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Abstract

Girinka is a community-based reconciliation approach practiced in Kamonyi District, Rwanda, with the purpose of achieving the five reconciliation premises: revealing truth, building trust, apology, promoting forgiveness, and collective identity/Rwandanness between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators. However, the approach’s capacity to pave the ground for sustainable peace in Kamonyi District has not been incisively inquired into. The study's objective was to assess the contribution of Girinka reconciliation approach on sustainable peace in Kamonyi District. This study is underpinned by the Conflict Transformation Theory of Lederach (1997) whose central emphasis is changing negative attitudes, violent relationships and behaviors of conflict parties into positive ones for sustainable peace. A descriptive survey and explanatory research designs were applied. The study recommended shifting the reparative (reconciliation) component of Girinka from Rwanda Agricultural Board to National Unity and Reconciliation Commission for effective realization of Girinka objective three. The research recommends scaling up Kamonyi Girinka reconciliation approach to the remaining 30 Districts of Rwanda building on good practices and lessons learned from Kamonyi District. Overall, the study concludes that Girinka reconciliation approach encompasses influencing practices of sustainable peace in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. These peace building practices include—Cow for Peace (Inka y'Icyiru) and Cow for Friendship (Inka y'Ubucuti) and that they are derived from Rwandan culture. The research established that measuring changes in human attitudes, behaviours and relationships is extremely difficult especially after gruesome genocidal violence like the genocide against Tutsi in Kamonyi District. A scientific study to establish actor’s contributions in changing attitudes, behaviours and relations between cow-givers and receivers should be conducted in Kamonyi District.
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1. Introduction

The United States Institute of Peace Report (2015) considers reconciliation as one of the long-term challenges peace-builders, state-building actors and non-actors face. The complexity of reconciliation is cited by Bloomfield et-al., (2003), noted further that the topic—reconciliation—is huge, complex and there is little agreement on its definition. Although many scholars concurred with the complexity of reconciliation, none thinks otherwise about its necessity not only for achieving co-existence, temporal peace, but as an arduous journey towards sustainable peace.

Archbishop Desmund Tutu in his foreword in the United States Institute of Peace Report, stressed: “Meaningful reconciliation is a difficult, painful and complex process” (Bloomfield et al., 2003:14). However, Bloomfield et al. (2003) notes that though reconciliation is painful and complex, “it must be grasped, because ignoring it sows the seeds of later, greater failure”. Reconciliation is not optional, but an essential pillar for building sustainable peace especially after gruesome violence like genocide. Because of its fast-pace and viscious nature, the genocide against Tutsi in Rwanda was the the worst genocides in the recent human history.

Bloomfield et al., (2003) argues that a goal in far as reconciliation is concerned, is—centered on an outcome to be achieved—and a process—a means to achieve that stated goal. “A great deal of controversy arises from confusing these two ideas [reconciliation as a goal in pursuit and reconciliation as an ongoing process],” (Bloomfield et al., 2003). Considering the viciousness of 1994 genocide against Tutsi and the foregoing Bloomfield’s view: reconciliation.

In view of the above, Lederach (2010) recommends conflict transformation touching four critical dimensions: personal, relational, structural and cultural. Such multi-dimensional transformation reveals also the complexity of reconciliation. In fact, Lederach's considered view of reconciliation is an onerous journey of moving from crisis times to fundamental generational changes (2010).
Responses to genocidal violence can be validly various some are prescriptive modelled on political, economic, psychological dimensions. From the reviewed literature, for instance, Report on activities of Gacaca Courts (2012), Rwanda Senate Report (2006) it was established that had Rwanda applied one single route—the conventional approach—as a response to the consequences of 1994 genocide against Tutsi, it would have taken hundreds of years for survivors and perpetrators of genocidal violence to get truths, restore trust, promote apologies and repair fractured relationships (reconciliation). Cognizance of the above registered limitations of conventional approach, Rwanda reintroduced a number of unconventional approaches to realize post genocide development and peace building objectives. Rwanda reintroduced Girinka in 2006. Girinka is one of the homegrown initiatives, Rwanda Governance Board (2014) and its reconciliatory value is rooted in cow-revering culture of Rwandan people. Girinka—is nationally implemented in all 30 districts of Rwanda. The reconciliation approach of Girinka is nationally piloted in Kamonyi District, Rwanda. This approach is premised on the view that it enables revelation of truth, trust-building, triggering apologies and strengthening Rwandans and forgiveness for realization of sustainable peace in Kamonyi District. However, there is no scientifically and empirically tested evidence base indicative of how the localized unconventional Girinka reconciliation approach is influencing the realization of sustainable peace after such unprecedented genocidal violence that befell Kamonyi District.

Failing to establish the scholarly contributions of Girinka Reconciliation Approach to Kamonyi’s peace building process contributes in widening the empirical research-policy gaps. Specifically (importantly), establishing the empirical evidence relating to the Rwanda’s unconventional approach—Girinka—adds to emerging scholarship aimed at demonstrating the relevance and impacts of African cultural values, resources in conflict transformation in Africa. In a modest way, the study further contributes towards translating the African Union mantra: “Africa solutions for African problems” into practice, Run (2013:17).

2. Research Design

The study used to descriptive survey design. According to Mugenda, (2008), descriptive design is applied when collecting information about people’s attitudes, opinions and habits. Findings, (qualitative and quantitative) demonstrated the level of transformed attitudes, behaviors and relations between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. The researcher applied descriptive survey design in translating study objective two into empirical evidence. It was suitable for this objective because it sought to establish attitudes, relationships, behaviors, truths, apologies, trust between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators.

Most important, the design was helpful in determining changes at four inter-interdependent dimensions—personal, relational (inter-ethnic), structural and cultural as suggested by Lederach (1997). However, key points need to be noted: to determine the level of behavioral changes because of Girinka, the researcher asked respondents questions that triggered forth quantitative and qualitative responses. Also, it is important to acknowledge that whereas some responses are rated quantitatively, change in human behavior sometimes cannot be determined by numbers because of its intangibility nature. These issues are clarified further in chapter six on measurability change in behavior.

Table 1 Summary of the research design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To assess the contribution of Girinka Reconciliation approach on Sustainable peace in Kamonyi District of Rwanda;</td>
<td>Descriptive survey design</td>
<td>To describe quantitatively and qualitatively the effects Girinka has caused after its revival in 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The Study Area

The study shall be conducted in Kamonyi District, Southern Province of Rwanda. According to Development Plan of Kamonyi District (2013), this is one of the eight Districts making the Southern Province. It is located in the central region of the country. It is composed of 12 Sectors, 59 Cells and 317 Villages (Imidugudu) with a population of 342,792 inhabitants on a total surface area of 655.5 km² and 72,000 households (EICV 2, 2011). Thus, its average density is 523 inhabitants/km². The education system in Kamonyi District includes 59 nursery schools, 90 primary schools and 50 secondary schools. The District Development Plan further noted that Kamonyi District envisages ensuring good governance through social justice, durable peace, and sustainable socio-economic development based on modernization of urban infrastructures in order to open agro pastoral opportunities.

Kamonyi district was purposively selected because of three considerations—first its hesitance to endorse the genocidal plan, secondly its later active implementation of the plan and thirdly, the district's embrace of Girinka practice to promote reconciliation between genocide survivors and perpetrators. In his doctoral research titled 'Understanding the Polarization of Responses to Genocidal Violence in Rwanda,' Bangwanubusa (2009) confirms the first two considerations. He argues, there are leaders of some prefectures (current use is Province in Rwanda, counties for Kenya's case) who either successfully or half-way mobilized for non-
violence and interfered with the genocidal project. Out of 12 Sectors of Kamonyi District, this study covered on 7 Sectors, namely, Musambira, Gacurambwenge, Nyarubakura, Rukoma, Mugina and Nyamiyaga and Rugarika (see the map below). All these sectors witnessed intensification of genocidal violence. For this reason, there are genocide survivors and perpetrators and most importantly, they are beneficiaries of Girinka programme.

![Figure 1 Map of Rwanda showing Kamonyi District](image)

**4. Target Population**

The study population for this study are former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors in Kamonyi District, Rwanda. These are two principal respondents for the study. Any study focusing on reconciliation and sustainable peace in Kamonyi District has to consider these two special social categories based on their specific demographic characteristic—genocide perpetration and genocide victimization. The remaining population study category comprised of (14): Executive members of Kamonyi District, Executive Director of Christian Action for Reconciliation and Social Assistance (CARSA), Executive Secretary for National Unity and Reconciliation Commission, Senior Members of Rwanda Academy of Language and Culture, Director of Girinka Program from Rwanda Agriculture Board, Author and Senior Member of Rwanda Elders Advisory Council, Senior of Rwanda Catholic Church and Author on Rwanda’s History. Out of 14 people the researcher planned to interview through SSI, 10 responded favourably. This category of the study population was purposively considered based on its specific roles, knowledge and expertise in issues of reconciliation processes, Girinka and Rwanda’s history. This criterion was deemed effective as the two groups share and co-own the cow despite their varying experience of genocide against Tutsi. In view of the above, guided by pairing principle the researcher applied cluster sampling technique to 300 respondents to determine who should be given the questionnaire while the remaining 14 were sampled purposively based on earlier noted roles and knowledge. Cluster sampling technique was done as per respondent’s age, marital status, and education to get 314 respondents. That is to say, 150 x 2 = 300 respondents from principal study respondents and 14 from secondary study population category.

