

International Alert.

HEALING FRACTURED LIVES: Reconciliation and reintegration in Rwanda

Aurélien Tobie with François Masabo

September 2012



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

MISEREOR
IHR HILFSWERK

Understanding conflict. Building peace.

About International Alert

International Alert is an independent peacebuilding organisation that has worked for 26 years to lay the foundations for lasting peace and security in communities directly affected by violent conflict. We also seek to influence the policies and practices adopted by governments, international organisations such as the UN, and multinational corporations in an effort to reduce the risk of conflict and improve the prospects for peace.

We maintain a presence in Africa, several Asian regions, the South Caucasus and Latin America, and we have recently begun working in the United Kingdom. Our thematic projects work at several key levels directly related to the development of peace and security. These include the economy, climate change, gender, the role of international institutions, the impact of development aid and the effects of good and bad governance.

International Alert is one of the world's largest peacebuilding NGOs, with more than 159 employees based in London and 14 offices around the world. For further information about the work we do and the countries in which we maintain a presence, please visit www.international-alert.org.

The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of International Alert and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States government, or of Misereor.

© International Alert 2012

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without full attribution.

Layout by D. R. ink

Front cover image: © Carol Allen Storey on behalf of International Alert

HEALING FRACTURED LIVES: Reconciliation and reintegration in Rwanda

About the authors

Aurélien Tobie is a peacebuilding practitioner with experience working in the Great Lakes region of Africa. Aurélien has worked with International Alert as a Senior Programme Officer, working alongside local civil society organisations as well as with international agencies and donors to help them reflect on their analysis and the implementation of their projects in conflict-affected regions. Aurélien's expertise focuses on land conflicts, mediation theory and practice, the reintegration of ex-combatants and conflict analysis.

Prof. François Masabo is a senior researcher at the Center for Conflict Management (CCM) in the National University of Rwanda. He is also a Lecturer in two Master's Programmes run by CCM: *Genocide Studies and Prevention* and *Peace studies and Conflict transformation*. Prof. Masabo holds a PhD in Sociology of Change, Crisis and Conflict from the Marc Bloch University of Strasbourg, France. His research interest mainly focuses on genocide memory and prevention, peacebuilding processes, social transformation and how to tackle new challenges in post-conflict development.

Acknowledgements

This report has been made possible by the support of the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and Misereor. We would like to thank both organisations for providing the opportunity to conduct this study. We thank the government of Rwanda for their support, as well as the many citizens of Rwanda and staff of national and international organisations working in Rwanda who gave their time to talk to us about their experiences and to provide us with information, analysis and ideas. In particular, Alert would like to thank our five Rwandan partner organisations, with which we are implementing our reconciliation and reintegration work in Rwanda. These are: Pro-Femmes/Twese Hamwe, Umuseke, the Rwandan Association of Trauma Counsellors (ARCT Ruhuka), Duterimbere Asbl, and Duterimbere IMF.

Contents

Acronyms	4
Executive summary	5
1. The context	8
1.1 Rwanda post-genocide	8
1.2 The reconciliation and reintegration project	9
2. Debates surrounding reintegration	12
2.1 The multidisciplinary approach	12
2.2 The inclusiveness of the target group	14
2.3 The level of engagement	16
2.4 Reintegration and its links to reconciliation	18
2.5 The issue of reparative justice, reconciliation and reintegration	19
2.6 A proposed framework for understanding reintegration	21
3. Recommendations	23

Acronyms

ARCT Ruhuka	Rwandan Association of Trauma Counsellors (<i>Association Rwandaise des Conseillers en Traumatisme</i>)
AVEGA	Association of the Widows of Rwanda (<i>Association des Veuves du Génocide Agahazo</i>)
CNLG	National Commission for the Fight against Genocide (<i>Commission Nationale de Lutte contre le Génocide</i>)
FARG	Genocide Survivors Support and Assistance Fund (<i>Fond pour Assistance aux Rescapés du Génocide</i>)
IGAs	Income-generating activities
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NURC	National Unity and Reconciliation Commission
RDRC	Rwanda Demobilisation and Reintegration Commission
RWF	Rwandan Franc

Executive summary

This paper focuses on the lessons learned and current situation in terms of reconciliation and reintegration efforts in Rwanda. Taking the *Fostering Reconciliation and Socio-Economic Reintegration in Rwanda* project implemented by International Alert and its partners as its starting point, it describes and analyses the main features of reconciliation and reintegration efforts in Rwanda. The target groups it considers are genocide survivors, former combatants, ex-prisoners and youth. While each of these groups has had different experiences of the genocide period and its aftermath, all have been affected by the violence psychologically, socially and economically.

The rebuilding of Rwandan society after the 1994 genocide against the Tutsis has demanded, and indeed still demands, considerable effort. The Rwandan state, the international community, civil society, the private sector, and others have all invested a great deal into finding ways for the country to recover from this unprecedented tragedy. Eighteen years after the genocide, it is time to learn the lessons of implemented programmes, and to try and envisage a way forward for those agencies currently involved in reconciliation and reintegration activities.

This paper describes six main characteristics and question points around reintegration efforts in Rwanda. It investigates the benefits and challenges of a multidisciplinary approach in reconciliation and reintegration programming. Such holistic approaches are now widely accepted as being extremely beneficial to affected populations and are increasingly used. However, they are challenging to implement, especially with regard to pooling necessary expertise and securing sustainable funding.

A second point explored by the research team was the possibility of designing programmes which target an inclusive group, made up of all affected populations, even former “adversaries”, instead of separate programming for each group. This paper argues that, while some initial separation of groups might be necessary and even desirable, it is recommended to aim towards an inclusive group of beneficiaries. Early results of inclusive approaches to the participation of target groups show that these approaches have direct benefits for social cohesion and are more in line with the goal of a unified Rwandan society.

The third research question concerned the challenges of responding to the enormous demands of reintegration, and whether coordination was effective at the national level to meet all the needs of the Rwandan population. While there is considerable attention to reintegration as a policy priority, a rather top-down approach and confusion about the goals of some programmes may have reduced effectiveness on the ground. The study thus recommends that a national platform for coordination on reintegration be created and that agencies investigate the possibility of including a strategic “multiplier effect” in their programmes.

A major obstacle to reintegration faced by all agencies and affected populations in Rwanda is the thorny issue of justice and reconciliation. With formal support to the Gacaca process having ended in June 2012, the implementation of Gacaca decisions and remaining needs for justice pose a potential trigger for conflict in Rwanda.¹ The study identifies key areas for research and proposes ways to better understand the connection of these important themes of reintegration, reconciliation and justice.

¹ Gacaca was a justice mechanism created in Rwanda in January 2001 to prosecute genocide crimes and other crimes against humanity committed between 1st October 1990 and 31st December 1994.

Finally, the report proposes a framework for mapping reintegration in Rwanda. It describes how distinguishing more clearly between rehabilitation, reinsertion and reintegration activities could help clarify who does what, and boost progress towards effective reintegration and reconciliation in the long term.

