procedure of preparing the lists of households, the procedure of asking the leaders of the ten house groups (*nyumbakumi*) to prepare the lists of the households beforehand should be generalized.

Traumas

We noted above some reactions of survivors (*rescapés*) from Butare, such as K. who became very angry when he was told that he had to wait until a later session to denounce someone and burst into tears, and F. who also became angry and said that he had had enough of the *Gacaca* jurisdictions, that he didn't like recalling the names of his children who had died in front of an audience where the killers were perhaps also present. He didn't want to go back to these meetings and was afraid for the future.

Some survivors [*rescapé(e)s* (Ruhengeri)] also stopped going to the *Gacaca* meetings, being unable to speak and to stop crying. In an earlier report we mentioned the traumas that many women who were raped had suffered.

It is clear that the *Gacaca* meetings do revive very painful memories that can lead to even more trauma among the victims. The infrastructure necessary to deal with these traumas is still insufficient, although the Government (MiniSanté) and associations such as *Médecins sans frontières* – MSF and *Association Rwandaise des Conseillers en Traumatisme* – ARCT are doing a good job in this field. Some of the detainees also seem to be quite traumatized (see below).

Recommendation

During the subsequent phase of the *Gacaca* jurisdictions (judgment) there will be a direct confrontation between both groups, which will need further preparation in the field of trauma counselling, especially at district level, where category 2 cases are handled .

Some thoughts about the start of the *Gacaca* Jurisdictions

The research resulted in quite diverse, sometime contradictory observations and data varied from one cell to another, even within the same sector, which makes it difficult to come to general conclusions. But some initial impressions and preliminary recommendations can be drawn up:

General Observations

Almost everywhere, the population and the *Inyangamugayo* started the procedure with enthusiasm, but since then interest in the *Gacaca* jurisdictions has been on the decline for several reasons mentioned above.

People generally hope that the *Gacaca* will indeed work (the survivors [*rescapés*], the families of some groups of detainees, the population in general). Others are afraid for the very same reason (potential first category persons in prison and those among the population who participated in the genocide but who are still free).

Recommendations

1. The use of coercion and force to make people participate goes against the spirit of the *Gacaca* jurisdictions and should be stopped.
2. To keep the *Inyangamugayo* motivated, they should receive some kind of compensation. This could also help prevent corruption.

3. The awareness-raising campaigns didn't reach the rural population sufficiently and should be intensified.
4. Further training of the *Gacaca* judges is needed.
5. The fear of the population, especially among the survivors (*rescapés*), and the feelings of insecurity should be taken seriously and addressed.
6. Trauma counselling should get more attention and not only for the priority group of survivors (*rescapés*), but also for groups among the detainees (minors, other vulnerable groups and those who are going to confess).
7. Regional, ethnic and (local) historical factors should be taken into account to better understand the various responses, attitudes and reactions to the *Gacaca* Jurisdictions.
8. The sessions of these *Gacaca* jurisdictions should be documented (by means of photos, film and audio registration) in order to capture this historical process and to contribute to the documentation of Rwandans' memory. It would be good if the 6th Chamber, could provide sound equipment for several *Gacaca* jurisdictions, not only to reach as many persons as possible, but also to facilitate audio recordings of these events of historical importance.

I have confessed, Pardon me !

The mayor of a rural district in Gikongoro and the director of the nearby central prison decided to try out certain aspects of the *Gacaca* procedure just before the official launch of the pilot phase of the *Gacaca* Jurisdictions, such as the confessions by detainees in front of the population where the crimes were committed. These meetings were also used to explain the *Gacaca* jurisdictions and the confession procedures to the rural population .

These experiments were very useful for the PRI research group because they offered an opportunity to see what could happen during the third phase of the *Gacaca* jurisdictions – the judgment. It is only at this moment, and especially during the public hearings in which all the parties (the accused, the victims, the witnesses, the members of the general assembly and everybody else in the community who wants to) can participate, that the accused detainee will have the opportunity to say whatever he wants in public concerning his case (categorisation, witnesses, etc), and has to repeat the confessions he or she made, complete them or make them for the first time; this is the last time the detainee is able to do so in order to benefit from a reduced sentence.

The PRI research team observed several of these meetings during which detainees confessed their crimes in public, after having informed the authorities beforehand. The prisoners arrived standing or squatting in the back of a truck and a pick-up which had taken them from prison to the '*collines*'. The singing men in pink behaved exuberantly, and according to some onlookers, not very much differently from the way gangs of killers had acted during the 100 days of the 1994 genocide, the main difference being the content of the songs, now dealing with reconciliation instead of killing...

The public sitting on the grass (about 3000²¹ persons) consisted of genocide survivors, families of the perpetrators and other persons belonging to the community. The authorities were sitting behind tables and the prisoners on benches.

Some onlookers didn't show any emotion at all. Others listened seriously with mixed feelings of anxiety, disbelief, shame and anger at what the detainees had to tell.²² Not only because of the terrible crimes revealed and the naming of accomplices who are still at large, but also owing to the often arrogant way the confessions were made: standing in the middle of the grass field the men (there were no women among the detainees) often spoke in a loud aggressive voice, a stream of words expressed without any visible sign of feeling or remorse, ending in vociferous attempts to pressure the victims to pardon them immediately, on the spot.

From the way some detainees acted, insisting on being pardoned, it looked as if they didn't realise that although victims may accept the apologies of the perpetrators, they also have the choice to refuse or ignore them, and that the non-acceptance of the apology by the victim,

²¹ This is an estimate. Because of the large numbers it would have been impossible to reach everybody without sound equipment. PRI assisted the Mayor who organised these meetings with such equipment.

²² Observation based on my own reactions, those of an American student, and above all those of my Rwandan colleagues who were present or transcribed the tapes, and of some members of the public during and after these sessions. Of the 60 detainees present, 20 confessed in public and only one showed real remorse. Rwandans – and especially men – don't show their emotions easily, but also many other Rwandans didn't like the performance of many of these detainees.

does not necessarily mean that a confession will not be accepted as sincere and complete. This will be decided by the *Gacaca* judges after hearing the cases, not by the victim.

None of us being psychologists, it was difficult to interpret with any accuracy the behaviour of these detainees as symptomatic of traumatic stress, which probably many perpetrators experience too after their participation in killings during the genocide, followed by many years of imprisonment.