5. Sample Size and Sampling procedure

5.1 Sample Size

According to the National Consensus of Genocide Survivors done by the National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda (2008), Kamonyi has 12,980 genocide survivors (female: 7,890, Male: 5090). The Report for the former National Service of Gacaca...
Courts, termed "Report on the Activities of the Gacaca Courts" (2012) puts the total of former Genocide Perpetrators in Kamonyi as 57,816 (female: 1,787 and male: 56,029). The principle of pairing genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators was deemed effective for selection of people population to be sampled and sample size as the two groups share and co-own the cow despite their varying experience of genocide against Tutsi. In view of the above, guided by pairing principle the researcher applied cluster sampling technique to 300 respondents to determine who should be given the questionnaire while the remaining 14 were sampled purposively based on earlier noted roles and knowledge. Cluster sampling technique was done as per respondent’s age, marital status, and education to get 314 respondents. That is to say, 150 x 2 = 300 respondents from principal study respondents and 14 from secondary study population category.

5.2 Sampling Procedure

The study adopted multistage random sampling. The researcher applied cluster sampling technique to 300 respondents to determine who should be given the questionnaire while the remaining 14 were sampled purposively based on earlier noted roles and knowledge. Cluster sampling technique was done as per respondent’s age, marital status, and education to get 314 respondents. That is to say, 150 x 2 = 300 respondents from principal study respondents and 14 from secondary study population category.

5.3 Data Collection

To get data, the researcher collected primary data from the targeted study area. However, secondary data was collected to provide supplementary support to the collected literature. Examples of secondary data studied include books, reports, journal articles, online materials and newspaper material and articles several thematic areas such as Girinka Reconciliatory Approach in the pre-colonial Rwanda and this influenced building sustainable peace. The data collection tools were used per the study category based on its envisaged capacity to generate reliable, and valid and verifiable research findings (read the next section). In total, three data collection tools were used: Semi-Structured Interview, Content Analysis and Questionnaire.

5.4 Semi Structured Interviews

Guided by the foregoing views, the researcher administered SSI to collect data from the leaders of institutions—National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC), Kamonyi District, Christian Action for Reconciliation and Social Assistance (CARSA), Rwanda Academy of Language and Culture (RALC), Director of Girinka Program from Rwanda Agriculture Board, Rwanda Elders Advisory Council (REAC) and retired Senior of Rwanda Catholic Church and Author on Rwanda’s History. Realities on ground reflected scholarly viewed stated earlier—time was one the major constraining factor especially for this category. Most of them being of advanced age, getting responses from them required patience.

5.5 Questionnaires

The results obtained from questionnaire can easily be quantified and analyzed scientifically. In view of the foregoing statement, specifically, factor of larger group of people raised by Judith Nasimiyu, this technique was applied to genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators (300) of Kamonyi District. Given the fact this category does not use English, the Questionnaire to be administered is was subjected to review and translation from English to Kinyarwanda language.

5.6 Content Analysis

According Byanafashe & Rutayisire's (2016:13), 'Rwandan History', "the written documents occupy an important place in Rwanda's historical memory,". An exploratory review of historical documentary/written sources was conducted to determine how Girinka practice nurtured and strengthened the traditionally perceived unbreakable inter-ethnic social bonds and social pacts. Rwandans of all walks of life cited historical narratives relating to deeper social bonds and pacts between Rwandans. Published enectodal evidence and empirical evidence was reviewed to enrich this research. If this is the case, how would an ethnic based genocide take place? The table below provides a summarized picture of what we discussed earlier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population category</th>
<th>Size/Number</th>
<th>Sampling Technique</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Data Collection Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former genocide perpetrators</td>
<td>57,816</td>
<td>Cluster sampling</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genocide survivors</td>
<td>12,980</td>
<td>Cluster sampling</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of principal respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

Validity is the extent to which the instrument measures what it is supposed to measure (Kothari, 2004). It is therefore the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represent the phenomenon under study (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). To ensure content validity, two critical activities were done: firstly, the design of the research instruments was informed by the study objectives and research questions. Secondly, the design of the research instruments based on key thematic areas, specifically, the key variables and sub-variables for independent, dependent and intervening variables. Thirdly and most importantly, the research instruments (Questionnaire and Semi-Structured Interviews) were subjected to systematic review and critique by experts and people with relevant knowledge of Girinka practices, reconciliation and Rwandan history as a whole.

Reliability is the measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). To test reliability of the instrument, the Questionnaire was piloted in Bugesera District of Eastern Region. This is a district where Girinka is applied for the same purpose as Kamonyi and it also suffered intensified genocide. Before administering the Questionnaire in Kinyarwanda was subject to critical review by a team of 6 research assistants who have been monitoring and conducting research on Girinka and Reconciliation in Kamonyi and Muhanga Districts of Rwanda. The team uncovered unacceptable Kinyarwanda terminologies which were later rectified. They also provided insightful feedback on timing the process of administering the questionnaire, changing the questionnaire from hard copy format to smart-phone; Ipad enabled software which later helped in not only collecting but generating data electronically. Noteworthy, the piloting of the questionnaire enriched in determining the relevance of the study variables and sub-variable.

7. Results

7.1 Introduction
This section presents findings on the contributions of Girinka Reconciliation Approach on Sustainable peace in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. The researcher sought to determine how the Girinka Reconciliation Approach influences the realization of sustainable peace in Kamonyi. The chapter covers the following themes: The influence of Girinka on attitudes, relations, behaviours of former genocide and genocide survivors. It also includes Girinka’s influence on the following themes: truths, apology, trust, and collective identity/Rwandanness. Other themes the chapter covers include: Girinka and forgiveness, Girinka and economic livelihood improvement, Girinka-based restorative justice and sustainable peace. The chapter ends with chapter summary.

7.2 Girinka’s Influence on Attitudes, Relations and Behaviours

Lederach (1996) recommends transformation of attitudes, relations and behaviours as prerequisites for successful reconciliation and sustainable peace in former divided societies. According to Church & Rogers (2006:14), “[sustainable] peace comes through transformative change of a critical mass of individuals, their consciousness, attitudes, behaviours and skills”. In view of the above, it is critical to determine how Girinka qualifies or disqualifies Jean Paul Lederach’s Conflict Transformation claims and insightful observations of Cheyanne and Mark M. Rogers. Are there noticeable harmony between theoretical propositions and empirical findings? Empirical evidence from the Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer—an instrument that determines the state of reconciliation in Rwanda considers Girinka as one of the strategies, specifically, the “pass-on of a cow’ principle helped to build social relationships destroyed during the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi,” (2015:114). The proceeding Girinka contributes to transformation of attitudes in Kamonyi District of Rwanda.

7.3 Girinka and the Them vs. Us Attitudes

Attitude is defined by IEP Positive Peace Report (2015) as norms, beliefs, preferences and relationships within society (p.13). The report further notes, attitudes influence how people and groups cooperate in the society. This study sought to determine how such cooperation happens after dreadful genocidal violence in Kamonyi District. The definitional understanding of what attitude is provided an entry point for presentation of empirical evidence of how Girinka contributed in building bridges and breaking Them vs. Us walls in the post genocide Kamonyi District of Rwanda. The table below shows the rate of responses based on the testable statement: Girinka contributed in removing “us vs. them” attitude(s) between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators?

Table 3 Girinka and the Them vs. Us Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(167)</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to empirical findings, 55.7 % (167) confirmed that Girinka in Kamonyi District contributes in removing Them vs. Us attitudes between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators and 27.3% (82) respondents strongly agreed. Summed together (agree and strongly agree), 83% (249) of former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors confirmed that Girinka removes negative ‘Us vs. Them’ attitudes between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. Respondents who are very knowledgeable of the Cow-giving practices in both pre-colonial, colonial and post colonial Rwanda also recognized the contribution of cow-giving in creating positive relations between former enemies. One of the major [negative] outcomes of genocidal violence in Kamonyi District was an elevated wall of Them vs. Us between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators. Has Girinka enabled the removal of Them vs. Us Ethnic Wall in Kamonyi District? Has it enabled the two special social categories to empathetically listen to each other’s concerns, validate each other’s fears without making biased judgement or reacting violent? The realization of these attitudinal milestones can act as giant foundational steps towards sustainable peace in Komonyi District.