The key recommendations stemming from the report's analysis include:

At the national level:

- ***Create a national platform for coordination on reintegration.*** This platform would include government and civil society. It would have a mandate to map actors engaged in rehabilitation, reinsertion and reintegration activities. It would also offer a space for discussion of particularly challenging issues, such as the interaction between justice and reintegration. Lessons learned would be shared and examples of successful approaches could be exchanged to improve current programming and coordination. Similarly, information gathered at the grassroots level could be made available to state agencies to help them adapt their programmes and policies and address any emerging gaps.
- ***Develop a roadmap and national strategy for reintegration, in coordination with state and non-state agencies engaged in reintegration programmes.*** This would include an analysis of the current needs in terms of reintegration, and set out clear landmarks for progress, as well as the approaches that are effective in the Rwandan context.
- ***Some state services could do more to take into account the legacies of the genocide and its consequences, ensuring that social provision responds to these specific needs.*** Policies in terms of health, education, housing or economic development should continue or strengthen the mainstreaming of specific care for people affected by the genocide.
- ***Take care not to reinforce divisive messages in Rwandan society through the provision of services.*** People's different experiences of the genocide will help determine their specific needs, for example some will need trauma counselling and rehabilitation, while others will not. Nevertheless, it is important that economic development and social services are made available to all Rwandans, whatever their experience of the genocide.
- ***Donors should continue to support reintegration and reconciliation efforts,*** funding activities aimed at the rehabilitation of people affected by the genocide, their reintegration, and the mainstreaming of their care within Rwandan social services, as well as initiatives that are geared towards the long-term reconciliation and social cohesion of society.
- ***The media should do more to foster awareness amongst the population about reintegration and reconciliation through media campaigns and cultural activities,*** building on the Rwandan Association of Trauma Counsellors' (*Association Rwandaise des Conseillers en Traumatisme*, or ARCT Ruhuka) radio and television broadcasts.
- ***The performance contracts of all relevant authorities should include specific targets for reconciliation,*** to ensure accountable implementation of the National Unity and Reconciliation Policy.²

At the programmatic level, a greater impact will be achieved if those designing, funding and implementing programmes:

- ***Spell out clearly their theory of change and objectives, whether in terms of rehabilitation, reinsertion or reintegration.*** This should inform the types of activities they implement and the groups they do or do not target. In particular, those involved in activities targeted at former combatants, ex-prisoners and/or genocide survivors should explain how their activities contribute to reconciliation and the perspective of a common life for Rwandans.

² Performance contracts are a type of result-oriented programming which has been introduced in Rwanda for good governance since 2010.

- *Use reintegration programmes to bring individuals together in an inclusive group of beneficiaries, targeting former combatants, genocide survivors and ex-prisoners.* This should be done cautiously, taking into account sensitivities. Specific care should be taken for the trauma affecting specific groups. Psychological support should be mainstreamed.
- *Formalise the multiplier effect of activities.* Currently reintegration activities only benefit a fraction of the population affected by the genocide. Programmes should be encouraged to spell out how they will reach the wider population through their limited target groups.
- *Adopt a multidisciplinary approach and tackle psychological, social and economic activities simultaneously (with some initial elements of trauma healing).* This requires the building of coalitions to provide the necessary expertise, as well as donor support.
- *Research and document the links between reconciliation and reintegration.* While there is anecdotal evidence that inclusive reintegration programming can lead to dialogue and reconciliation between victims and perpetrators, this should be further researched to see if it can be replicated and widely adopted as an element of reintegration activities.
- *Explore the possibilities of reintegration and reconciliation projects targeting youth, given their specific needs linked to secondary trauma.* Youth can present such projects with the opportunity to transform and reinvent community dynamics and influence other community members.
- *Extend training and other opportunities given to beneficiaries to close members of their families such as children and partners.* This will help to ease the healing and reintegration process on a wider level within communities.

1. The context

1.1 Rwanda post-genocide

Nearly two decades after the genocide against the Tutsis, Rwanda is recovering from the devastating effects it has had on the population.³ Beyond the number of deaths directly related to the genocide, its consequences continue to affect large swathes of the population. For most genocide survivors, its trauma has had a direct effect on their ability to engage in the rapidly developing Rwandan economy, and has contributed to widespread poverty. Mistrust and inter-community tension persist between groups around the country. Interactions between victims and ex-prisoners are still haunted by memories of the genocide; they continue to struggle against the challenges these pose to their present cohabitation, for example fear of reprisals and revenge, payment of reparations in a poor economic environment, or denial of responsibilities during the genocide.⁴

However, from an external point of view, Rwanda's recovery in general is considered a perfect example for other war-affected countries. The economy is progressing very quickly, with growth directly affecting the lives of millions of Rwandans. State services and public goods such as health and infrastructure are being delivered thanks to the efforts of the Rwandan government and the influx of international aid. Radical changes are being implemented and envisioned for Rwanda, such as the governmental programme "Vision 2020".

Despite remarkable progress, Rwandan society has not turned its back on its terrible recent history, and efforts are being initiated at the highest levels of state to address the legacy of the genocide. There have been important drives towards reconciliation and specific commemoration ceremonies take place every year. Memorials have been created, and educational tools around the causes and consequences of the genocide initiated. The Rwandan constitution itself refers to the genocide as a defining moment in Rwandan identity, and a number of agencies have been created to work on repairing the damages caused by the violence. The importance given to recovery is particularly salient when one considers that the Genocide Survivors Support and Assistance Fund (*Fond pour Assistance aux Rescapés du Génocide*, or FARG), the mandate of which is to help survivors recover from the impact of the genocide, receives a six percent allocation of the national budget. Reintegration also attracts international attention, with international development agencies investing in reconciliation and reintegration programmes.

While the term "reintegration" remains largely vague and adaptable, this study is primarily concerned with a view of reintegration which goes beyond the reparation of the harm caused by the genocide, encompassing the building of sustainable social and economic livelihoods for those Rwandans affected by the genocide, and leading, as a result, to reconciliation. This includes care for individuals and building capacities to promote self-dependence, but also support for the creation of a welcoming community, where past wrongs can be admitted and a common future can be envisioned for all the groups which make up Rwandan society.

In this context, this report was commissioned by International Alert to analyse reintegration efforts undertaken in Rwanda. It aims to identify, build and make recommendations on the lessons learned by the multitude of actors working on reintegration and reconciliation in Rwanda, focusing on one case study in particular, Alert's *Fostering Reconciliation and Socio-Economic Reintegration in Rwanda* project.

³ Hereafter referred to as "the genocide".

⁴ In this study, "ex-prisoners" will refer to those people who spent time in prison as a result of the Gacaca process. It is important to note that this also includes people who spent time in prison without being charged, waiting for their trials for what was sometimes years, as well as people who were found to be innocent at Gacaca courts.

This project highlights a new and daring approach to the challenges of reintegration and reconciliation in Rwanda, and is useful for comparison with other actors' approaches. This study does not aim to conduct a thorough evaluation of a particular project, but rather highlights the range of approaches used to target communities affected by the genocide, tries to lend some coherence to the reintegration process, and identifies where gaps exist.

Four initial research areas for this study were identified:

- the effectiveness, feasibility and limits of a multidisciplinary approach to reintegration;
- the possibility of choosing an inclusive target group composed of former combatants, genocide survivors, ex-prisoners and youth;
- possible articulations with other levels of interventions within the community or at the state level;
- the links between reintegration and reconciliation.

In the course of the study, two additional areas for research emerged:

- the nature of the links between reparative justice, reintegration and reconciliation;
- the possibility of proposing an integrated framework for understanding reintegration in Rwanda.