But if this is difficult for us bystanders, how much more so it must be for the victims, who are often deeply traumatised, and other members of the community to accept that such a perpetrator is rehabilitated and to forgive him. This is particularly important and sensitive because if the confession of the accused is accepted, he or she can soon be released (although often sentenced to a Community Service order), and may become a neighbour again, after frequently having been exposed to Hutu Power ideology by hardliners in the prison with whom he or she will have lived for many years.²³

According to some specialists, confessions without real or genuine regret are very common. To say “*I was wrong, very sorry*”, can be done without true acknowledgement of one’s guilt, especially if it is just a matter of a verbal apology.²⁴

Recommendation: If this kind of defensive behaviour from the perpetrators isn’t recognized and widely discussed by the persons responsible for the *Gacaca* programme and by counsellors before the third phase of the *Gacaca* judgments starts, it could lead to huge problems for all the stakeholders in the process, causing an increase in social tensions and disruption, at least in the short term, instead of the peaceful cohabitation or reconciliation hoped for.

Some government departments, such as *MiniSanté*, the Ministry of Health, together with civil society groups such as ARCT, have been making provisions to tackle the trauma problem anticipated to coincide with the hearings, by training trauma counsellors and sensitising the population. But these activities seem to be directed specifically at genocide survivors and others among the population, and not so much at detainees.

Recommendation: Obviously, the group of genocide survivors must have the highest priority. But some preparation of at least those detainees who are going to confess could help to create a more favourable environment during the public hearings in the third phase of the *Gacaca* Jurisdictions.

During the sessions in the *collines*, the State, represented by one of the local authorities, sometimes granted pardon to a detainee who confessed. This seems a bit strange when it is officially only up to the *Gacaca* judges to decide if a confession is sincere (conforming to the

²³ PRI has worked since 1998 in the prisons of Rwanda where, according to our observations (see internal PRI note: “Some reflections on the reproduction of an undemocratic ideology and how to counter this”; Kigali, n.d.):

“(…) the same pre-genocide ideology/discourse could be reproduced daily inside these prisons as before, without any control or counter argument from outside. From talks with some lawyers who also visited the prisons and talked with the detainees this impression was only strengthened.” However it is good to remember that most prisoners who confessed are not Hutu Power extremists, but people who are eager to start again with normal life. If certain extremists confessed only to obtain their release, they would not represent a big danger for society because of the fact that they denounced others, which is seen by other hardliners as an act of treason and not as a basis for future joint clandestine activities.

²⁴ See McGrew, Laura: “Truth, Justice, Reconciliation and Peace in Cambodia: 20 Years After the Khmer Rouge”; Phnom Penh, 2000 –unpublished; p.30.

truth) or complete²⁵. Moreover, an official acceptance of such an apology doesn't make much sense if not followed by some direct action, and if it does not reflect the sentiments of the community itself.

A case: confessions of *génocidaires* in a rural district of Gikongoro²⁶

After a short welcome by the mayor and an explanation of what the *Gacaca* jurisdictions are all about, the 'president' of the group of prisoners who had confessed gave a speech. In his introduction he idealised the past when the ethnic groups were living together in peaceful co-existence and [traditional] *Gacaca* settled disputes.

The 'president' explained that their participation in the genocide was the consequence of 'bad policy', which had affected them all. Nowadays they were conscious of the fact that they had done serious harm. They had decided to go along with the Government's demand and tell the whole truth at the *Gacaca* jurisdictions, although confessing crimes was far from easy. He informed the public that they would ask the survivors of the genocide for pardon and that they were willing to promote unity and reconciliation:

Because of the problems that have submerged our country due to the war and the genocide of 1994, some of us prisoners are resolved to acknowledge our crimes, to speak, to confess, which is the procedure to be followed to ask for a pardon. We have taken such a decision following a review of the past and the present of Rwanda, also after finding that it is the only way that could lead us to unity and national reconciliation, which is the wish of our government.

(...)

not everybody would be ready to acknowledge his mistakes and recognize the wickedness of his actions. (...) it is really a struggle, one has to overcome one's shame, and this is the most difficult emotion to get over.

*Those who have harmed others must ask them for forgiveness. That is the right path chosen for this *Gacaca* in order to achieve good national reconciliation, as our government wishes.*

(...)

Therefore our resolve and our contribution is that we will tell the truth so that the survivors know the truth, but also to discharge the innocents who have been wrongly imprisoned. The State will also benefit as it will then know how to act; it is in this way that we will achieve real justice.

The 'president' of the prison group insisted that those who had confessed were conscious of the fact that they themselves were criminals and that they no longer see the survivors (*rescapés*) as their enemies.

²⁵ It is only after public hearings – during the third phase of the *Gacaca* Jurisdictions – that the *Inyangamugayo* of the *Siège* will decide among themselves if a confession is accepted or refused (see DJG/ASF: "Manuel Explicatif sur la loi organique portant création des Juridictions *Gacaca*", Kigali, 2001:32)

²⁶ Reportage sur la procédure d'aveu dans le cadre de *Gacaca*, épisode de Gikongoro, district Nkumbure le 30/05/2002.

Obviously the leader of the group of prisoners tried to separate his group from those *génocidaires* who didn't seem to feel personally guilty of the crimes they had committed and who blamed the genocide survivors who had accused them for their time in prison

After confessing, which shows that they have become aware that they were the criminals, [he articulated his words, as if to make it very clear what he meant] these people no longer view the survivors as their enemies. This is a major change. You see, for instance, we have come with about sixty persons who have confessed, but they are not the only ones. Their numbers increase day by day.

After having understood the seriousness of their crimes, they also realise that the survivors who accused them were right. They tried to imagine themselves in the place of the survivors and found that they, in their turn, would have done the same.

We are ready to ask you for pardon and beg you to grant it to us, as it was a bad policy of our country that led us astray.

The president asked the audience to pardon them:

And in the name of my comrades, I present our request for pardon. Will you grant it to us?

Probably the speaker had hoped for a positive reaction from the side of the public, but when nobody said anything, he concluded by saying:

Thank you! Thank you!