Reviewed literature revealed that ‘Them vs. Us’ in form of ethnic divisions facilitated the effective planning and implementation of the genocide against Tutsi in 1994. Immediately after the genocide against Tutsi, the, ethnic based Them vs. Us was sharply visible. Quoting Ericson (2001) and Staub (2000) Sentama (2009) pointed out that reconciliation in this context should principally focus on “alteration of negative conflict attitudes through enhancing must trust, and understanding, and challenging misperceptions and distrust, among other negative relational aspects.”
He stressed further, enhancement of positive attitudes should be followed by positive actions (2009: 32). The latter—positive actions— will be discussed in the proceeding section. Given how cows are highly prized amongst Rwandans, the researcher concurs that the home-grown Girinka acts as the readily available local resource with greater capacity to reduce if not total removal of formerly rooted ethnic-based *Them vs. Us* attitudes which characterized pre-genocide and periods immediately after genocide against Tutsi in in 1994.

“Kagame’s programme like Gira inka (own a cow) and other programmes are good because they do not discriminate against anybody” Bemeriki Valerie, aged 63, a genocide perpetrator [still] serving prison her sentence is infamously renown for her divisive, virulent genocidal messages through media (Bamporiki , 2017). Noting, the genocide perpetrator’s (Bemeriki) evaluative remark is instructive given her central role in the preparation and implementation of genocide against Tutsi in Rwanda. Also, worth noting is, the reviewed literature confirmed that like pre-genocide Rwanda, immediately after 1994 genocide against Tutsi, inter-ethnic tensions was astounding high. Ethnic division was part of pre-genocide government policy and practice.

Respondents—former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors stressed that the cow they shared with genocide survivors has acted as a connecting bridge (*ikiraro*) between the two categories. A former genocide perpetrator remarked more concretely:

Girinka removed the walls. Before, receiving the cow, I never dared reaching in the home of the person I caused pains to [during the genocide against Tutsi in 1994], but these days, I visit freely whenever I am taking cow feeds and this results into exchange of casual conversations and deeper bonding (a genocide perpetrator, Murehe Cell, Rukoma Sector, Kamonyi District, 11th April 2018).

The above statements were frequently stated by both genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in the responses generated from administered Questionnaire in Sectors in Kamonyi District. Elders with knowledge of Rwanda’s pre-colonial traditional practices confirmed that cows acted as social bridge between families, clans and significantly halted inter-generational pass-on of violence. The IEP Report (2015) considers attitudes, as one of the positive peace factors—implies one of the factors which create and sustain peaceful societies (p.81). Other two positive peace factors according to IEP Report include— institutions and structures. These two were however not studied by this researcher. The centrality of attitude enables us to understand the level of acceptability of the others amongst genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District. Accepting the right of the other to live unharmed is the foundational basis for changing attitudes from negative to positive relationships.

### 7.4 Girinka and Social Relations

Church & Rogers (2006) observed that “Strong relationships are a necessary ingredient for peacebuilding,” (p.14). This study argued, positive relationships are integral elements of reconciling communities after gruesome genocidal violence and the ultimate outcome of such continued process is sustainable peace. In view of the above scholarly claims by Cheyanne Church and Mark M. Rogers (2006) to what extent is empirical evidence confirming it?

Out of 300 respondents—former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors, at least 89.6% (210.4) confirmed that the revolving process of cow-giving between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators leads to strong inter-ethnic bonding. Respondents made references of a cow as a relational pact. Reference of cows as a relational pact used to be a common feature of blossoming friendship in the pre-colonial and colonial times in Rwanda. Therefore, such reference further confirmed the reverence of cows even in modern Rwanda. Similarly, many respondents referred to the shared cows as a *Ikiraro* loosely translated as a connecting relational bridge between genocide survivor and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District.

Though the two categories laudably likened Girinka as a unifying factor, former genocide perpetrator considered Girinka as a liberating force in Kamonyi District. However, genocide survivors used expressions such as off-loading emotional burdens while former genocide perpetrators referred cows to liberators from genocide burdens. To illustrate the state of affairs before the reeducation of Girinka, respondents used terms such as fear, mistrust, mental burdens (fatigue). To indicate the state of affairs after introduction of Girinka, terms such as love, mutual support, mutual understanding, release of mental burdens, liberation, trust, were constantly mentioned by both genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators to illustrate the present state of relations.

“Today, we drink milk together from the cow we share. Formerly, I could never even drink water from their homes,” (a respondent from Mugina Cell, Mugina Sector, 20th April 2018 remarked a laughingly). Culturally, the sharing of water in rural Rwanda carries deeper meaning—failure to share water can be an indicator of failing relations while sharing of basics such as water, salt and soap are reflectors of socially blossoming relations in many rural parts of Rwanda. Respondents, especially genocide perpetrators acknowledged that meeting survivors through Girinka was miraculous—for instance, a respondent from Cell Mpushi, Sector Musambira on 18th April 2018, testified—“having managed to even talk to her and listen to my concerns, fears and pleas was a miracle for me.”
The process of receiving, taking care of the cow (cleaning the cow-shed, feeding of cows and its calves, and provision of water) and mutual enjoyment of cow products strongly reinforced social contacts, enhances communications between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District hence cementing positive relations between the two categories. Specific cases indicative of established social relations are recited. For instance, one genocide survivor stressed:

Girinka improved our social ties, mutual social support. There was a former genocide perpetrator whose role against our people was unknown to us. Because of established relations under Girinka, he once brought to us reconciliation drinks—a crate of beer and ubushera (local brew)—as part of foundational steps towards apology seeking. He later came and apologized, and I forgave him a genocide survivor, Cell Mugina, Sector Mugina, Kamonyi District, 20th April 2018).

Sharing of local brew in atmosphere of mutual respect, mutual acceptance and non-violent rhetorical exchanges can be an indication of good relational processes in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. Most rural Rwandans consider sharing of local brew as symbolic acts of solidarity, unity and expression of achieved milestone. It is no surprise that sharing of local brew constituted key social activities after committing genocidal acts in rural parts of Rwanda in 1994 genocide. One of the perpetrator’s comments captured the quality of social relations, and for purposes of maintaining meaning of the responses, it is worth-while to keep the Kinyarwanda version and thereafter translate in English:

Inka imaze kubahara abo nahemukiye dusangira amata nki kimenyetso cy’urukundo. Ibi binyereka ko nta kunyishisha bafite ndese ko ntacyo babasha kunyinga. Umuntu mwasangiye amata ntacyo yaqughisha. Translation in English: When the cow we were given calved, I shared milk with the people I betrayed as a sign of deep social relationship (love). This was very reassuring that they don’t fear me. The person you have drunk milk together can’t hide anything from you (A genocide perpetrator, Cell Rukambura, Sector Musambira, 18th April 2018).

To sum up, findings—both quantitative and qualitative—revealed that Girinka influences positive social relations between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators. Sharing of cow product specifically milk, mutual support such as sharing of basic necessities, for instance salt, water and so forth are practical cases of improved social relations. As pieces of evidence for the above, two remarks will act conclude the above analysis:

Gugana inka ni igihango, inka yatumye tubana neza. Translation in English: Cow-giving and receiving between us is a social pact. The cow influenced our social relations, (a genocide perpetrator, Cell Murehe, Sector Rukoma, Kamonyi District, 11th April 2018).

As a reminder, NURC Executive Secretary, Jean Ndayisaba outlined giving and receiving a cow as one of the strategies of sealing social pacts between clans, groups and communities in the pre-colonial Rwanda. He cited inter-marriage between former adversaries another strategy of sealing social pacts between families, communities and groups. Many elderly Rwandans emphasized that treacherous and murderous acts between inter-married families was strictly forbidden. A genocide survivor equally equally:

Ubu dutahirana ubukwe mbere ya Girinka cyaraziraga. Ubu dutzanya udukoresho bya hato na hato. Translation in English: These days, we invite each other for weddings. Before Girinka, this was like a taboo. Now days, we mutually share basic things. After genocide against Tutsi, these had completely disappeared, (a genocide survivor, Masaka Cell, Rugarika Sector, Kamonyi District, 16th April 2018).

In fact, responses from the Questionnaire Administration revealed that former genocide perpetrators qualified Girinka in Kamonyi as Godsend for narrowing social relational gaps inflexibly polarized by the genocide against Tutsis in Rwanda. The process of receiving, taking care of the cow (cleaning the cow-shed, feeding the cows and its calves, and provision of water) as well as mutual enjoyment of cow products strongly reinforced social contacts, enhances communications between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District hence cementing positive relations between the two categories. Girinka’s contribution toward cementing inter-ethnic bonding in Kamonyi District is a commendable lesson worthy learning and replicating by other Districts in Rwanda striving to achieve harmonious inter-ethnic bonding, accelerated reconciliation and sustainable peace. Beyond Kamonyi District, there are scores of people, genocide perpetrators who underscored the contribution of Girinka in bridging relational gaps between genocide survivors and genocide perpetrators or their relatives.