The report gathers views from a large number of agencies involved in the implementation of reintegration programmes, including relevant governmental agencies. Focus groups with beneficiaries were held in three different locations; guided observation techniques, as well as interviews, helped gather information during these sessions. A literature and project document review was also undertaken to understand how these programmes have developed over time, as well as to understand the nature of the theoretical framework in which they operate. The study's primary aim has been to gather perceptions of actors in and beneficiaries of reintegration projects on the approaches which best fit their specific needs.

1.2 The reconciliation and reintegration project

The starting point for this study was the *Fostering Reconciliation and Socio-Economic Reintegration in Rwanda* project. This project, which started in 2010 after a two-year pilot phase, brought together International Alert, Umuseke, *Duterimbere Association sans but lucratif* (Duterimbere not-for-profit organisation, or Duterimbere Asbl), *Duterimbere Institution de microfinance* (Duterimbere micro-finance institution, or Duterimbere IMF), Pro-Femmes/Twese Hamwe and ARCT Ruhuka in a partnership, which aims to strengthen reintegration efforts to benefit four target groups: genocide survivors, former combatants, ex-prisoners and youth.

The project is original in the Rwandan context for three principal, interconnected reasons: it brings together four groups in joint activities, while caring for the specific needs of each constituency; it uses a comprehensive approach, working on the psychological health, dialogue needs and economic wellbeing of the target groups; it selected its target groups at the individual and family level, but also includes a strand targeting the population as a whole, articulating connections between the community and national level.

Operating in eight *secteurs* of Rwanda,⁵ group therapy sessions for trauma sufferers, conducted by counsellors from ARCT Ruhuka, are provided. These sessions are conducted jointly for members of different groups; former combatants, survivors and ex-prisoners have access to a space where they can share their experiences of the genocide and the psychological consequences they have inherited

⁵ A *secteur* is an administrative unit in Rwanda. The project is being implemented in eight *secteurs* across three districts, namely Gasabo (Kimironko and Kinyinya), Gisagara (Save, Mukindo, Kigembe and Muganza) and Ngororero (Gatumba and Nyange).

from it. Individual counselling is provided if requested by beneficiaries. ARCT Ruhuka also provides awareness-raising sessions for communities in which the project is active, helping neighbours or family members to identify signs of trauma and informing them of referral possibilities. As of March 2012, ARCT Ruhuka had trained 42 facilitators, held 52 meetings on trauma, and broadcast 4 programmes on radio and television. The various clubs were providing psychological help to 358 people. Their activities revolve around active listening techniques and taking responsibility for individual and group traumas. The beneficiaries have been able to detect signs of trauma early on in individuals and to attempt to help them, and they have adopted an understanding attitude towards those affected psychologically.

A strong learning point from this strand of the project was the similarity of individuals' symptoms from all sides of the conflict. While the causes of trauma were different, behavioural and clinical symptoms were often the same for survivors and ex-prisoners.⁶ Trauma counselling offered considerable benefit to former combatants. While this last group had benefited from a reintegration programme implemented by the Rwandan Demobilisation and Reintegration Commission (RDRC), a number of former combatants felt that they had not received adequate screening for trauma, and had found themselves suffering from alcohol or drug abuse.⁷ This may be due to the fact that the trauma only revealed itself after they had undergone demobilisation, or that the large number of former combatants did not allow RDRC to provide adequate or sufficient screening for trauma. Meanwhile, youth are often a victim of "secondary trauma", or "transferred trauma" phenomena. In Rwanda, while youths did not all personally suffer as a result of the genocide, the environment in which they were brought up has been strongly marked by the violence their families have endured. This has, in turn, impacted on their ability to interact in a peaceful social environment and they have started to develop symptoms of trauma.

The dialogue sessions organised by Pro-Femmes/Twese Hamwe are a further critical element of the Reconciliation and Reintegration project, aimed at establishing a basis for dialogue between the different target groups. Sessions focus on techniques and ground rules for dialogue, such as active listening techniques or recognising the subjectivity of one's opinions, as well as on issues of concern for community members, such as the justice element of reconciliation and the economic situation. While this component of the project was less "specific" than the psychological or economic elements in its objectives, it seems to have been highly valued by the beneficiaries, and was often cited as extremely helpful. As of March 2012, Pro-Femmes/Twese Hamwe had trained 459 members (62 men and 397 women) and set up 36 dialogue clubs. Within these clubs, discussions are focused on techniques to manage and resolve conflicts and the fight against divisive discourse. Umuseke lead similar dialogue clubs especially for youth within the project. As of March 2012, it had initiated peace dialogue clubs in eight schools, reaching a total of 1,046 pupils (553 girls and 493 boys).

Results are tangible. In each location, the research team made notes on the sitting arrangements of the focus group participants. In the location most recently targeted by the project (Nyange), participants chose to sit in their respective groups, with former combatants sitting separately from ex-prisoners, and with survivors sitting on the other side of the room. In other locations, the groups mixed much more thoroughly. Similarly, as the groups progressed through the project, the research team found them more able to relate to the experiences of members of other groups: when mentioning highlights from the projects, the testimonies from ex-prisoners often related to the positive experience of a survivor, or vice versa. This was found to occur more frequently among groups involved in the project for longer periods of time. While anecdotal, these observations seem to highlight the fact that the dialogue element was able to raise awareness amongst the project participants of the need to understand others' experiences of the genocide.

⁶ Interview with ARCT Ruhuka staff, Kigali, 19th January 2012.

⁷ Interview with former combatants, Nyange, 26th January 2012.

Finally, the economic element of the project has been implemented by Duterimbere IMF and Duterimbere Asbl. Duterimbere IMF asked participants to organise themselves in “solidarity groups” of five members. These groups are collectively responsible for repaying loans, the amount of which slightly increases in size as projects progress. Groups are formed by participants according to certain guidelines: members should be confident that their partners would be able to repay the loans, and that they would be able to communicate with them on a regular basis. In nearly all instances, cohesive groups bringing together survivors, former combatants and ex-prisoners have formed. The repayment rate of the loans has been very high. The approach is characterised by an evident element of sustainability: rather than focusing on income-generating activities (IGAs), which are commonly implemented by NGOs in the region, the micro-credit schemes treat the beneficiaries as “clients”, with whom the relationship may last on a commercial basis beyond the duration of the project. It therefore avoids prolonging the one-sided assistance characteristic of more traditional economic recovery projects, which can have a damaging effect on beneficiaries. As of March 2012, the training delivered by Duterimbere Asbl had reached 1,476 people (733 women and 743 men). On the one hand it has focused on savings and credit procedures, and on the other on the design, installation and management of revenue-generating activities. In total, 91 support groups have been trained, and 80 deprived young people have been identified and trained.

Given the Rwandan context and the challenges of reintegrating numerous potential target groups of traumatised and economically deprived individuals, this project has taken an ambitious approach. During the initial consultations that informed its design, doubts were reportedly raised over the possibility, and even desirability, of bringing together groups who were seen as antagonistic and possibly even at risk of returning to violence. Issues of justice between perpetrators and victims have still not been resolved. The needs and even rights of different groups to reintegration packages have not been seen as similar or comparable.⁸

Another difficult question faced in the early stages of this project was the way in which to articulate the links between reconciliation and reintegration. As we will explore in other sections of this paper, the two concepts are sometimes presented in a sequential way: reconciliation (often confused with “justice”) is seen as a prerequisite for reintegration activities. The project took a different view: reintegration and reconciliation are inextricably linked. Through common approaches to reintegration, dialogue and economic development, beneficiaries would develop the capacity for reconciliation. Similarly, the comprehensive approach used by the project meant that it could simultaneously tackle very different needs, such as economic recovery, healing trauma, and dialogue sessions. While these activities are related and respond to needs, it was questionable how compatible they could be within one project framework. The timeframes for each of these approaches may differ, and the variety of activities implemented demands very different sets of skills and expertise.