After this introduction, during which the “president” (leader) himself didn't make any personal confession, some other detainees came forward one by one to tell their story. some examples follow below :

The first, Jean, presented some terrifying statistical data of Tutsi families who lived in 1994 in the Kibirizi sector, how many were killed and how many survived the genocide, and he mentioned the names of some *génocidaires* who, according to him, had committed these crimes. Rape or sexual torture – category 1 crimes – were not mentioned. These kinds of statistics were produced by the detainees themselves during the pre-*Gacaca* sessions that took place in prison, as described in an earlier report. One can consider them as fairly reliable²⁷, as far as the events themselves are concerned, and they could be useful for the *Gacaca* judges at the cell level as an additional source of information. But the list with names of those suspected of having committed these crimes, provided by the detainees themselves, should certainly be used with a lot of caution.

My name is (...) Jean. I live among you, my brothers, men of my generation and even old men. I think everybody knows me except perhaps the visitors to whom I have the time to introduce myself. I hope you are as happy as I am because the truth will be brought to light and thus the persons detained unjustly will be released and the survivors will know the truth about the death of their children or their parents. There are very few prisoners who come from this district of Kibirizi. We have counted them, there are 49. 24 persons have been accused of the crime of genocide in Kibirizi, 7 are accused of other crimes, 14 are detained for massacres of the genocide committed in other districts and 4 have already died, and you knew them. You will judge the 24 accused of genocide in Kibirizi. Those who are innocent will be released and the real criminals will be punished. We have also listed the number of Tutsis who lived in

²⁷ These statistics can probably be seen as the lowest estimate of the number of serious criminal activities, because rape (a Category 1 crime), which happened on a large scale, is almost never mentioned.

the Kibirizi district: there were 22 Tutsi families with 120 members, distributed in 3 categories:

Categories	Living	Dead	TOTAL
Children	29	49	78
Women	10	13	23
Men	1	18	19
TOTAL	40	80	120

Jean stipulates that he didn't kill these 80 men, women and children alone, and that he and his friends are not going to take responsibility for these killings alone. They will mention all the names, not only of those who are imprisoned, but also of the ones who participated but who are never arrested.

We should consider this logically and see what part each one played in the death of the 80 persons. We shall not carry this heavy load all by ourselves. You are here to confess your part in it. I shall start with myself. I have confessed that I rooted someone out of his hiding place and then I killed him. However, I was not on my own and those who were with me kept silent! Our prisoner friends find it difficult to denounce their accomplices. I shall not accuse anyone. I am only giving you some examples and anybody who feels embarrassed will own up. I start with K's (...) house in Kabuga, where several persons were massacred. Then at G's (...) house, where the daughter of that old man was killed. Don't you know her? Yes, you do know her.

We pass on to M's (...) house where a young girl was killed. Are the people who I have named present here? They should not be afraid, they will not be arrested. Are they not here? No? Really not? It is their affair. Don't be surprised! Then to A's (...) house, the daughter of C (...).... We sometimes meet in prison and exchange experiences. If you don't do so, you are unfortunate and I am sorry for you.

While talking Jean raised his voice more and more, whereas some persons in the audience showed that they didn't feel very comfortable listening to his accusations.

There are others whom we took from Uw's (...) house, the son-in-law of Ur (...). If anybody knows anything to the contrary, I shall let you think on it. Can it be said that killers from other villages or cells killed the people of this place? Except maybe the Nyagishubi cell which was invaded by people from Cyongorozi, but who among us does not know them? It is unnecessary to mention them since everybody knows them and I have seen people from Muyove, Kamenge, Kamajoro, all of them are from the Nyagishubi cell, where I live.

What follows is rather common; many family members of prisoners seem to think that those who are detained are completely innocent. Because the sensitisation, especially of the rural population (with the exception of many detainees, the local authorities and some *rescapés*) has been insufficient, little knowledge exists of the confession procedures, and because there is often no time to talk with the detainees during the very short visits to relatives in prison, they often don't even know if their relatives have confessed or not.

We are four detainees, the fifth was in prison at the time. The families of the four detainees believe that their children are being detained unjustly; they wish for their immediate release. Somebody was killed at G... 's house. Is he present? It is said that this one was killed by

people from Mudasomwa who came from Bugarazi. The daughter of H... named Ka..., is there anybody from Nyagishubi here? It is said that he died on the bridge, in the company of the daughters of S... who were fleeing from an attack, coming from where? Is anybody here from Munyabunga? They may keep silent, but I shall reveal everything. The attack came from Gakoma. The people who attacked Nyagishubi, where did they come from? Eh... it doesn't matter. But bear in mind that nobody attacked us, we ourselves killed our brothers. In the meantime, I ask you to think about it... go on.

Almost all the testimonies have in common that people expect that innocent detainees will soon be released. But this is not so sure since the *Gacaca* judgments probably will start with those who confess, followed by members of the more vulnerable groups, such as minors, women, the elderly, etc., then the culprits will be punished, but those who confess will be treated with leniency. While talking, they mentioned the names of quite a lot of persons jointly responsible for their crimes, inside and outside prison, or declared their intention to do so in the near future.

The detainees stressed the fact that it is very hard to confess, not only for emotional reasons, but also because of intimidation by co-prisoners and the negative reactions of family members.

With a few exceptions, the public remained remarkably quiet in general, but the words they heard must have made an impact, because in the week that followed these meetings, some persons from this community fled.

Almost nothing was said about the causes of the genocide in general or about why they decided to participate in the killings:

Théo:

My name is Théo. I come from the ex-village of Mudasomwa, Nkumbure district, Nkur cell. I am one of the prisoners who confessed to crimes in the Nkumbure districts. There are others who have confessed, I am not the only one.

The following statement refers to the way the killings were often organised. A pack of killers often didn't murder in their own *cellule*, but elsewhere, although gangs from elsewhere were often invited to come to do the 'work' in a form of 'exchange' arrangement.

There are people who believe they are innocent in this affair because on their hill there were no Tutsis, thus there are no dead Tutsis, no houses destroyed, nothing. Yet people were killed in Murambi; did they commit suicide? And those who were caught running from one hill to the next, was it not the population mobilised for this activity? Think about it yourselves and reply. Those who do not want to confess and the members of their families call us who have confessed « Talibans », « Tutsi ». They ask us what will happen to us when things change.