The process of receiving, taking care of the cow (cleaning the cow-shed, feeding of cows and its calves, and provision of water) and mutual enjoyment of cow products strongly reinforced social contacts, enhances communications between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District hence cementing positive relations between the two categories. Specific cases indicative of established social relations are recited. For instance, one genocide survivor stressed:
Girinka improved our social ties, mutual social support. There was a former genocide perpetrator whose role against our people was unknown to us. Because of established relations under Girinka, he once brought to us reconciliation drinks—a crate of beer and ubushera (local brew)—as part of foundational steps towards apology seeking. He late came and apologized, and I forgave him (a genocide survivor, Cell Mugina, Sector Mugina, Kamonyi District, 20th April 2018).

Sharing of local brew in atmosphere of mutual respect, mutual acceptance and non-violent rhetorical exchanges can be an indication of good relational processes in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. Most rural Rwandans consider sharing of local brew as symbolic acts of solidarity, unity and expression of achieved milestone. It is no surprise that sharing of local brew constituted key social activities after committing genocidal acts in rural parts of Rwanda in 1994 genocide. One of the perpetrator’s comments captured the quality of social relations, and for purposes of maintaining meaning of the responses, it is worth-while to keep the Kinyarwanda version and thereafter translate in English:

Inka imaze kubyara abo nahemukiye dusangira amata nki kimenyetso cy’urukundo. Ibi binyereka ko nta kunyishisha bajite ndese ko ntacyo babasha kunyinga. Umuntu mwasangiyeyi amata ntacyo yaguhisha. Translation in English: When the cow we were given calved, I shared milk with the people I betrayed as a sign of deep social relationship (love). This was very reassuring that they don’t fear me. The person you have drunk milk together can’t hide anything from you (A genocide perpetrator, Cell Rukambura, Sector Musambira, 18th April 2018).

To sum up, findings—both quantitative and qualitative—revealed that Girinka influences positive social relations between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators. Sharing of cow product specifically milk, mutual support such as sharing of basic necessities, for instance salt, water and so forth are practical cases of improved social relations. As pieces of evidence for the above, two remarks will act conclude the above analysis:

―Gugana inka ni igihango, inka yatumye tubana neza. Translation in English: Cow-giving and receiving between us is a social pact. The cow influenced our social relations,” (a genocide perpetrator, Cell Murehe, Sector Rukoma, Kamonyi District, 11th April 2018).

As a reminder, NURC Executive Secretary, Jean Ndayisaba outlined giving and receiving a cow as one of the strategies of sealing social pacts between clans, groups and communities in the pre-colonial Rwanda. He cited inter-marriage between former adversaries another strategy of sealing social pacts between families, communities and groups. Many elderly Rwandans emphasized that treacherous and murderous acts between inter-married families was strictly forbidden. A genocide survivor equally observed:

Ubu dutahirana ubukwe mbere ya Girinka cyaraziraga. Ubu dutizanya udukoresho bya hato na hato. Translation in English: These days, we invite each other for weddings. Before Girinka, this was like a taboo. Now days, we mutually share basic things. After genocide against Tutsi, these had completely disappeared, (a genocide survivor, Masaka Cell, Rugarika Sector, Kamonyi District, 16th April 2018).

7.5 Girinka and Behaviours

To establish how Girinka influences change in behavior, the researcher formulated the following statement: The received cow enabled us to plan and work together for our own survival and the survival of our cow. Reviewed literature revealed that joint planning and implementation of activities to realize a shared objective, improves behavioural aspects of former enemies. This view informed the formulation of the foregoing statement. The table below presents the quantitative findings in response to the question which: The Cow we received enabled us to plan and work together for our own survival and the survival of our cow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(156)</td>
<td>(98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Empirical findings showed that 52% (156) of respondents agreed, 32.7% (98) strongly agreed, 4% (12) disagreed and 2% (6) strongly disagreed with the statement that Girinka enabled joint planning and working together for genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District. Totalling agreed and strongly agreed resulted into 84.7% (254) of rate of confirmation. The empirical reveal was in tendem with the earlier stated view that joint planning and implementation of activities improves behaviours of former conflict parties. It was established that common survival and survival of the cow—improved behavioural aspects of former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors in Kamonyi District.

This empirical evidence, (84.7% ) is conformity with the theoretical perspective of John Paul Lederach, which emphasises that “conflict transformation requires deliberate interventions to minimize the destructive effects of social conflicts and maximize its potentialities for personal growth at physical, emotional and spiritual levels” (John Paul Lederach, 1997: 82). Transformation of genocidal violence to non-violent behaviours necessitate time, well-thought-out strategies, great human ingenuity and commitment from both genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators, state and non-state actors. Citing Adam Curle, Jean Paul Ledearch (1997) referred to this process as moving the two categories from “unpeaceful to peaceful relationships,” (p.64). Changing deeply rooted old habits—actions—was however noted not to be a simple undertaking, especially, in Rwanda where genocide was systematically planned, implemented in the most vicious manner.

Reviewed scholarly literature, for instance, Brounéus (2007) firmly accentuated the same view, noting that though former enemies must continue living harmoniously side by side, transforming genocidal attitudes and behaviours to collegial ones hardly comes fast and easily. The unending genocide ideology and violent acts aimed at causing terror to genocide survivors in some rural parts of Rwanda 24 years after the genocide against Tutsi attest to the foregoing statement.

In their impressive work which stressed the complexity and centrality of measuring change in fragile and post-conflict societies, Corlazzoli & White (2003) referred to measuring behaviours, relations, perceptions as “measuring unmeasurable,“ (same research title). They also cited intangibility of change in behaviour, relations, and attitudes as critical challenges for peace building scholars and practitioners in post conflict societies. The following citation of the two authors is illustrative:

“Intangible change is compounded with the complexity of the causal mechanisms that bring about change. It is difficult to measure how changes in values and perceptions manifest themselves, (directly or indirectly, intended or unintended) as behaviour change at the individual, group-, and/or societal-levels. How these changes interact with other elements of societal systems, for instance institutional reform or electoral outcomes, is even harder to measure (2003:9).

The foregoing view resonates with the caution from monitoring and evaluation specialists emphasizing the need “to recognize that, it is better to monitor and evaluate how interventions and actions contribute to an increase in peace or a decrease in violence,” (Vanessa Corlazzoli and Jonathan White, 2003:10).

While there is no empirical evidence pointing to how Girinka negatively influences behaviours of genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators, the two authors emphasized a shift from attribution of achieved behavioural change in post conflict societies to one key factor or actor to contribution. Corlazzoli & White, (2003) defined attribution as “when it is possible to demonstrate—[beyond reasonable doubt—] a direct causal link between an intervention and its impact,” (p.10). Considering peace building context, for instance, Rwanda’s post genocide case, “many things are often happening at the same time—multiple actors and programmes may be working in the same area […] conflict environments may rapidly evolve or devolve, programmes may have more than one causal strand,” (Corlazzoli & White, 2003:10). The call for shifting from attribution to contribution as advocated by Vanessa Corlazzoli and Jonathan White, enables sharing of achieved gains in terms of behavioural, relational, cultural and perceptions of former advisors. In view of this, Girinka reconciliation approach stands as one of the contributing factors of sustainable peace in Kamonyi District. Analysis of other contributing factors goes beyond the aim of this study.

Notwithstanding the complexities associated with changing genocidal behaviours advanced by the scholarly literature, quantitative empirical evidence showed a rather different behavioural landscape in Kamonyi District. Both former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors attested to adoption of socially acceptable behaviours in Kamonyi District. To verify the authenticity of these revelations, the researcher triangulated claims of former genocide perpetrators with views of genocide survivors. For instance, the respondent from Muginca Cell, Mugina Sector remarked:

“After the cow-giving ceremony, the wife of the man who killed my people came and profusely apologized. She even testified that they looted things from our homes. Later on, she would render a helping hand in my farming activities.”

Joint actions such as farming, cutting glass for the cow, milking the cow, building houses for genocide survivors consisted of key indicators of a shift from "past adversarial behaviours to cooperative actions," (Church & Rogers, 2006:3). The above is put into practical evidence by a genocide survivor from Masaka Cell, Rugarika Sector of Kamonyi District during the administration of questionnaire on 16th April 2018:
There is someone who apologized for his genocide responsibility to me. Thereafter, he ordered his children to always come and carry out home errands for me such as cutting cow glass, fetch water, collect firewood (A genocide survivor, Nyarubuye Cell, Rugarika Sector, date 16th April 2018)

Cases such as a genocide perpetrator milking the cow while the genocide survivor holding the calf, ploughing the land jointly, weeding gardens, harvesting together and building houses actualize the behavioural change from adversarial to cooperative partnerships, Cheyanne Church and Mark M. Rogers, (2006). There are practical evidences indicative of collective planning and cooperative actions between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators.