The extremely large number of potential beneficiaries made decisions over the targeting level quite delicate. While targeting beneficiaries at the individual and family level, the project had to find ways to reach out to the wider community. It also had to coherently link with larger, state-driven programmes.

⁸ To this day, interpretations over the right of ex-prisoners to benefit from large nationwide government economic programmes are still disputed. In the case of the “Girinka” programme, where each vulnerable family is being provided with a cow, some local authorities consider that former combatants should not be eligible because of an “integrity” eligibility criterion. It appears, however, that this criterion does not officially exist (Interview with ex-prisoners and local authorities, Nyange, 26th January 2012).

2. Debates surrounding reintegration

2.1 The multidisciplinary approach

The multidisciplinary approach is widely accepted as a valuable approach for effective reintegration. Interviews with implementing organisations and beneficiaries confirmed the interconnectedness of psychological activities, dialogue sessions and economic projects. A successful economic venture, for instance, can help people feel that they are contributing positively to their community, reinforcing their psychological wellbeing. Similarly, dialogue sessions strongly support cohesion within solidarity groups, the basis of micro-credit schemes. On the other hand, it was also mentioned that each aspect taken independently could have negative impacts on the other. A failed economic enterprise or a challenging business venture can push people back into trauma and destroy their self-confidence. This calls for continued psychological support in economic projects, and further reinforces the need for a multidisciplinary approach.

In the *Fostering Reconciliation and Socio-Economic Reintegration in Rwanda* project, the benefits of the integrated approach were very much felt by the beneficiaries. When asked why and how the activities helped them specifically, most answers referred to the impact they had on other aspects of their lives; for example, an economic activity helped them feel better about their trauma, or the dialogue sessions allowed them to set up a successful business venture.

Testimony

D.Y., genocide survivor from Gatumba

The genocide took my entire family. Life after the genocide was unthinkable to me. I found no interest in anything. I lived my life as it came, in solitude and poverty. I had no trust in people around me. I had fields, but I would not go to work.

I remember there was a project which asked us to come because they wanted to help survivors. The project organised training over a few days, but I thought it was not serious. They even gave us 30,000 Rwandan Francs (RWF) as pocket money after the training. I went to the bank, as it was necessary to have a bank account to withdraw this money. I withdrew the entire amount, I went to the market and bought everything I wanted, until I spent all the money. I remember I came home with only RWF500 left. The trauma was such that I could not do anything sensible, or do anything with other people. I isolated myself in fear and hatred.

The Alert project helped me accept myself, and grieve. The training given by Pro-Femmes has helped me reintegrate into the community in all aspects, and to meet people again. I realised I had a lot of prejudices against ex-prisoners, and Hutus generally. I did not know that they, too, had suffered, in some respects, from the genocide.

We spoke together of the topics related to the analysis of conflicts, and we learned how to solve them. The support given by ARCT Ruhuka has helped me recover my mental health, so I managed to find reasons to live and I started to live in harmony with all the people around me. I feel I have been accepted by other people, and I have a new network of relationships thanks to the project. I even accepted working with the killers of my family. Today, I earn a good living, I have activities which bring me money, I have projects for the future. I even decided to forgive the culprits of my family's killing.

These findings point to the idea that overly linear sequencing of interventions is not desirable. One of the strengths of the Alert-led project is that all the activities are implemented simultaneously, which allows for holistic support to beneficiaries. It has to be stressed, however, that some initial degree of trauma healing may be needed before a truly multidisciplinary approach can take root, as very traumatised people are not seen as being ready to engage in social, or economic activities.⁹ This interaction and interdependency of the different aspects of reintegration is well accepted by all actors involved in reintegration projects in Rwanda. However, in practice, a number of organisations face challenges in implementation. Indeed, some are engaged in sequencing interventions, for example starting with psychological support, then engaging in economic recovery as a second phase. The reasons for this sequencing are related to project setup. The interviews revealed that they did not feel that they would be able to attract funding to implement complex projects which would touch on all aspects of reintegration. As a consequence, agencies may prioritise the areas of intervention they feel are the most crucial at each stage, losing the benefits of a more holistic approach. For instance, the non-profit organisation IBUKA was reportedly well aware that it needed to implement economic activities, but did not feel it had the financial capacity to do so until recently.¹⁰ It will soon be launching a new phase of its programming, focusing on IGAs. However, it is not clear how this will be linked to the medical and psychological support they have been providing until now.

In addition to perceived and real funding constraints, a further challenge of the multidisciplinary approach is technical complexity. Very rarely will one single organisation be able to expertly implement psychological, medical, and economic activities with the required degree of expertise and sensitivity. The implementation of specialist activities without the necessary expertise might have very negative consequences: IGAs which are poorly planned or do not correspond to the realities of the Rwandan economy might be detrimental for the intended beneficiaries. This might disempower the beneficiaries by making them overly reliant on constant support from implementing organisations, damage their self-confidence, or compromise sustainability beyond the life of the project.

This is a challenge relevant to a wide range of reintegration activities: most organisations, the mandate of which is to work on reintegration issues or recovery after large-scale tragedies such as the Rwandan genocide, are often conflict-resolution or social change specialists. While this gives them an excellent vantage point to analyse the roots of the problems and the needs of their target groups, it does not necessarily mean they have the required expertise to work on issues which should be the prerogative of the private or medical sectors. A factor of success for reintegration will be the ability of organisations to draw in specialised partners who will be able to implement specific projects for the benefit of the overall programme and respect the need to recognise and integrate other perspectives into the common goal of reintegration.

One of the clear strengths of the project implemented by Alert and its partners was the success in convening and nurturing a strong collaborative partnership between very specialised organisations towards a common goal. The approaches taken by ARCT Ruhuka, Umuseke, Pro-Femmes/Twese Hamwe and the two Duterimbere organisations were very different, yet they followed a coherent, common plan within the project framework. Each of the organisations was very clear about their specific mandate within the project, while recognising the added value of the others' approaches for their own field of intervention. Duterimbere IMF, for instance, talks about "clients" instead of beneficiaries, and is very clear about the private sector, profit-orientated view of its part of the project. This allows it to support their "clients" to build up strong, sustainable enterprises. This ensures that when the "clients" leave the project, or the project ends, they will be able to sustain their economic activities and the relationships they built up through the solidarity groups.

⁹ A point strongly made by representatives of Duterimbere, who have been facing challenges related to trauma in some of their other projects in which psychological support was not provided.

¹⁰ IBUKA is an umbrella organisation of genocide survivors.

‘If you consider people as “beneficiaries”, then at the end of the project, they will not be “beneficiaries” anymore, they will be nothing. With us, they will always be businesspeople.’