It is obvious that the only aim of all these declarations is to intimidate us in order not to denounce the others. However, our determination is firm and we shall tell everything without hiding anything.

There are those who started by promising us money if we abstained from denouncing them. We say to them publicly that it is a waste of time. There are others who tell us that we have been too hasty, as the international community has signed an international amnesty agreement with the Rwandan government and that in a very short while it would be implemented. What you call a short time is for us an eternity. It has already been 8 years

since many people were jailed while you, you get married, and you celebrate all the time while we wait endlessly. Don't think that we have denounced you out of jealousy, not at all, but remorse for our crimes has been gnawing at our hearts. And in order to have a clear conscience, we have revealed all, all, all! Tomorrow, I shall be back in my district where I shall show all my co-team members. I invite you to come. Thank you.

From the regular references to God, Jesus and Bible texts, which was confirmed in interviews with many detainees, one can deduce that the confessions of guilt are also made due to religious motives. The following characteristic of Christianity, described by some Cambodian Buddhists in the following words: “*In Christianity, people can easily be forgiven and released from their sins*”²⁸, can have something to do with the popularity in the Rwandan prisons of Christian denominations and especially of the Evangelistic ones (like the Pentecostal movement or the Adventists). These churches have developed the custom of organising public confessions, while making it clear that God will forgive the sinners who confess, even if the Government or the survivors (*rescapés*) don't, although for their own sake it is considered better if they do.

Michel:

I am called Michel, I come from the village of Mudasomwa, Munini district. Our president spoke of the beliefs of the ancestors in a single god, our ancestor Ryangombe. Currently, Catholics live as Christians and carry rosaries. I very much regret that the so-called Christians that we are were the first to forget the vows that we made on the day of our baptism. Read Matthew 10:26 where Jesus said: « All that is hidden shall be revealed ». Jesus said that 2000 years ago. Did he not predict the Rwandan Gacaca? Elsewhere, Jesus said that if you made an offering to God and on the way you remembered that you had a quarrel with your neighbour, you should leave everything by the wayside and go back to reconcile yourself with your neighbour before returning to make your offering. Do you not see that Jesus also foresaw the unity and national reconciliation of Rwandans?

Here is my confession: the wife of my brother was killed during the genocide. It was on the morning of the 10th of April that I was given the sad news. I got ready to go and help with the funeral. Half-way there, at a place called Nkomi, I came upon a group of attackers who were going to Tare II to kill at the house of a woman called N. The members of the group made me follow them, otherwise I might have been killed. The attackers mobilised me and I followed them without responding, and they killed the woman in my presence. After the war, I did not blame myself for anything. When I was arrested, I did not accept my arrest, I felt I was unjustly detained. Some time later, I read some documents that explained the crimes.

(...)

Then (...) I realised what my share of responsibility in the killings at N's house was. I confessed to being present and I gave the names of those whom I still remembered; for those I may have forgotten, let others give the missing names.

(...) Therefore make your declarations quickly before it is too late. If the truth is not revealed, if the guilty are not known, the surviving victims will consider all their neighbours, all the inhabitants of the village as criminals or accomplices. They feel threatened from all directions, marginalized by all and distrustful of everybody. It is for us to put an end to this state of affairs, to initiate good cohabitation in unity and mutual trust. But this will only be

²⁸ Quoted in McGrew, 2000: 30-31.

possible if the whole truth is brought out in the open, if the criminals acknowledge their crimes, are remorseful and ask for forgiveness, and if the victims have the courage to pardon them. Then reconciliation could be achieved and the Rwandan community would regain its image of friendly solidarity (...)

This former school teacher ended by saying that the ‘*rescapés*’ also have to tell the truth if reconciliation and living peacefully together are the common objectives; that they also have to ask for pardon if they have given false testimonies. This idea is often heard from some prisoners, as well as from some members of their families, namely, that many ‘*rescapés*’, especially those who are members of organisations such as Ibuka (believed to have a tremendous power), fabricated false testimonies.

[I] remember our daily life with the survivors. We are all playing hide-and-seek. The time has come to stop playing that game.

The government has thought for us and has found a better strategy to re-establish unity among Rwandans. They are the Gacaca where each one will lay down his stone, telling all he has witnessed. Do not delay, the earlier the better. (...) It shows that among the survivors there are also those who admit giving false testimony and beg pardon. This is not a one-way process, quite the contrary. I wish all of you courage. Thank you.

During the next confession the audience could no longer remain calm. The detainee, as so many others too, said that he had participated in the genocide, because he was afraid of being seen as a supporter of the RPF if he had acted differently²⁹, and also because it proved to be quite beneficial. However, at the same time he had been proud to be accepted by the gang of killers, as somebody who “worked” (killed) well. The way he told his story did not please many among the public, although for often quite different reasons: the survivors (*rescapés*) because of the killings he described; and the families of prisoners and some among the audience because of the persons who were denounced.

Charles :

- I am sure that everybody is curious to hear the confessions of the terrible Charles, that is, myself. Doubtless you are saying to yourselves: « At last! Charles has also confessed! Yes, I have confessed to killing the child of that woman XN whom I see over there. Among my colleague prisoners, nobody is surprised, but I think that among you there are those who mock me. And yet, you are not all innocent, are you? I shall tell you the story of the death of that child so that its mother does not harbour feelings of rancour against anybody. The massacres started in the village of Nyamagabe, in the Nyagishubi district. It was the 9th of April. On Monday, the 11th of April, the most violent attackers came to ask me why I did not join the others in the fighting. They called me an accomplice of the FPR, and even more so because my brothers were either in Kigali or in exile. D is there, I see him, he can be my witness. My whole family was absent, I was alone. On the following day, Tuesday, the cruel day, we went to Remera, to the house of N. Those who were with me know it. We took 1,400,000 Frw, we pillaged everything, but we didn't kill anybody. N's wife asked me: « Say, are you the leader of this attack? ». I said: « No, it's not true. As you can see, I have not taken anything from your home ». And it was true that I had not pillaged anything. Around 2 pm we were here in Kabuga where R was, who stayed in Zaire. My father-in-law H (if he is here he should not be afraid, he will not be arrested) came to join us at R's house where we were

²⁹ Many offenders claim that they have been forced to participate in the genocide, but we will see later on that those claims are not always legitimate (see the case of the ‘*forgeron*’).

drinking banana beer. He asked me: « Hey, are you going back home without having killed anybody? ». I replied: « No, I didn't find anybody to kill », and he added: « You are nonetheless an accomplice, you shall see ». A short time later, he said to us: « I will show you where a “cockroach”³⁰ is hiding ».