7.6 Girinka and Truth Revelations

Information about what happened, how it happened, who did what and the whereabouts of unburied genocide victims constitute integral parts of truth in far as Rwanda’s post-genocide context is concerned. Likewise, truth about the past human wrongs such as genocidal violence significantly impacts on reconciliation and sustainable peace in Kamonyi District. In view of the foregoing view, knowing the extent Girinka enabled truth revelations about key aspects such as causes of genocide, whereabouts of unburied genocide victims and so forth forms part of this research.

7.6.1 Truths about Unburied Genocide Victims

24 years after genocide against Tutsi, survivors are still yearning for the truths relating to the whereabouts of people who were killed and have never been humanely buried. Yet, giving a decent burial is a humanely dignifying cultural practice the living Rwandans still owe to the genocide victims (the dead). Uncovering the whereabouts of the genocide victims remains one of the critical challenges to not only genocide survivors but the entire human community in the post genocide Rwanda. The ugliest part of the genocide against Tutsi was genocide survivors cannot trace the locations for the genocide victims. Compared to other genocide, the genocide against Tutsi did not have marked killing spots. Whereas, the post genocide leadership considers exhuming and giving genocide victims a culturally befitting burial as one of the key priorities, the hardest question remained—what can be done to enable revelation of truths about the whereabouts of genocide victims in the post genocide? This question is not only concerning some specific districts leaving others. Given the intensification of genocide in Kamonyi, it was worth-while to establish how Girinka contributed to knowing the whereabouts of unburied genocide victims. The testable statement appeared as thus: Girinka contributed to knowing whereabouts of unburied genocide victims.

Table 5 Girinka Influencing Revelation of Unburied Genocide Victims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings indicated that 55.3% (166) of respondents (Genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators) agreed with the view that Girinka contributed to knowing the whereabouts of unburied genocide victims in Kamonyi District. A total of 59% (177) of respondents (agreed and strongly agreed) revealed that Girinka contributed to knowing the whereabouts of unburied genocide victims in Kamonyi District. However, 15.7% (47) disagreed with the foregoing statement.

Referring to Cambodian genocidal violence and post genocide processes, John D. & Jaya Ramji-Nogales (2012) qualified truth as learning information relating to victim’s suffering and the fate of their lost loved ones. It is on this basis that knowing the whereabouts of unburied victims gains prominence. To Rwandans providing a befitting burial is part of highly valued cultural practices. Nonetheless, finding the whereabouts of genocide victims or getting information leads is still a major challenge for genocide survivors. Literature pointed out that some truths revealed during Gacaca sessions helped in healing, forgiveness and reconciliation processes in Rwanda. Sentama (2009) stressed there is proximate nexus between sincere truth and non-repetition of genocidal behaviours by former genocide perpetrators.

The person I share the cow with showed me where my people were killed and buried during the genocide against Tutsi. He also told us the names of looters of our properties. This was mainly triggered by encounter meetings prior to giving and receiving of the cows. The cow catalysed the process of telling the truth and the process of taking of
the cow enabled revelation of details, (A genocide survivor, Murehe Cell, Rukoma Sector, Kamonyi District, 11th April 2018).

Some scholars, for instance, Naqvi (2006) have even observed that accessing truthful information is right for genocide survivors. However, there are still cases of uncounted truth relating to the whereabouts of genocide victims. Plausibly, this accounts for 16.4% of respondents—(disagreed and strongly disagreed) who differed with the earlier statement. Identification of the whereabouts of unburied genocide victims is not only a major challenge for Kamonyi District, it is a national reconciliation and peacebuilding challenge in the post genocide Rwanda.

Compared to other quantitative evidence for other sub-variables under this research, noticeably, Girinka has marginal influence (59%) on truth revelation, specifically the whereabouts of unburied genocide victims in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. Respondents, especially from genocide perpetrators who testified during Gacaca sessions and again revealed information under Girinka arrangement attributed the reluctance to reveal information about the whereabouts of unburied bodies of genocide victims to fear of retributive justice, fear of re-traumatizing genocide survivors. A former genocide perpetrator from Ruvumu Cell, Musambira Sector testified to the researcher as thus: “The genocide we committed was awful. After realizing its dreadful nature, incessant fear consumes your entire life. Those who committed the crime are fearing the genocide survivors,” (respondent, Ruvumu Cell, Musambira Sector, 18th April 2018). Whether genocide survivors confirmed that repentant former genocide perpetrators showed extreme fears the first time they revealed truth, the subsequent act of apologizing and responding with forgiveness released them from what some respondents referred to as mental prison.

In the earlier literature review, Erin Daly and Jeremy (2007) alluded to the problematic associated with truth vs. justice dichotomy, noting that, sometimes, revelation of truth, can be deeply injurious to genocide survivors, hence summoning what the two authors termed as—“the clamour for justice.” Whereas a good score of scholars emphasize the healing value in truths, they equally acknowledged the re-traumatizing effect of truth to its seekers—genocide survivors and eventually provoking the desire for retributive justice. From the above empirical revelation, it is important to note the following: first, the researcher did not establish whether there were cases of re-traumatizing truths triggered by Girinka however, many respondents (genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators) underscored that the first encounter meetings between the two parties to discuss their issues together were painful. Also, crucially, the above dichotomy—truth vs. justice—is not tenable to the overall research objective—to establish how Girinka Reconciliation Approach contributes to the realization of sustainable peace in Kamonyi District.

7.6.2 Girinka and Truth about Causes of Genocide

Scholars, reconciliation and peace building practitioners have discussed the causes of the genocide against Tutsi varyingly. Gacaca sessions, the ongoing Nkurunyang Rwanda and genocide commemoration forums have provided platforms for revisiting the genocide against Tutsi; it causes, evolution among others. However, there some Rwandans who still lack truths about the causes of genocide. Failure to know what caused the genocide can act as a barrier against effective Girinka based reconciliation and sustainable peace in Kamonyi District. This researcher asked respondents to affirm whether or not Cow given/received contributed to revelation of truths about the causes of the genocide against Tutsi in Rwanda in Kamonyi District, Rwanda. The testable statement was formulated as: Girinka contributed to knowing the truth about causes of genocide against Tutsi.

Table 6 Girinka and Truth about Causes of Genocide in Kamonyi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(164)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings indicated that 54.7% (164) of the respondents confirmed that Cow for Peace shared by genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators contributed to knowing the truth about the causes of the genocide in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. At least 14.0% (42) strongly agreed with the same statement. This implies, a total of 68.7% (206) of both genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators found Cow to have contributed to knowing the truth about the causes of genocide. Only 9% (27) disagreed with the foregoing statement. Respondents attested that the process of caring for the cows provided opportunities for regular social contacts such as meetings, culturally binding greetings and discussions about the cow’s welfare, its feeding patterns and so forth. The more genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District intensified contacts and
communication through the Girinka, the more the two categories gained confidence in the other’s intentions and actions hence consolidating reconciliation.

The Rwanda Reconciliation Barometers (2015) revealed that 91.2% of Rwandans agreed with the assumptions that “causes of the genocide against Tutsi were frankly discussed and commonly understood in Rwanda” (RRB, 2015:28). According to RRB of 2010, at least 87% of Rwandans agreed that in sixteen years following the genocide, most of the major issues related to genocide causes and its consequences had been frankly discussed and understood (see RRB, 2015:28). A shared sense of the past, specifically, the causes of genocide, collective stitching of the violence free future will be much easier. A citation in RRB (2016) resonates with foregoing assertion, “Understanding the past is important because when one does not know where s/he is going, she can’t know where s/he is going, (RRB, 2015:29). Simply put, as a shared resource, Girinka significantly contributed in providing safe-space for truthful information exchanges about the causes of genocide against Tutsis of Rwanda between the genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District.

7.6.3 Girinka and Truth about People’s Roles in the Genocide against Tutsi

Knowing who did what in the genocide against Tutsi is a lingering challenge for not only justice but reconciliation and building sustainable peace after gruesome violence, genocide included. There is ample evidence from literature indicating that home-grown approaches enable revelation of truths related perpetrator’s actions during violence times. Gacaca is on record for enabling the disclosure of even bitter truths about people’s behaviours during the genocide against Tutsis in Rwanda. Likewise, Girinka Reconciliation Approach provides unique opportunities for knowing such information between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators based on how the approach brings the two categories together, bridging communicational and relational gaps and building confidence between two former protagonists. The preceding table presents findings relating to how Girinka enabled the revelation of truths about people’s roles in the genocide against Tutsi in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. Revealed truth through communications triggered by Girinka is not normally used against by person who revealed it. The respondents scored the statement: Girinka contributed to knowing the whole truth about people’s roles in the genocide against Tutsi in Kamonyi District.