Delphin Ngamije, Duterimbere IMF Director

Beyond implementing organisations’ recognition that a multidisciplinary approach is beneficial, and that it requires a wide range of expertise or strong partnerships with specialist organisations, an enabling environment is also essential for these organisations to operate effectively. In the case of Rwanda, a platform for coordination at the national level for all the actors involved in reintegration has yet to be created. The national government and its agencies do cooperate with civil society organisations, but on a bilateral partnership basis. More effort could be invested in bringing together a wider group of organisations and services which would be able to form a solid base for mapping out available expertise. The ministries of education, health and economic recovery should be invited to bring their expertise into the reintegration projects of specialised agencies such as the National Commission for the Fight against Genocide (*Commission Nationale de Lutte contre le Génocide*, or CNLG), RDRC, or FARG. While there is a degree of cooperation at the moment, this could be better systematised and offer broader opportunities for consultation. Even more crucially, and currently missing, are consultations with civil society organisations and private sector actors, which would enable the sharing of specialist knowledge.

Finally, donors should be aware of the necessity of funding wide partnerships, and invest in the coordination of expert organisations, as well as the direct implementation of projects. This will enable these organisations to build the kinds of collaborative partnerships that are necessary for multidisciplinary approaches to take root and have an impact.

2.2 The inclusiveness of the target group

The intention of Alert’s Reconciliation and Reintegration project to bring together former combatants, survivors and ex-prisoners was initially viewed with scepticism.¹¹ Indeed, even the project partners themselves viewed it as an approach with potential, but fraught with risk, in the sense that it was so novel in Rwanda. Other organisations outside the project, such as the Association of the Widows of Rwanda (*Association des Veuves du Génocide Agahazo*, or AVEGA), IBUKA, and CNLG were also initially opposed to the approach. These organisations have a mandate which pushes them to work primarily with and for survivors of the genocide. In this sense, to them, it was difficult to understand and to accept that ex-prisoners or former combatants who might have been associated with the killings would benefit from the same assistance as survivors.

Beyond moral and rights-based issues was also a concern about the feasibility of the approach. Would survivors accept being considered in the same group as ex-prisoners? Considering their needs are potentially very different, would the project be able to respond to each group’s demands adequately?

‘At first, we did not think that dialogue between widows and genocidaires was possible... Actually, it helped people heal.’

Programme officer, AVEGA

However, a number of reasons call for the inclusivity of target groups for reintegration. The main one is pragmatic in nature: in today’s Rwanda, survivors, former combatants and ex-prisoners live side by side. They are neighbours – avoiding each other or treating groups separately is not

11 C. Doal and D. Mukagatare (2009). *Final Report on End-Term Evaluation of Fostering Social and Economic Reintegration and Reconciliation Project*. International Alert: London; Interviews with project partners, IBUKA (Kigali, 20th January 2012) and AVEGA (Kigali, 20th January 2012).

sustainable in the long term. Besides, they share the same social and economic infrastructure, such as hospitals, markets, schools, and administrative centres. Reintegration, if it is to be successful in the long run, has to take into consideration the daily realities of the target groups. The aim of reintegration, from this particular perspective, is to ensure that cohabitation is possible and can even expand into more advanced forms of understanding between groups while still considering their separate experiences of the genocide.

'We are neighbours, whether we like it or not.'

Participant in focus group

Beyond the pragmatic reasons for supporting integrated target groups lies another reason related to the purpose of reintegration. If programmes aim to rebuild relationships between groups and enable individuals to find their place in society, this cannot be done in isolation from society itself. The reintegration process has to accompany the individual from his/her own experience of the genocide until they reach a new, positive and accepted role they can play in their community. Besides, a reintegration programme which would only benefit some sections of society might be strongly resented by other groups, and lead to further feelings of exclusion, eventually leading to a threat to stability in Rwanda. In this case, it is apparent that the choice of separated or integrated target groups depends largely on two major considerations: the capacity of individuals to accept being considered together with members of other groups, and the chosen end goal of a programme. If this end goal is exclusively linked with one target group in particular (e.g. helping survivors of the genocide recover physical and economic wellbeing) then the programme is understandably limited in its choice of target group. If, however, the aim of the programme is wider and considers the recovery of Rwandan society as a whole after the traumatising events of the genocide, then the inclusivity of target groups is unavoidable. The choice of the target groups for organisations in Rwanda is, therefore, directed by the mandate and aims of the organisations working towards reintegration. The Rwandan administration setup provides agencies responsible for the reintegration of former combatants - RDRC - and for the rehabilitation of genocide survivors: FARG and, to a certain extent, CNLG (through IBUKA, AVEGA and other genocide survivor associations). However, the mandate of the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC) is wide enough to implement potential activities directed towards the recovery and reintegration of all groups.¹²

Testimony

M.T., ex-prisoner from Nyange

When I got out of prison, I realised I was completely left out by the changes in my community. My wife had a kid with someone else. She had her own network of relationships, in which I did not fit. Even my own family did not understand me. I had bitter talks with my wife. I was always in a bad mood. My heart was heavy; I was interested in nothing.

I was also always scared, and I was suspicious of everyone, especially the survivors. Indeed, they were pointing at me every time I met them in the street. I could never think a survivor could forgive a killer. I thought they always wanted revenge, even if they did not say it openly. I hated them, thinking I was only answering the hatred they had of me. I isolated myself in the consumption of alcohol and tobacco. My life had no future.

The project helped me understand the root causes of conflict, and understand the role of prejudices and rumours in the triggers for conflict. I understood the source of my pain, and the suffering of others around me. ARCT Ruhuka helped us a lot. We realised we had serious problems related to trauma. The fact that we all learned that together helped us make a step towards reconciliation.

¹² NURC (2007). 'Mission and Vision', accessed 28th January 2012. Available at <http://www.nurc.gov.rw/about-nurc/mission-vision.html>.

It has to be noted however, that the inclusiveness of target groups also faces challenges. Indeed, for people who remain very traumatised by the genocide, or do not have a strong feeling of physical security (e.g. they are afraid of reprisal), sitting in the same room as members of the other groups can feel like a step too far. For these individuals, inclusive targeting might not be appropriate. Indeed, in the project led by Alert, the first activities were conducted in separate groups. It was only when participants in the separate group counselling sessions asked to be reunited with the other groups that the project took this approach. A programme bringing together members of these different groups should therefore take a demand-driven approach, and be respectful of the wishes of group members. For individuals who do not feel ready to confront and meet other groups, a referral system might be put in place, redirecting them to organisations who have activities for specific groups: for example, traumatised survivors might feel more comfortable with organisations like AVEGA, FARG or IBUKA, while some former combatants might feel more secure amongst their peers within RDRC programmes. Eventually, however, inclusion of the wider community is desirable.

‘I was surprised I could talk to survivors and share a meal with them. It was not easy, but little by little, we managed to talk. So much so that we even were looking forward to the next meeting so we could meet again.’

Former combatant

In conclusion, strong arguments can be made for an inclusive approach, bringing together perpetrators and victims, as well as former combatants and related groups such as youth. This approach is very much forward looking, and is aimed at the cohesion of Rwandan society as a whole, going beyond recovery from the devastating effects of the genocide. It builds on the rehabilitation efforts of group-specific activities conducted by AVEGA, IBUKA, FARG or RDRC. Once beneficiaries are ready to consider themselves part of their community, regardless of their experience during the genocide, the benefits of inclusive programming are important, and its feasibility is now proven.