« He told us that a “cockroach” was hiding in M's house. We decided to go there. S first had to take home the cassava flour he had just bought. He was going to eat it with the goat meat that he had stolen from that old woman whom I see. Can she come closer? Did S not steal a goat from you? Tell the truth? No? OK, forget it! Is there anybody? I am sorry for you in your trials! People do not want to confess, but we are telling all! There were two of us when we left Kabuga. When we arrived in Cyagasha, we saw a certain child called N, the son of Bambarangwe. I ask XN to follow with attention the stages of the death of your child. XN, you will forgive me afterwards, and even if you don't, God will forgive me.

The detainee seemed confident of being pardoned, which gave the impression of quite an arrogant attitude:

We found people such as N, the son of S, I don't know his name, two sons of M, R and his brother called H, N son of B, and S who lives behind the house of P. We all left together, I am not accusing anybody falsely of having entered the house. I went in together with the son of B, who lives in Kigarama; we went around the whole house and did not find anybody, above all Semuhuhora whom we were looking for. B can be my witness, as well as N, whom I found in his house and whom I asked if he had not seen Semuhuhora. He said no but shortly afterwards we saw his son and we said to ourselves: « he too is a little tutsi ». We took the little boy and with my machete I cut him and I threw him to the side of the road. Do you understand madam? Forgive me if you will, if you don't, so be it, but I would personally like you to forgive me!

This was too much for many among the audience, and one could hear certain persons murmur “enough, stop this!...”, after which the detainee resumed again, but asking this time for pardon, in a more polite way:

When I returned, I boasted aloud about my bravery. I felt proud of having done an « action », so I would no longer be called an accomplice of the FPR. I was given some drink and everybody congratulated me and said I had worked well. You can jeer at me, but that was the practise. After having accomplished my task, I did not go outside so as not to be seen by the children of G of whom everybody was afraid. I thus confess my crime to you and beg to ask forgiveness from that mother. [He repeated this twice and this time in more remorseful voice]. And I end my confessions by asking you to pardon me if you will, I do not oblige you to do so. And I shall ask her at least to come and greet me. Doesn't she want to?

³⁰ The Tutsi were known under the name *inyenzi* or cockroaches, the name given to the armed guerrillas who undertook – in the beginning of the 1960s – several raids into Rwanda which targeted the officials of the new regime. According to Mamdani (2001:129-130) these raids invited cruel repression as the local Tutsi population was targeted as active or potential support for the *inyenzi*. A raid turned, in the opinion of this author, into a signal for the massacre of the local Tutsi population, and for the distribution of their property, rewarding perpetrators with benefits. It is estimated that during these first years of the 1960s between 750 (estimate by the Government at the time) and 20,000 Tutsis were killed. After the November-December raids of 1963 between 5,000 and 8,000 were killed in the préfecture Gikongoro (the core area of Tutsi opposition) alone, killings which involved enthusiastic popular participation.

XN [from the middle of the audience]: *If your confessions are really sincere then I forgive you. [But the tone in which she said this indicated that her pardon was artificial]*

-The pardoned detainee: *Let us thank that woman for her courage in pardoning me. If everybody can be like her, the Gacaca will go quickly and reconciliation will be possible. I urge you all to have the courage, especially those who have been denounced here, to tell what you have done and what the others have done. In this way there will be no more suspicion.*

- *Do you have anything else to add, you who live here? Truly, it is not our fault, but I ask you to collaborate to discover where the other children of this woman were massacred because it cannot be very far off. I therefore thank my sister here who has granted me her pardon (...)*

The public remained silent and Charles continued with his narrative, this time about the death of another boy. He wasn't involved in the killing himself and he didn't even want to be present, because there were family connections between him and the child. However, he indicated one of the killers, the son of a woman in the audience. The woman got furious and reacted very negatively while listening to his accusations:

Another child was killed; it was Monday, he was found in the latrines of V's house, son of D. The people of Nyagashubi know him and I can explain the death of that child. He was called Kamondo, the son of Seburikoko on the road to Kabuga, in the reforestation of Gakwaya, I heard the shouts of men announcing the discovery of a "cockroach". We approached the place where the noise was coming from and learned that it was a child who had been found in the open latrines. There were many of us who watched without doing anything; there were men, women and young men, such as H, B, N, N, the son of B, H of Nyirangegeera, V, and S of Gasherebuka.

We did not know how he fell in the hole. S, who lived nearby, informed us that he had also heard him shout asking for water, and that he had come to look and then appealed for help. We decided to get him out of the latrines, but because my sister-in-law was a blood relation of S's wife, this child was my brother-in-law. I did not want to know how he ended his life. When I saw them take him to a hill, I left. Among the people who took him, there were M, son of B, there was a son of N with light skin, the one who is following the soldier, yes, I remember. Don't look at me like that, pardon me; it is not my fault. But you know him, don't you, your son there?

Do you affirm that you do not know your son who is following the man who is a soldier? Denounce him or not, it is your own affair entirely! So, don't you know that we also have women genocide killers? We have one, but she is not accused of the genocide in Kibirizi. All this is only a foretaste of what will happen during the Gacaca. I advise you not to act according to your feelings. You should denounce them even if they are your father, your mother, your uncle, your father-in-law, etc. And I end my confession by begging you to pardon me if you will, I do not oblige you to do so. And I shall ask her at least to come and greet me. Doesn't she want to?

He finished by saying "It is not my fault that your son killed and you had better denounce him yourself!"

Conclusions and some recommendations

The material of such meetings as described above seemed very useful because it showed some important issues to take into account, while preparing the third phase of the *Gacaca* programme:

- a) The concern of some local authorities to do everything to make the *Gacaca* process work well and their willingness to test some parts of the *Gacaca* jurisdictions in advance is very recommendable because these meetings had an important awareness-raising impact concerning the functioning of the *Gacaca* courts and their possible outcome.