Table 7 Truth Girinka and Truth about People’s Roles in the Genocide against Tutsi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(179)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ascertain whether truths about people’s actions would be revealed through Girinka, contributed a question was asked—“Girinka contributed to knowing the whole truth about people’s role in the genocide.” In response, 59.7% (179) agreed with the foregoing statement, 11% (33) strongly agreed and only 7.7% (23) disagreed with it. Agreed and strongly agreed responses to the statement stood at 70.7% (212). One genocide survivor, shared information about a former genocide perpetrator who revealed his role in the 1994 genocide: “He said he killed my wife during the genocide against Tutsi. He came forward to apologize carrying local brew. He came with his wife,” (a genocide survivor, Cell Nyamiyaga, Sector Mukiinga, Kamonyi District, 21st April 2018). A former genocide perpetrator said: “Through Girinka enabled free space—pre-Girinka encounter Meetings—I was able to fully understand the enormity of the crime of genocide I committed…” (respondent, Cell Mukiinga, Sector Nyamiyaga, Kamonyi District, and 21st April 2018).

Responses from genocide perpetrators indicated how meeting fellow genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors enabled them realize the heaviness of genocide burdens and shared desire of off-loading genocide-related baggage—genocide perpetrators carried trauma caused by what they did during the genocide against Tutsi and the failure to release truths of what happened while genocide survivors carried trauma from what was done to them and failure to get truths about what happened and why it happened.

However, there were a good number of both genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators who stressed that whereas the revelation of one’s role is possible, pointing out other’s role is extremely hard because of fear of reprisals. Self-confessions to own-up, confessing personal responsibility in the genocide was largely influenced by pre-Girinka encounter meetings which acted as catalysts for critical self-reflection. Noteworthy, the pre-Girinka encounter meetings was part of the pre-conditions for receipt of cows by both genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi. A noted: “Girinka initiated dialogue between us. Through casual conversations, he was able to tell us what he did in the genocide, how he was arrested, detained and stories
about his life in prison. From the repeated stories he keeps sharing, you realize truth therein,” (A genocide survivor, Cell Ngoma, Nyamiyaga Sector, Kamonyi District, 19th April 2018).

7.6.4 Girinka and Prevention of Genocide against Tutsi in Kamonyi

Translating the globally cited Never Again ideal into reality has been largely rhetorical than practical in view of genocidal violence since the Holocaust of Jews. At global level, several genocide prevention attempts have been tried and borne minimal outcomes and impacts. In Rwanda, both conventional and unconventional strategies are integral part of the Genocide Prevention processes. Empirical findings by RRB (2015) revealed “84.1% Rwandans strongly indicated that genocide can never happen again in Rwanda,” (p.41). The Executive Secretary for National Unity and Reconciliation Commission Jean Ndayisaba cited National Reconciliation as one of the strategies for genocide prevention in Rwanda. Further down to Kamonyi District, at least 95.9% of respondents confirmed that “they prefer to die instead of engaging in divisions and/or genocide,” (RRB, 2015:37). Emphatically, the Executive Secretary noted Kamonyi’s Girinka programme acts as one of the home-grown approaches for promoting reconciliation hence paving the way for realization of sustainable peace. In view of the above, the researcher asked respondents to rate how Girinka can contribute to genocide prevention in Kamonyi District.

Table 8 Girinka and Prevention of Genocide against Tutsi in Kamonyi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(163)</td>
<td>(86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table above shows, 54.3% (163) respondents agreed with the view that Girinka can contribute to genocide prevention, 28.7% (86) strongly agreed and 3.7% (11) disagreed. Agreed and strongly agreed responses summed up, 83% (249) of genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District indicated that Girinka contributes to genocide prevention. Central to these statistical figures is answering the question of how. Both genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators testified how the Girinka influences mutual understanding, strengthens social ties, enables opening up communication lines, and removes suspicions and negative ethnic stereotypes in Kamonyi Districts. In earlier sections, empirical evidence showed rate of inter-marriage between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District. If the foregoing and emerging empirical evidence—statistical and verbal claims of genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators—are incontestable facts, undeniably, the much-admired Cow meaningfully contributes to genocide prevention in Kamonyi District.

7.6.5 Girinka and Truth after Healing

Reviewed literature provided two sides of truths. First, is the power to heal inner-wounds of not only genocide survivors, but even the healing of the perpetrators. Secondly, the power of truths to re-traumatize genocide survivors if it is inappropriately delivered, Erin Daly and Jeremy (2007). The latter has been part and parcel of Rwanda’s post genocide processes. For this study, the researcher was interested in the former. The empirical findings in the table below provide statistical findings related to healing of inner wounds through Girinka triggered truth.

Table 9 Girinka and Truth Revelation after Healing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%(0)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table above shows, 54.3% (82) genocide survivors agreed with the statement and 28.7% (43) strongly agreed. Summed up, 83% (125) of genocide survivors strongly agreed and agreed. Guided by the above statistical facts, there is noticeable harmony between empirical evidence and the
reviewed scholarly literature, specifically relating to truth and healing. Centrally, there is proximate linkage between healing, reconciliation and sustainable peace in Kamonyi District. To demonstrate a psychological shift from the past to the present, one respondent said: “For myself, I never talked to the person who killed my people even not greeting him. But, these days, I don’t have any problems in my heart” (a genocide survivor, Cell Bihembe, Sector Rugarika, 17th April 2018).

Many respondents cited routine contact/meetings, informal discussions, and working together while taking care of the cows, joint works in farms and so forth, as opportunities for revelation of non-injurious truths by genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District. Genocide survivors pointed out the ways former genocide perpetrators extend helping hand to genocide survivors through managing domestic errands, building genocide widows are indicative of change in attitudes and practices.

8.1 Girinka and Apology

One of the hardest hurdles after genocidal violence is getting genuine apologies from former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District. Yet, according to many peace building scholars, there cannot be meaningful reconciliation and sustainable peace without apology. Similarly, genuine apology from former genocide perpetrators constituted one of the expectations of genocide survivors after 1994 genocide against Tutsis in Kamonyi and Rwanda as a whole. Reviewed literature pointed out that apology involves the former genocide perpetrator taking responsibility of the pains inflicted onto the genocide survivors regardless of risks associated with taking such decision, (Carl Schneider, 2007 & Alison Dundes Renteln 2008).

Assessing how apology and forgiveness contribute to reconciliation in Rwanda, 70.8% and 88.3% the Rwanda Reconciliation Baromers(2010 and (2015) respectively confirmed so with above statistical revelations. In view of the above, we formulated the statement: Girinka facilitated former genocide perpetrators to plead for apology in Kamonyi District.

| Table 10 Girinka Facilitated Former Genocide Perpetrators to Plead for Apology |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Percentage (%)              | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree | Total (%) | Total |
| 0%                          | (16)             | (21)     | (172)   | (89)  | (172)         | 100       | 300   |

In view of the empirical findings in Kamonyi District indicated that, 57.3% (172) respondents agreed that Girinka facilitated former genocide perpetrators to plead for apology to the genocide survivors, 29.7% (89) strongly agreed while 5.3%(16) disagreed. Summed up, 87% (261) of respondents confirmed that Girinka facilitated former genocide perpetrators to make apology to genocide survivors. The Executive Director of CARSA, the local Non-Governmental Organization that has been at the forefront of giving cows under Girinka arrangement cited many examples of survivors and former genocide perpetrators not only freely exchanging cows, but developing deeper relations and promoting forgiveness instead of apology. Such have happened, according to CARSA’s authorities as a result of continual interactions, for instance, when former genocide perpetrators come twice in the home of the genocide survivors to milk the cow.

The cow has enabled former genocide perpetrators to go beyond acknowledging their crimes but to seek forgiveness and understand the deepness of the consequences of the crimes they committed. This is a result of former genocide perpetrators coming twice to the home of the genocide survivor to milk the cow given. After milking the cow, definitely, they share milk, (Executive Director, CARSA, SSIs, May 2018, Kigali, Rwanda).

Girinka Reconciliation Approach facilitated former genocide perpetrators to verbally express their apologies and escorting their words with concrete actions in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. This agrees with Janna Thompson’s central argument in the Age of Apology (2008) emphasizing both genuine expressive regrets and reparative actions by the apologizer to the offended. What makes Janna Thompson’s view slightly problematic is, he did not specific how much should be expressively said in form of apology and how much reparative works to be done—quantitatively, qualitatively and for how long. Failure to determine how much expressive apology and reparative actions constitutes risks to be attacked as enslavement of former genocide perpetrators by genocide survivors.

The following sub-section provides elements of that constitute apology. Provision of element of apology responds to the noticed divergences on definition of apology. Some of these elements of apology included—sincere admission of guilt, taking responsibility, expression of commitment for non-repetition of crimes by the former genocide perpetrator, among others.
8.2 Girinka and Admission of Guilt

Former genocide perpetrator’s admission of their genocidal actions is critical for genocide survivors to accept the genuineness of apology from the apologizer. Making such attempts marks a self-liberating journey for healing, reconciliation and building of sustainable peace in any post genocide society. The researcher sought to understand how Girinka facilitated admission of guilt by former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District as the following table presents. The testable statement was formulated as thus: Girinka has helped genocide perpetrators to admit guilt for the crimes they committed in Kamonyi District.