2.3 The level of engagement

This section of the report focuses on matching the apparent needs in terms of reintegration against the current response provided by the organisations and agencies operating in Rwanda. There is evidently a strong level of engagement by the Rwandan state in terms of reintegration. A number of agencies have been created to deal directly with the issue of genocide (such as CNLG, NURC, and FARG). These agencies address the direct material needs of the victims, providing housing and medical care. They also work on justice and truth, and organise and conduct research on the genocide. These agencies are well funded, re-confirming the level of priority given to this issue both by the Rwandan state and international donors. Moreover, other government departments are also involved in providing services to the most vulnerable and genocide-affected populations. The “Girinka” programme is implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture, and trauma counselling services are being offered through the Ministry of Health.

On the political side, the Rwandan government also provides leadership on reintegration, and has passed robust legislation on the definition of Rwandan identity, moving away from a divisive perception of the Rwandan population, and concentrating on the remembrance of the genocide and tolerance in Rwanda.¹³

At the grassroots level, a large number of organisations are active and provide reintegration services in many of the *secteurs* of Rwanda. These range from direct support to survivors for material needs (housing or financial support) to trauma healing and health projects. Given the enormous number of potential beneficiaries, the response of Rwandan civil society, the government

¹³ The Constitution of Rwanda, for instance, refers in its first articles to the genocide against the Tutsis and the need for remembrance.

and international donors has been rather effective at supporting the most vulnerable. There is a very large amount of attention given to the people affected by the genocide, both domestically and internationally.

Understandably, support has been primarily directed at genocide survivors. However, there is a growing recognition that ex-prisoners and former combatants are also in need of reintegration. Recent studies have also confirmed the existence of a transfer of trauma, through which young people, while they did not experience the genocide themselves, have been affected by the trauma of their parents.¹⁴

There is, then, a wide-ranging sector of interventions – notably pitched at the level of the individual. Focus groups and interviews with civil society organisations, however, revealed that a community dimension is very much called for in Rwanda. The initiatives described above have detected a need for reintegration at the national level, as well as direct support for people affected by the genocide. However, the reintegration of these individuals raises the question of the community into which individuals should be reintegrated. Indeed, while direct work needs to be done at the individual level, reintegration efforts should also be directed at creating a welcoming environment for those people being reintegrated. In the words of one of the researchers of this study, ‘the word “community” has lost its sense in Rwanda’.¹⁵ The values that Rwandan society held, and that provided social cohesion as well as economic links and psychological support in terms of needs, have been destroyed by the genocide. The scale of the violence has meant that traditional support mechanisms, such as family or neighbourhood networks, have lost their value.

Testimony

E.H., student from Nyange

I was only 5 when the genocide happened. I did not understand what was really happening. I started experiencing problems when I was playing at school – these problems came from my parents, who forbade me to play with children from another ethnic group. They told me of some families that I should never interact with on the way to school, even if the weather was bad. My mother did not want me to make friends with some of my classmates. When I asked for permission to go and see a classmate, she would cry and say no. I was suffering from this separation from my friends so badly that I had to see them in secret.

The project was helpful to me because it freed me from this hatred that exists in our families, for reasons unknown to me. I was able to understand it came from the trauma that my parents suffered from, which was like a poison in our life. I was able to talk to my parents about what was happening in our social club. I realised other kids at school had the same problem as me. Now, we can lead the normal life of schoolchildren, and interact without regard to our different ethnicities.

In focus groups, there were many instances of beneficiaries of the *Fostering Reconciliation and Socio-Economic Reintegration in Rwanda* project referring to challenges encountered not within the project, but when relating to members of the community outside of the group of beneficiaries. The families of some beneficiaries would treat them with mistrust when they announced that they were working alongside other ethnicities. People undergoing trauma healing also faced setbacks when returning to their community, experiencing difficult situations without benefiting from support from their neighbours or family. Young people participating in the project also explained that they did not understand the values held by their own communities, and that some of the social problems experienced by young Rwandans came from a lack of understanding between generations.

¹⁴ C. Doal and D. Mukagatare (2009). Op. cit.

¹⁵ Interview with François Masabo, Kigali, 21st January 2012.

In response to this problem, some initiatives have attempted to incorporate elements of community work. ARCT Ruhuka, for instance, provides awareness-raising sessions on recognising the symptoms of trauma and appropriate responses. This contributes to helping people understand that traumatised people can and should be supported within the community. Umuseke provides spaces where different generations can meet and talk about their different experiences of the genocide, and the different ways in which it affected them.

State agencies also organise a lot of spaces to talk about the genocide and its consequences, mainly around the commemoration period (in April each year). However, these are very much experienced as top-down rather than community-led initiatives.¹⁶ A rumour in Butare was that when people attended the commemoration, they were given a white ribbon to attach to their wrist. Those who did not have these ribbons would then be seen as *genocidaires* who refused to mourn the victims and who would preach hatred.¹⁷

Work at the community level should therefore be initiated to try to recreate an environment in which people affected by the genocide would be welcome and valued. This work should encourage the participation and leadership of communities themselves.

There is also evidence that the beneficiaries of the project led by Alert act as multipliers: they are seen as positive examples of how Rwandans can come together again and solve their conflicts through dialogue and shared activities. The local administration representative in Save was very appreciative of how beneficiaries had helped spread positive messages through the community.¹⁸ Formalising and supporting this role as multipliers would help projects reach wider groups of people and complement community reintegration programmes.

2.4 Reintegration and its links to reconciliation

The National Policy for the Unity and Reconciliation of Rwandans is understood to promote citizen behaviour based on the conviction of sharing the same territory, culture and destiny, and enjoying the same rights; it is characterised by a spirit of trust, tolerance, mutual respect, equality and complementarity, and a willingness to tell the truth and help each other find solutions to the problems arising from the difficult history, in order to move forwards together towards a state of general wellbeing.¹⁹ The policy is driven by some guiding principles: promotion of national identity instead of specific identities based on ethnicity, religion, gender, region, etc.; the fight against the ideology of genocide and all forms of discrimination and divisionism; the establishment of rule of law which respects human rights; mutual support in the process of healing from psychological injuries; the re-establishment of trust among the population, based on avowal and the seeking and offering of forgiveness; commemoration of the genocide in order to prevent it ever reoccurring; and self-confidence and a willingness to work.²⁰

There is then, considerable overlap with reintegration, and the implementation of reconciliation and reintegration policies concerns all individuals and institutions in Rwanda. This link between reintegration and reconciliation is central to most discussions about inter-community relations in Rwanda. In fact, reconciliation itself is high on the political agenda at the national level. Dominant views in Rwanda are often expressed in sequential terms: reconciliation is a prerequisite to successful reintegration, economic growth or sustained dialogue between Rwandans. This is linked to punctual, repeated events aimed at reconciliation and the public expression of successful

16 Interview with member of IBUKA, Kigali, 20th January 2012.

17 Interview with members of the public, Butare, 23th January 2012. It was confirmed that a number of similar rumours existed throughout the country.

18 Interview with the executive secretary of the Save *secteur*, Save, 23rd January 2012.

19 NURC (2007). *National Policy for Unity and Reconciliation*. Kigali.

20 Ibid.

reconciliation between groups, as stated by Lederach: ‘reconciliation must find ways to address the past without getting locked into a vicious cycle of mutual exclusiveness inherent in the past. People need opportunity and space to express to and with one another the trauma of loss and their grief at that loss and the anger that accompanies the pain and memory of injustices experienced [...] Reconciliation-as-encounter suggests that space for the acknowledgement of the past and envisioning of the future is the necessary ingredient for reframing the present. For this to happen, people must find ways to encounter themselves and their enemies, their hopes and their fears.’²¹

While the dominant narrative amongst other NGOs, and indeed many state agencies in Rwanda, seems to focus directly on activities designed to bring about reconciliation, the project led by Alert has pointed towards a view of reconciliation defined as a consequence of reintegration rather than a starting point, as discussed above.