Recommendation: to continue with this kind of trial

- b) Some detainees (still a minority, but a growing one) indeed seemed eager to confess, to describe their role in some killings and to denounce their accomplices in prison who had not yet confessed and even those who were still in liberty. It gave hope to some survivors (*rescapés*) that perhaps the ‘truth’ would finally come out, but it also frightened many others.
- c) The detainees tend to explain the genocide only as the consequence of bad politics of the former government, which put them in an awkward position. They don’t seem to take personal responsibility for their actions, although they confessed and apologised for their crimes, which seems contradictory, but as explained above, probably is not so from their perspective.
- d) The fact that for many in the local community it was probably the first time they heard such confessions and also because of the way they were often made (on the one hand delivered either without showing any feelings or conversely with considerable aggression) seemed to shock the population in general and the survivors in particular, who had reasons to doubt if these confessions were ‘sincere’ because no remorse was shown. Others among the public seemed to be shocked because of the accusations made and the naming of accomplices. The reaction of the assembly in general was mostly one of falling silent.
- e) Certain prisoners perhaps hadn’t realised that the victims would not automatically accept the apologies of the perpetrators, but that they also had the power to refuse or ignore them, and that the non-acceptance of the apology by the victim does not necessarily mean that a confession will not be accepted as sincere and complete.
Recommendation: Further awareness-raising initiatives on this point could be useful, including also the necessity on the part of detainees to present themselves less arrogantly and more humbly.
- f) Denouncing people still at liberty can lead to security problems, such as the flight of the accomplices who have been named or worse.
Recommendation: this issue is to be taken into account in the near future.
- g) The detainees who confessed often encountered a lot of pressure from other prisoners and had to deal with intimidation from them and often also marginalisation by their own families. [For recommendations in this field, see Report I].

- h) The *Gacaca* jurisdictions could perhaps make good use (as an additional source of information, to be checked of course) of the statistics concerning the crimes committed as established by detainees during the *Gacaca* sessions in the prisons. [Recommendation, see also Report I].
- i) Corruption plays and played a role: detainees are sometimes paid or offered payment for not denouncing their accomplices. Even some Genocide survivors, who at the time were living in conditions of extreme poverty, seem to have previously accepted payments from *génocidaires* in order not to accuse them.
Recommendation: some compensation for the *Gacaca* judges could help to combat further corruption and undermine it.

The blacksmith (*forgeron*)³¹ who said NO: thoughts about genocide, power struggle and reconciliation

We will first use the following case of the Hutu blacksmith from Gikongoro,³² who helped some Tutsi neighbours and got away with it, to suggest that such a case or similar ones, could perhaps be positively promoted as role models in order to contribute to reconciliation, and for those among the mass of the population who lost self-esteem, and for those survivors who still distrust every Hutu. This could be achieved, for example, by setting up in Rwanda a project such as *Citizens Network* (RCN) carries out in Burundi under the name of “*Appui à la culture des actes justes*”³³, by profiling and promoting “just acts”, a good practice that given persons undertook during the genocide in order to save others, often taking great personal risks and endangering themselves and their families in consequence.

But secondly, we propose to use this same case of the blacksmith (*forgeron*) to discuss a related question, which is also the central concern of the above mentioned book of Mamdani³⁴: how to explain the mass participation in the Rwandan genocide, the fact that many did enthusiastically join in the killing?

Thirdly, the case of the blacksmith (*forgeron*) proved to have some interesting ideas about *Gacaca* and Reconciliation.

To save or not to save?

We found the blacksmith (*forgeron*), a friendly-looking, strong, stocky man of about 65 years in his workshop, a simple shed of about 9 m² where he sat hammering a glowing piece of metal on an old anvil, while one of his two young helpers built up the fire with a traditional pair of bellows of the type African blacksmiths have been using for over 1000 years.

From one of his neighbours, we had heard that during the genocide the blacksmith (*forgeron*) had helped to save the lives of a number of persons:

-*Question: Were you able to save some people or give help?*

-*Blacksmith: For example, a woman (Hutu) called Madima, managed to save a baby from the place where there was fighting. This baby was still very small and Madima needed money to buy a shawl to help her carry the child on her back. I lent her the money. We established a*

³¹ Blacksmith

³² Tape n°010-A: Interview with a blacksmith of Gikongoro...

³³ See RCN-Burundi: “*Appui à la culture des actes justes*”; Bujumbura, 2002. A project that aims at “restoring and promoting positive cultural values within civil society to harmonize relations among its various groups (...)”. More specifically it aims at “stimulating the rebirth of social and cultural values and their transmission by community-based activists who have been trained in such techniques: story tellers, singers, actors... Incite artists to produce symbolic work related to justice and human rights. To create a link between the values of the (...) society and universal human rights”. Above (...) stands for Burundese, but this could easily be replaced by Rwandese. According to certain experts “culture in such forms as art, music or theatre has proven an effective tool in many countries recovering from trauma” (McGrew, 2000:42).

³⁴ Mamdani, 2001:17-18

contract for reimbursement³⁵, but unfortunately Madima died before paying me back. The child is for the moment being kept in the SOS village of children near by.

(I managed to save M.³⁶), his old mother, Mukandekazi, had lost her first husband and her second husband. After that, she had a child called M who currently works in the parish. I loved that boy a lot so during the war I declared that he was mine and nobody dared to kill him. As he was born after the death of both his mother's husbands, nobody ever knew who his natural father was. I even asked for an identity card at the village as if he were my own son and he was given one³⁷.

-Q: Is his natural father not known?

-B: I don't know him either. I loved him because his mother had done me a lot of favours. I never made love to her. For a very long time, she had been my father's friend and my friend too. Her husband had also been a good friend of my father's. It was as if we all belonged to the same family, only our ethnicity was different.

M is Tutsi. Even her mother was left intact. Unfortunately, I did not manage to save her brothers because everybody knew her Tutsi father. If I managed to save M, it is because people thought that I might be his father.

The blacksmith (*forgeron*) managed to save his young friend because the *génocidaires* accepted what he told them, but it could equally have gone wrong.

Large-scale participation:

The blacksmith (*forgeron*) had not only saved some persons, but had not participated in the genocide at all, nor had one of his sons. But why did so many participate in the large-scale massacres?

-B: I was not engaged in the actions of the war. Those who threw themselves into it body and soul had certain interests at heart. I was satisfied with what I earned through my work, I did not covet other peoples' possessions.