**Table 11 Girinka and Admission of Guilt in Kamonyi District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(83)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per the table above, 55.3% (83) of genocide survivors confirmed that Girinka facilitated the admission of guilt while 25.3% (38) strongly agreed. At least 12.0% (18) were neutral/undecided and 7.0% (11) disagreed. Considering the agreed and strongly agreed response rate, a total of 86.6% (121) of genocide survivors confirmed that Girinka facilitated the admission of guilt by former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District. “The person who killed my relatives came forward and apologized to me and my mother. This was bit stressful but the cow we share facilitated meeting, building trust in him,” (Kidahwe Cell, Nyamiyaga Sector, 19th April 2018). As a reminder, admission of guilt is one of the major elements of genuine apology seeking.

8.3 Girinka and Taking Responsibility for the Harm Done

Accepting to take responsibility and commitment to repetition of genocidal violence is an integral element of genuine apology. It is a risky-undertaking endeavour, however, especially, owning up awful responsibility such as genocidal violence and its associated consequences to victims and genocide survivors. Whereas committing to not repeat certain offences can be easy, taking responsibility for killing and causing indescribable pains and destruction, is one of the hardest endeavours of post genocide apology-seeking processes. Owning up of even lesser offences are not the easiest of human activities. Nonetheless, it is a central pre-condition for any genuine apology. In this study, genuine apology constituted integral part of reconciliation which eventually leads to sustainable peace in Kamonyi District. The table below entails the statistical empirical evidence relating to how Girinka facilitated taking responsibility for the genocidal harm done and committing to not repeat it.

**Table 12 Girinka and Taking Responsibility for the Harm Done**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table above indicates, 49.7% (75) of genocide survivors in Kamonyi District agreed with the view that Girinka facilitated taking responsibility and committing to non-repetition of similar genocidal violence acts. In view of the foregoing statement, 34.3% (52) strongly agreed, 9.3% (14) chose to remain neutral while 3.0% (5) disagreed. Agreed and strongly agreed combined makes 84% (127) of respondents confirming that Girinka facilitated former genocide perpetrators to take responsibility and promised no repeat of genocidal violence in Kamonyi District. Recounting how some of the former genocide perpetrator’s admission of guilt, one respondent revealed:

A group of former genocide perpetrators came and pleaded for forgiveness through sincere apologies. They confessed that at the peak of the genocide against Tutsi, they looted my house’s roof tiles and thereafter returned
them. They later roofed and rehabilitated my house, (A genocide survivor, Nyarubuye Cell, Rugaruka Sector, 16th April 2018).

Noting the earlier noted fact that 87.5% of Rwandans confirmed that Girinka contributes to reconciliation as per Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer (2015) findings, it is worth-while to argue that if apology constitutes reconciliation, Girinka’s role in bettering reconciliation is scientifically incontestable. However, this section largely focused on a much smaller component of apology—taking responsibility and committing to non-repetition of genocidal violence acts in Kamonyi District. This requires further analysis before drawing conclusions.

8.4 Girinka and Recognition of Harm Done and Its Consequences

Scholars on apology note that as long as the perpetrator has not recognized the harm he caused to the victims and survivors and longer-term consequences thereof, apology plea from him needs to be treated with reservations and hesitations. As such, complete and sincere apology plea should state perpetrator’s perceived or actual genocidal acts, naming the harm done and their proportional consequences to the genocide survivors and victims. Guided by scholarly arguments, the researcher asked respondents—genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators to rate the extent at which Girinka facilitated former genocide perpetrator to recognize the harm done and its consequences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13 Girinka Facilitated the Former Genocide Perpetrator’s Recognition of Harm Done and Its Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage (%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least 49.0% (147) of the respondents they agreed, 36.7% (110) strongly agreed 4.0%(12) disagreed and 7.7%(23) kept a neutral position. A positive view can be got from the summation of agreed and strongly response: 85.7% (257). Failure to realize one’s responsibility in causing harm to another is recipe for repetition of the committed crimes. Former genocide perpetrators mainly the repentant ones confirmed that deliberate refusal to recognize harm committed to genocide survivors is not only painful, it reverses reconciliation processes in Kamonyi District. Nonetheless, in the earlier discussions, there were cases of genocide perpetrators providing support to the survivors of genocide in managing home errands exemplify recognition of harm done. Houses of the widows of genocide destroyed during the genocide have been rehabilitated under this arrangement. The following statement is a testament of the recognition of harm done to genocide survivors by former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District:

In the first place, I had the responsibility in the genocide against Tutsi. The cow-giving acted as an eye-opener for me because I was able to see the consequences of my [genocidal] actions. Now, I can reassure genocide survivors that I cannot repeat it. I compare the life of genocide to Jesus on the cross. We were responsible for all this…(a former genocide perpetrator, Cell Murehe, Sector Rukoma, Kamonyi District, 11th April 2018).

Views from the Semi-Structured Interviews with respondents from National Girinka Coordinator, CARSA Executive Director and NURC Executive Secretary noted that self-driven reparative actions by former genocide perpetrators to genocide survivors translate verbal apologies into actions in Kamonyi District. Referring to reparative actions by former genocide perpetrators, one respondent said: “He came forward and apologized. He provided support through actions such as giving me fertilizers, supporting me in my farming activities. This expressed commitment for improved relationships,” Kivumu Cell, Musambira Sector, Kamonyi District, 18th April 2018).

9. Girinka and Collective Identity/Rwandaness

The 1994 Genocide against Tutsi was a direct product of ethnic divides in Rwanda. Studies about the contribution of ethnicity in Rwanda confirmed this assertion. Ethnicity was outlawed in the post genocide Rwanda after considering how harmful it can be when used by manipulative elites. Referring to bettering relationships, Cheyanne Church and M. Rogers (2006) underlined, it is imperative to move formerly divided people “from different ethnicities to a common nationality as a path towards reconciliation
and sustainable peace (p.18). Like Girinka, NdumunyaRwanda, embodies unique opportunities for achieving a shared Rwandan society after a shattered one by 1994 genocide against Tutsi.

Testimonies of genocide perpetrators gathered by Bamboriki Edouard (2017) affirmed this foregoing view. Repentant genocide prisoners and former genocide perpetrators recommended that there is a need to devise mechanisms for undoing Tutsi-Hutu and Twa ethnic divides for reconciliation and peacebuilding to take root after the 1994 genocide against Tutsi. One resident of Rukoma, Kamonyi District, emphasized:

“There is a close relationship between national identity and reconciliation because when people feel that they share nationality [Rwandaness], it makes them understand that what can bring consequences to one can also impact the other since they share the same nation, (RRB, 2015:48)

In his seminal work, Oliver Ramsbotham (2017) stressed two schools of thought on identity reconstruction after violence. Central to this study was his emphasis that after deadly ethnic-based violence:

“What is required is nothing less than an eventual redefinition of self/other identity constructs themselves, so that a sense of “we” replaces the us/them’ split or—at least identities based on a view of “them” as the enemy and “us” as the embattled victims begin to dissolve,” ( Oliver Ramsbotham et al., 2017).

In view of this, the researcher asked genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District whether Girinka contributes to formation of collective identity or Rwandaness. According to NURC Report—Ndi Umunyarwanda Program: Perceptions, Results and Challenges (2017), “Ndi Umunyarwanda” made it possible for us to know that what unites us is far authentic and important that what divides us. Rwandans are “graduating” from more divisive identities to a more inclusive one.” In view of this, the research sought to determine how Girinka reinforces NdumunyaRwanda/Rwandaness between the two categories—genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District of Rwanda.

### Table 14 Girinka and NdumunyaRwanda/Rwandaness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(142)</td>
<td>(118)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the empirical findings, at least 50.7% (142) of respondents, specifically, the former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors confirmed that Girinka reinforces NdumunyaRwanda/collective identity in Kamonyi District, 39.3 % (118) Strongly agreed and only 3.0%(10) disagreed. Whereas the NURC Report above states that Rwandans have realized—what unites them is greater or what NURC referred to as “far authentic” than what divides them, (p.45), the report did not highlight some of the unique unifying factors of Rwandans. Knowledge of these unifying factors would enable harnessing them to consolidate reconciliation processes that will ultimately lead to sustainable peace in Rwanda. Arguably, the researcher considers Girinka as one of these unique unifying factors for Rwanda. Empirical evidence emerging from Kamonyi District—specifically, the total sum of 90% (260) respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the statement—Girinka reinforces NdumunyaRwanda.