‘The first step to reconciliation is to meet the other party.’

Genocide survivor

The research process for this report found evidence of the positive impact of reintegration activities on the reconciliation process. Most participants actively showed signs of reaching out to members of other groups, and gave practical examples of the ways the activities had changed their daily lives. Most participants were also proud to be seen by other, more sceptical members of their communities as living examples of how reconciliation was possible, and working together across groups was a possibility. This highlights the way that reconciliation was seen as a product of reintegration activities, but also that reconciliation needs remain great in the wider community.

Testimony

E.M., former combatant from Muganza

When I got back home after the genocide, I found that our neighbours had killed my family. A lot of thoughts went through my mind: I wanted to get revenge, but I realised I could not fight the entire population on my own. Everybody was suspicious of me, I felt isolated. I became depressed. I tried to find comfort in alcohol and in drugs. I was unable to have any economic activity; my life had no sense.

When the Alert project started, we had the opportunity to discuss the root causes of conflict, such as prejudices, rumours, stigmatisation, and how to give and receive forgiveness. We also discussed how to solve these conflicts. The psychological support provided by ARCT Ruhuka has helped me understand and change my behavioural problems.

Today, I live in harmony with my neighbours. I have been able to reconcile with the killers of my family. I have met my neighbours and gained their trust. We have been able to start IGAs together. I feel I have reintegrated into my community.

2.5 The issue of reparative justice, reconciliation and reintegration

Justice is by far the most contentious issue within the reintegration context. It is both a conceptual problem (of who is morally entitled to be helped) and a practical one (e.g. the payment of reparations ordered by Gacaca for level 3 offenders). These issues are strongly felt by beneficiaries of reintegration programmes and implementing organisations alike, as it is one of the main obstacles to the successful cohabitation of ex-prisoners and genocide survivors.

21 J.P. Lederach (1997). *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. United States Institute of Peace Press: Washington, DC.

A number of problems are emerging in Rwanda in relation to justice. The Gacaca process is now closed, and fears exist that some cases will not be addressed through more formal justice processes, that the totality of the crimes committed during the genocide have not yet been judged, and that some cases will remain unsolved. Moreover, the implementation of the decisions given by Gacaca has been problematic in itself: for some crimes, for example theft or destruction of property, material reparations have to be paid by the perpetrators. In many instances the perpetrators either refuse or are unable to pay. In effect, poverty is an obstacle to the payment of reparations, and as a consequence, an obstacle to justice and reconciliation.

There is a strong link between reintegration and the themes of justice and reconciliation.²² However, this causality is linked to very different narratives, depending on the organisations interviewed. For some, justice, and the payment of reparations, is a prerequisite to reintegration. Without the acknowledgement of guilt by the perpetrators, the payment of reparations and the forgiveness of victims, there cannot be social cohesion in Rwanda. Indeed, while reconciliation can be understood as a process, the reparative justice element of reconciliation (the payment of Gacaca reparations) is a trigger for this process. Without this payment, the process is flawed. Therefore, the Gacaca process and the implementation of the decisions taken by the Gacaca courts are a first step towards reconciliation, without which reintegration is impossible.

Another view is that people affected by conflict can only start the process of reconciliation once their basic needs are met. They should feel secure, and have access to ways of fulfilling their demands in terms of livelihood, shelter or health before they can participate in dialogue about the genocide, recognise wrongs and attempt to put them right. A certain level of financial stability would ease the process of justice and the payment of reparations. If perpetrators had the financial means to pay back their dues, and felt physically secure in their communities, they would be more able and willing to fulfil the obligations set by Gacaca. Therefore, justice and reconciliation are seen more as a process than a fixed point in time or as a step which needs to be completed before reintegration can begin. Justice, reconciliation and reintegration are linked, and programmes should seek to implement them together, rather than sequentially.

Both of these theories of change are valid, and it is difficult to validate one and not the other. What remains is a practical, problematic situation with regards to justice and reintegration.

For many reintegration programmes, the issue of reparations remains problematic, particularly for ex-prisoners. Different approaches have been tried to solve the problem, such as mediation between prisoners and survivors to lower the amount of compensation to a realistic level, a proposal for a “community reparation fund”, a national reparation fund (but the law was never passed, and probably never will be), or even just forgetting the debt.²³

In general, more research needs to be carried out into the issue of reparative justice and its links to the wider situation in Rwanda. There are different terms/concepts/practices which need to be investigated and clarified. In communities, it was not clear during this research what, for example, was understood by “pardon”. Testimonies seemed to link it strongly with the payment of reparations, rather than the moral pardon for the crime committed. Indeed, victims’ accounts of what they meant by “pardon” were often related to the payment of reparations, suggesting you could grant your “pardon” for a lower amount than the one decided by Gacaca. It would, therefore, seem to be very important for people to link moral forgiveness to some degree of material compensation.

²² When asked about the benefits of the reintegration programmes, focus groups participants very often explained how they had helped bring about reconciliation between them, or in their communities. It was very clear to them how the dialogue elements in particular had helped create enough physical and psychological safe spaces for them to discuss reconciliation and justice questions.

²³ A Huye-based organisation, *Association Modeste et Innocent* (the Modest and Innocent Organisation), proposed the “community reparation fund” model. The community would raise funds on a voluntary level, and the amount raised would be used to pay the reparation payments for those who could not pay them. While this would fulfill the needs of the victims in material terms, it removes the symbolic transaction between perpetrator and victim, and may not address the feeling of injustice. The project is currently being proposed to the local authorities at the *secteur* level, and might be tested in the coming months.

2.6 A proposed framework for understanding reintegration

The needs of individuals affected by the genocide in Rwanda in terms of recovery and reintegration are enormous. Moreover, beyond the sheer numbers of the target groups, the diversity of situations poses a serious challenge to the coherence of reintegration programmes. Some individuals are very traumatised and might need a greater degree of assistance, while for some others the economic and material challenges are greater.

This is very much reflected in reintegration programming in Rwanda. Reintegration practices and objectives are very diverse and even confusing in terms of aims and objectives, as well as actual activities. This leads to a level of bewilderment amongst actors and can be the cause of a lack of articulation between government-level projects and civil society initiatives. It might even cause disagreements as to whom should be targeted and what would be the most appropriate package to help people regain better standards of living.

This section is an attempt to propose a framework for reintegration programmes in Rwanda based on a definition of the objective of reintegration as: ‘the building of a sustainable life for the community, in which individuals feel secure and able to contribute meaningfully to the social and economic aspects of society.’ This definition very much emphasises the community aspect of reintegration. However, it is acknowledged that individual needs are also important, and that, primarily, reparation of harm caused by the genocide and individual wounds should be healed before people are ready to get involved in community life. This implies that reintegration and reconciliation are not an attainable goal for all the people affected by the genocide just yet. For example, the psychological scars might still be too deep for some victims to get involved with ex-prisoners, and former combatants might still be living with deep trauma, leading to behavioural troubles, such as alcohol abuse. These might be obstacles to reintegration into the community; therefore, needs at the individual level should be catered for.