On the other hand, some had a thirst for power. Well, for a very long time, I have never had any function in the administration. I have always been a blacksmith, and I have always lived in harmony with everybody without distinction. Nobody envied me, nobody could be jealous of me as I was not powerful. And yet, when the elections of the cell members were held, for those responsible, etc., people begged me to stand as a candidate, but I refused. It was thus that during the war, as I did not exercise any power, I managed to avoid the acts of vengeance wreaked by those who were in power. I had no political interests to safeguard, neither for myself nor for my children. I withheld from politics when I was still young and full of energy, it is not now in my old age that I would start to become involved. Some people had children who were in politics or in the army, they would not have wished them to lose their place or their grade. But I did not have anybody like that among my children. I was very aware of the injustices that were committed on either side and I would intervene whenever I could. This is how I behaved throughout the war.

³⁵ Copy dated 21/07/1994 available.

³⁶ Cf. « L'entretien avec un jeune rescapé de Gikongoro au nom de M(...) » (Interview, May 2002)

³⁷ Unfortunately this document was lost.

Gikongoro for a long time has had a reputation as an unfertile region. It was called the region of the Bakiga, who were hostile to the Tutsis. After 1959, Tutsis and Hutus cohabited uneasily with each other. But people did not fight only for ethnic reasons. It is a poor region, ravaged by famine most of the time, and April is a month of poverty. People therefore took advantage of the war to get things by taking possession of everything they could lay their hands on.

Since very far back my grandfather had been a blacksmith. He lived on good terms with the Tutsis. I too, from a young age, had good relations with the Tutsis. I thus felt inclined to protect the Tutsis rather than kill them.

-Q: The Hutus who lived on good terms with the Tutsis turned against them during the war. How do you explain your exceptional behaviour?

-B: This is the reason: those who turned against the Tutsis had children in power at all levels of the administration: the members of cells, councillors, burgomasters, ministers and even soldiers. They wanted to safeguard the honour of their children. I did not have anybody in any of these categories.

To point out the role of the authorities in the preparation and organisation of the genocide, as many observers do, doesn't totally explain why so many ordinary Hutus turned against their Tutsi neighbours. The 'traditional' obedience to authority of a mostly illiterate peasant population doesn't either, although both factors played an important role, in particular the hate campaign by Hutu political extremists.

Mamdani³⁸ discusses this question by analysing the genocide not only as a state project, but also as the result of both planning and participation. In other words, the genocide was, according to Mamdani, also a social project because it resonated with perspectives from below: an antidote to Tutsi privilege and a way to defend the power obtained during the so-called 1959 revolution which removed the Tutsi from politics and sent many into exile. To resolve this, Hutu Power extremists – who took over after the President's death – decided that this could only be attained through genocide.

Indeed, as the blacksmith (*forgeron*) said, it wasn't only because of their ethnic identity that the Tutsi were killed; it had everything to do with material and political interests and a struggle for power. Although he mentioned incidentally that he was personally very sensitive to all forms of injustice, no matter by which side, he was also able to give a socio-political analysis of his behaviour and that of others who did participate in the genocide. He gave some weight to economic factors, such as poverty and famine, to explain the genocide, but he emphasised above all the political aspect of the genocide, or (in Mamdani's terms) he understood the violence of genocide as political violence.

One can often hear and read – and indeed enough examples are known – that many perpetrators were forced to kill or killed reluctantly, husbands sometimes even their own wives. But in Gitarama as well as in Gikongoro we found Tutsi women, married to Hutu men before 1994, who survived. Detainees told us that they killed Tutsi and that others came to kill Tutsi in their communities, but not their own Tutsi wives ('a woman takes the tribe of her husband' one often heard) who they managed to protect. And from what the blacksmith (*forgeron*) told us, one can ask oneself the question if the argument '*I was forced to kill*' hasn't also been used by certain perpetrators as an excuse to deny any responsibility or to suppress (consciously or not) painful memories. But if the scale of this 'forced killing' should be somewhat corrected, the need to understand and to explain the massive killings by

³⁸ Mamdani, 2001; Chapter 7 "The Civil War and the Genocide":185-233

hundreds of thousands of ordinary people who became willing executioners, becomes even more important.

Q: It is said that everybody was supposed to take part in the killings, otherwise you were threatened with death. You and your family, did you not receive threats?

-B: Here no one threatened anybody. Many people did not kill anybody and they were not persecuted.

-Q: But everybody was supposed to do the night rounds and it was then that the killings occurred. Didn't you make the rounds?

-B: The rounds were voluntary, not obligatory. Even now, rounds are made but it is not an obligation to go.

Following Mamdani again – the political struggle referred to above is in particular the one between competing Hutu and Tutsi elites. This power struggle between these two ethno-political groupings took place in the context of a civil war that the Habyarimana regime was losing. According to Mamdani many Hutu, members of the post-1959 Hutu middle class, as well as ordinary peasants who would not have access to land but for the land reform that followed 1959, *feared* that they would lose out if the Tutsi would win. Seeing themselves as potential victims of the RPF, they also demonised the opponents and were willing to follow the Hutu extremists.

But not our *'forgeron'* who didn't have much to lose nor gain, although he admitted that perhaps if he or one of his sons would have had political interests to defend, he could have acted differently:

-Q: Does this mean that if you had a child in power, you would engage in acts of war?

-B: Suppose my son were burgomaster or mayor at the time. I don't know how I could have refused his order if he had convinced me that those who were fighting against us were doomed to failure. Maybe I would have done it in his interest or his power. Imagine that somebody gave you everything and put a vehicle at your disposal so that you could help him stay in power. Would that not be enough to fight for him? I think that those who persevered in the war wanted to protect the power of their loved ones. So, really, don't you see as I do that their power was shattered?

Turning a new page: about *Gacaca* and reconciliation

According to the blacksmith (*forgeron*) traditional *Gacaca* meant to reconcile families with the participation of the whole community and not only the individual who had done harm, like in the *Gacaca* jurisdictions. He warns that to succeed the *Gacaca* jurisdictions shouldn't pronounce heavy penalties, because then it won't merit the name *Gacaca*. He seems to see reconciliation as building relationships and to arrive at this, the family of the guilty person and the perpetrator himself have both to ask to be pardoned and vow never to let it happen again and the family of the victim has to accord pardon. Both parties will have to move forward. Considering what had happened in the past, he thought that it could be difficult for the genocide survivors to accept apologies, but they would have to contribute to the reconciliation by pardoning.