Therefore, the model proposed to bring coherence to reintegration efforts has to allow space for initiatives aimed at the reparation of physical, economic and psychological wounds, as well as some more forward-looking community elements. It should also include provisions for those who have been absent from the community for a long time, and who would need to be consistently supported and assisted in terms of security and/or psychological support. A third step would be the building of a sustainable life for the community, in which people would establish sustainable ways of living together. This would involve spaces for dialogue, economic development and acceptance. Finally, these efforts should be mainstreamed into the vision Rwanda has set for itself. The challenges which people endured should not be forgotten, and provisions for future government programmes should cater for the scars left by the genocide in the Rwandan population in policies on education, health, social services and economic development.

There is a strong need to distinguish between different types of programmes. The proposed model offers three possible stages: rehabilitation (repairing past wrongs, ensuring the physical and mental health of a person), reinsertion (providing conditions for living in the community such as security, housing or an economic package), and reintegration (a sustainable life for a person within a community, where the person builds a new identity for him/herself).

The three steps are not to be understood as simultaneously applicable for the whole of Rwanda. They are complementary: some organisations can work alongside each other to target different groups, such as the most affected individuals or communities which have already reached a certain stage of dialogue.

Rehabilitation	Reinsertion	Reintegration
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Righting wrongs (retributive justice) • Caring for material and primary needs • Health issues and medical needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reuniting the individual and the community • Ensuring common ground rules, and ensuring the physical security of everyone involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring the sustainability of community life • Common development goals • Deepening and strengthening social cohesion

This framework aims to establish a coherent tool to understand why different organisations might have different aims when implementing their programmes, and to explain why it might be useful to target different groups. Organisations like FARG, IBUKA and AVEGA clearly target the rehabilitation of genocide survivors. When targeting former combatants or refugees returning to Rwanda, an additional step of reinsertion is necessary. The Alert-led consortium would fall under the reintegration category, accompanying individuals and communities and ensuring that they develop ways of building a positive, cohesive future for themselves.

This model also implies a greater degree of coordination and consultation between agencies operating in Rwanda. The activities building up to a reintegrated Rwandan society should build on each other and avoid sending out contradictory messages.²⁴ Linkages should be built between organisations, which might, for instance, initiate a system of referral, by which they could decide to redirect individuals to those organisations which implement activities most suiting individuals' needs. Mutual help and discussions could also take place to tackle the most contentious topics, such as the link between reintegration and justice.

Finally, the model provides a roadmap for reintegration. It explains how activities should be made sustainable by initially providing direct assistance to affected populations, then gradually building their capacity to look after themselves through dialogue and economic recovery, before finally being fully reintegrated into Rwandan society. In this sense, the step beyond reintegration would be the integration of beneficiaries into normal services provided by the state.

It must be noted that, while the programmes analysed during this study did not present their activities in this way, organisations to which this model was presented strongly saw their activities fitting into one category or the other. FARG, for instance, clearly agreed that its activities were of a rehabilitative nature. Its plans for an exit strategy already include a referral system for the beneficiaries, who will be redirected to specific state social services after having benefited from the programmes offered by FARG, therefore avoiding dependency on direct support activities and pointing towards greater autonomy and reintegration.²⁵

²⁴ For example, both NURC and Umuseke conduct workshops in schools, but very little dialogue has taken place between the two organisations about the content of their messages.

²⁵ Interview with FARG representative, Kigali, 30th January 2012.

3. Recommendations

The recommendations offered in this section of the study are directly based on the observations made in the previous chapters.

At the national level:

- ***Create a national platform for coordination on reintegration.*** This platform would include government and civil society. It would have a mandate to map actors engaged in rehabilitation, reinsertion and reintegration activities. It would also offer a space for discussion of particularly challenging issues, such as the interaction between justice and reintegration. Lessons learned would be shared and examples of successful approaches could be exchanged to improve current programming and coordination. Similarly, information gathered at the grassroots level could be made available to state agencies to help them adapt their programmes and policies and address any emerging gaps.
- ***Develop a roadmap and national strategy for reintegration, in coordination with state and non-state agencies engaged in reintegration programmes.*** This would include an analysis of the current needs in terms of reintegration, and set out clear landmarks for progress, as well as the approaches that are effective in the Rwandan context.
- ***Some state services could do more to take into account the legacies of the genocide and its consequences, ensuring that social provision responds to these specific needs.*** Policies in terms of health, education, housing or economic development should continue or strengthen the mainstreaming of specific care for people affected by the genocide.
- ***Take care not to reinforce divisive messages in Rwandan society through the provision of services.*** People's different experiences of the genocide will help determine their specific needs, for example some will need trauma counselling and rehabilitation, while others will not. Nevertheless, it is important that economic development and social services are made available to all Rwandans, whatever their experience of the genocide.
- ***Donors should continue to support reintegration and reconciliation efforts,*** funding activities aimed at the rehabilitation of people affected by the genocide, their reintegration, and the mainstreaming of their care within Rwandan social services, as well as initiatives that are geared towards the long-term reconciliation and social cohesion of society.
- ***The media should do more to foster awareness amongst the population about reintegration and reconciliation through media campaigns and cultural activities,*** building on ARCT Ruhuka's radio and television broadcasts.
- ***The performance contracts of all relevant authorities should include specific targets for reconciliation,*** to ensure accountable implementation of the National Unity and Reconciliation Policy.²⁶

At the programmatic level, a greater impact will be achieved if those designing, funding and implementing programmes:

- ***Spell out clearly their theory of change and objectives, whether in terms of rehabilitation, reinsertion or reintegration.*** This should inform the types of activities they implement and the groups they do or do not target. In particular, those involved in activities targeted at former combatants, ex-prisoners and/or genocide survivors should explain how their activities contribute to reconciliation and the perspective of a common life for Rwandans.

²⁶ Performance contracts are a type of result-oriented programming which has been introduced in Rwanda for good governance since 2010.

- *Use reintegration programmes to bring individuals together in an inclusive group of beneficiaries, targeting former combatants, genocide survivors and ex-prisoners.* This should be done cautiously, taking into account sensitivities. Specific care should be taken for the trauma affecting specific groups. Psychological support should be mainstreamed.
- *Formalise the multiplier effect of activities.* Currently reintegration activities only benefit a fraction of the population affected by the genocide. Programmes should be encouraged to spell out how they will reach the wider population through their limited target groups.
- *Adopt a multidisciplinary approach and tackle psychological, social and economic activities simultaneously (with some initial elements of trauma healing).* This requires the building of coalitions to provide the necessary expertise, as well as donor support.
- *Research and document the links between reconciliation and reintegration.* While there is anecdotal evidence that inclusive reintegration programming can lead to dialogue and reconciliation between victims and perpetrators, this should be further researched to see if it can be replicated and widely adopted as an element of reintegration activities.
- *Explore the possibilities of reintegration and reconciliation projects targeting youth, given their specific needs linked to secondary trauma.* Youth can present such projects with the opportunity to transform and reinvent community dynamics and influence other community members.
- *Extend training and other opportunities given to beneficiaries to close members of their families such as children and partners.* This will help to ease the healing and reintegration process on a wider level within communities.

International Alert.

346 Clapham Road, London SW9 9AP, United Kingdom

Tel +44 (0)20 7627 6800, Fax +44 (0)20 7627 6900

general@international-alert.org

www.international-alert.org

ISBN: 978-1-906677-96-1