*-Q: Do you think that these *Gacaca* trials will solve the disagreements between Rwandans?*

-B: The Gacaca has always existed. When somebody harmed someone else, both families would be sent for and the family of the one who was recognized as being guilty would ask the family of the victim for pardon in his name. It was not an affair between two individuals. It was the families who would reconcile. In this new system, if one admits that the guilty should ask for pardon and that the victims should grant it, I don't know if the latter will grant it, although in the past they would have done so, as the guilty party would swear never to do it again.

It is quite possible that this last point – *the promise not to commit the offence again* – was stronger in the traditional *Gacaca*, because the Christian culture that penetrated Rwanda made it probably easier than before, as we saw above, for people to confess and be forgiven.

-Q: And if it is the individual who asks for pardon, do you believe that it is harmful for the Gacaca trials?

-B: Let us say that in the past, it was not only the family of the guilty party who would beg for forgiveness. All the participants in the Gacaca pleaded in his favour and in favour of the family of the victim, so that one would pardon the other. And all would insist that if the malefactor should offend again, there would be no more pardon.

-Q: What do you think of the elections of the honest judges (Inyangamugayo)? Are they really honest? Were they held democratically?

-B: The honest judges were elected at different levels: The honest judges elected at higher levels are perhaps mature men, but those at lower levels, I doubt it. Of course, I must not denigrate them before they prove what they are capable of, but... As everybody knows, the Gacaca is designed to reconcile families and I hope that the people who planned the Gacaca also had this vision. The Gacaca does not intend to inflict very harsh sentences. If Gacaca is now intended to punish, it does not deserve to be called Gacaca. It should be called by another name.

-Q: You have spoken of a reconciling Gacaca. What do you believe needs to be done in order that this reconciliation is possible?

-B: It is important to raise awareness among the survivors so that they agree to grant pardon. This does not mean that they were not offended against, but they should contribute to this reconciliation by pardoning. There are many people who lost family members and did not say anything. I too have lost members of my family, but... War does not make ethnic distinctions, people from all ethnic groups die during wars.

-Q: What will you say during the Gacaca trials?

-B: I shall denounce those I saw.

Acknowledgements

Our research reports are the outcome of team work, first of all of PRI's *Gacaca* research team (Léonilla Musengimana, Charles Kayibanda, Salim Bucyanayanda and Marco Longari), but also of our PRI colleagues in Kigali (Gareth Richards and Federica Loretoni) and Paris (Ahmed Othmani, Véronique Geoffroy-Cyimana and Barbara Liaras); of translators as Geneviève Mukandekezi and this time also of colleagues like Louisa Lombard and the following temporary interviewers/observers: Etienne Kabera, John Nkubana, Bernadette Mukashyaka, Gilbert Musoni, Innocent Ntihabose, Gideon Ngirimana, Odette Dusabe, Théoneste Musabyimana and Pascal Gashumba. Thanks to all! Klaas de Jonge.

Kigali, July 2002

Klaas de Jonge
Penal Reform International
BP 370 Kigali, Rwanda

Annex

Discours de Paul Kagame à l'occasion du lancement officiel des travaux des juridictions gacaca, le 18 juin 2002³⁹.

Comme nous le savons tous, le génocide et les massacres ont détruit et endeuillé ce pays et l'ont laissé face à des problèmes insurmontables, dont certains liés à la justice.

Les rescapés du génocide et des massacres ont été torturés de manière épouvantable. Les péchés commis doivent être réprimés et punis, mais aussi pardonnés.

Le nombre de gens qui ont commis le génocide est très élevé. Il est bien connu que les tribunaux classiques ne peuvent traiter tous ces dossiers. C'est pour ça que les Rwandais sont allés chercher un autre moyen pour régler le contentieux du génocide.

La gacaca a cinq objectifs :

- 1) Faire connaître toute la vérité sur ce qui s'est passé;
- 2) Accélérer les jugements;
- 3) Déraciner la culture de l'impunité;
- 4) Unir les Rwandais sur la base de la justice tout en renforçant l'unité et la réconciliation;
- 5) Démontrer la capacité de la famille rwandaise à résoudre ses propres problèmes.

Il faudrait analyser minutieusement ce qui s'est passé dans notre pays. Établir la différence entre le génocide et les autres crimes commis pendant ou après la guerre. Il ne faut pas faire l'amalgame.

Il y a des gens qui ont été tués par des actes de vengeance commis par des individus, et lorsque ces derniers ont été identifiés, ils ont été punis sévèrement. Donc, qu'on prouve ces crimes et nous poursuivrons leurs auteurs.

On sait que les bourreaux de l'époque ont entraîné la population dans la guerre et les actes de tueries.

Il y a des gens – des Rwandais comme des étrangers -- qui ne voudraient pas que les Rwandais aillent de l'avant et abandonnent les vieux clivages. Ils appellent génocide les crimes de vengeance, ce qui est archi-faux. Ce discours vise à nier le génocide. Ils veulent maintenir les Rwandais dans la division. Et ils font oublier que ce sont les Rwandais eux-mêmes qui ont arrêté le génocide, alors que le monde ne faisait rien.

Je demande que les tribunaux gacaca soient respectés comme les tribunaux classiques. Je demande à tous les Rwandais à tous les échelons d'appuyer les tribunaux gacaca, notamment en disant la vérité. Je voudrais inviter tout particulièrement les victimes du génocide à faire preuve de tolérance et de patience envers le témoignage de ceux qui savent.

J'invite les bourreaux à faire preuve de courage et d'avouer, de se repentir et de demander pardon.

³⁹ Translation by RCN from Kinyarwanda into French

Je demande aux personnes élues d'être vraiment des personnes intègres. Je leur demande d'éviter les discriminations basées sur les relations de famille, sur les tribus, sur l'origine ou sur les gains qu'ils ont faits (dans le cadre du génocide).

En appuyant la gacaca, nous montrons notre patriotisme et notre amour du Rwanda.

La justice est la levure de l'unité et la fondation du progrès.