There are two valuable lessons that can be drawn from the above 90% (260) record of respondents confirming that, Girinka reinforces NdumunyaRwanda in Kamonyi District. First, this re-affirmed the earlier presented views both from literature findings relating to the considerable approval and cultural respect to cows in Rwanda. Whereas this 90% of respondents are from Kamonyi District, this confirmation is widely generalizable and applicable to most parts of Rwanda. Another worthy important point to note is, NdumunyaRwanda forums exhibit greater and unique opportunities for revealing more truths, trigger apologies, forgiveness and healing for both genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in the whole post genocide Rwanda. Given the already discussed socio-economic and cultural significances of cows to Rwanda, the foregoing empirical revelation provided valuable basis to recommend to reconciliation and peacebuilding actors to draw best practices from Kamonyi for scalability and replicability to other districts of Rwanda.

Considering the sensitivities and transformational impacts of NdumunyaRwanda, its success rests on depoliticizing its process and its outcomes, good will of both state and non-state actors, ample resources in terms of human, logistical and budgets. Further, NdumunyaRwanda’s effective implementation and success needs selfless champions exhibiting higher integrity like the one that exemplified Gacaca’s Inyangamugayo (wo/men of integrity). However, more nuanced elements need further analysis before more conclusions and recommendations.
9.1 Girinka-Based Ndumunyarwandaand Reduction of Ethnic Divides in Kamonyi District

Ethnic divisions essentially contributed to what Paloutzian & Kalayjian, (2009:4) referred to as “episodic violence, and structural violence.” The foregoing descriptions on the forms of violence suggested by Paloutzian & Kalayjian, characterized the path towards the genocide against Tutsi in Kamonyi District and Rwanda as a whole. For instance, one’s ethnic identity determined how long a section of Rwandans would live, his prospects to enjoy prosperity or poverty, peace or living in a permanent state of fear of state-instigated violence in pre-genocide Kamonyi. The objectives of NdumunyaRwanda programme in the NURC Report (2017) strongly emphasize eradication of ethnic divisions and promoting unity and reconciliation of Rwandans. Similarly, eradication of ethnic identity forms part of Rwanda’s unity and reconciliation agenda after 1994 against Tutsi. The table below presents empirical findings of how Girinka-based NdumunyaRwanda reduces ethnic divides in Kamonyi District. The testable statement was: Girinka-based NdumunyaRwanda reduces ethnic divides in Kamonyi District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicated that 55.7% (167) of respondents from Kamonyi District agreed that Girinka-based NdumunyaRwanda/reduces ethnic divides, while 33.3%(100) strongly agreed and only 4.0%(12) disagreed. Respondents agreed and strongly agreeing with the statement that Girinka-based NdumunyaRwanda strategy reduces ethnic divides stood at 89% (267). From this, we can deduce Girinka-based NdumunyaRwanda significantly fast-tracks the removal of ethnic divides in Kamonyi District. This study finding (89%) (267) is in line with objectives of NdumunyaRwanda (NURC, 2017), specifically, objective one—“to help Rwandans to transcend divisive ethnic identities,” (p.26). In Kamonyi District, Girinka contributes in actualizing the above objective by making ethnic identities weaker as evidenced by the forthcoming remark and many more that would not be considered because of space:

These days, because of Girinka, we no longer see themselves as Hutus and Tutsis. We see ourselves as Rwandans than ethnic divisions, (A genocide perpetrator, Cell Gahinga, Gacurambwenge Sector, Kamonyi District, 13th April 2018).

9.2 Girinka-based NdumunyaRwandaand Sustainable Peace

This peace building goal is drawn from the devastating outcome of ethnic divisions—destroyed Rwandaness and the fabric of Rwandans. Most historians argue that peace exited from Rwanda once Rwandans embraced divisive ethnic policy in early 1930s. Reviewed literature confirmed this view. For instance, the study conducted on Cattle, Identity, and genocide in the African Great Lakes Region, Andrew Reid (internet source) observed that:

“Much has been made of the difference in physical appearance between Tutsi and Hutu, but, faced by their practical inability to distinguish between the two; the Belgians authorities [colonialists] conducted a census that issued identity cards that defined Tutsi as those who possessed 10 or more cattle and Hutu those who had fewer. The resultant identity documents have been used ever since to define ethnicity…and indeed, these identities were used at roadblocks in 1994 to determine who was spared and who was murdered (Internet source: articles/10.5334/ai.0412/galley/197/download/, August, 2018).

Basing on the destructive nature of ethnic division, the researcher argues that Girinka reconciliation approach encompasses greater opportunities for realizing a peaceful, secure and a safer future for Kamonyi people. Both strategies—Girinka and NdumunyaRwanda are not only mutually supportive; they are inclusive, transformative in many ways. The reviewed literature uncovered two major facts—first, the two strategies bind Rwandans together as opposed to dividing them. Secondly, both are listed as post genocide home-grown solutions in Rwanda. This research was focused on how Girinka-based NdumunyaRwanda influences the realization of sustainable peace in Kamonyi District. The table below and subsequent analysis and inferences show extent at which Girinka-based NdumunyaRwanda influences the realization of Sustainable Peace in Kamonyi District. The scoring was based on Strong Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagreed.
Table 16 Girinka-based NdumunyaRwanda and Sustainable Peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least 54.7% (164) of respondents agree that Girinka-based NdumunyaRwanda influences the realization of the Sustainable Peace in Kamonyi District whereas 23.0% (69) strongly agreed and 20.3%(61) kept neutral position (undecided). Agreed and strongly agreed responses summed up together revealed that 77.7% (233) of respondents in Kamonyi District confirmed that Girinka-NdumunyaRwanda influences the realization of Sustainable Peace in Kamonyi District of Rwanda.

The two empirical revelations specifically on how Girinka-based NdumunyaRwanda reduces ethnic divides and equally how it influences the realization of Sustainable Peace in Kamonyi District is in conformity with the observation made by NURC Report (2017): “compared to the expected effects of Ndi-Umuryarwanda, it appears that the program is likely to produce some better outcomes in some areas than in others,” (p.42). The most important areas to be effected by NdumunyaRwanda more than others in Rwanda, and Kamonyi District in particular, included: “reduction of ethnicity, reconciliation and open debates on forgiveness in Rwanda,” (NURC Report, 2017:42). Whereas this study concurred with the above observations in the NURC Report, specifically, revelations from empirical findings indicated that Girinka-based NdumunyaRwanda disposes more valuable potentialities: the revelation of important truths, triggering apology pleas, building trust—as integral prerequisites of reconciliation in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. One respondent put the above views into proper perspective. To cature the respondent’s views as there, it is worth-while to write them as verbatimly expressed:

"Ukuntu mbibona, iyo nicaye nkibuka ubukana bwa jenocide yabaye hano birandenga. Ntekereza ko iyo bitaza kunyura muri nzira, nitiyari kumuhohokera ngo ambwiwe ukuri. Guca bugafu no kwemera kugondeka tucafu t’agafu ku kwita ku nka twembi byatamwe mwojera. Niyio twiyiye duhaza urugwiro maze akatubwira uruhare rwe—loosely translated in English as—Myself, this is how I see itf. When I recall the viciousness of the genocide in this area, it passes my imigination. I think if it was not because of this [Girinka] strategy, he would not have opened up to tell me the truth. He was humble and accepted joint responsibility of taking care of this cow. Whenever we are seated, upon gained trust from us, he narrates stories relating to his role in the genocide ( A genocide survivor, Bugoba Cell, Rukoma Sector, 11th April 2018)

The above citation embodied what the researcher considered as integral prerequisites of Girinka reconciliation approach—truth, trust, elements of apology (acknowledgement of one’s genocidal roles), and so forth. Emphatically, based on the above revelations, the foregoing and forthcoming empirical evidences, the researcher can infer, the cumulative effects of the integral prerequisites of reconciliation influence the realization of Sustainable Peace in Kamonyi District.

NURC Report (2017) indicated, “NdumunyaRwanda, being a free space, people are more disposed to participat[ing] and share their stories, both victims [genocide suspects] and those who caused harm or their relatives in a more sincere atmosphere,” (p.42). Whereas NdumunyaRwanda provides free space for revelation of truth for genocide survivors, former genocide perpetrators and all Rwandans, this study did not investigate how this specific integral prerequisite—NdumunyaRwanda—triggered the truth relating to genocide against Tutsi in Kamonyi District. The potentiality of NdumunyaRwanda to reveal truth was scantily uncovered by this study focused on Girinka in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. However, this was not the overall objective of the study. Therefore, the researcher argues that the quality and quantity of truth related to genocide against Tutsi elicited by the ongoing NdumunyaRwanda needs to be scientifically studied in the future as an independent study.

10. Girinka Influencing Trust-building

Ramsbotham et al., (2017) made a key observation—after “too much has happened and too many relations have been severed...and too much traumas endured [...] to reach the transformative levels of bridging differences and restoring trust requires a capacity for innovation and creative renewal (p.289). Central to this research was the home-grown solution—Girinka—as an innovative reconciliatory approach embodying capacity for restoration of trust between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators. After all, Bamboriki (2017) and many other post genocide writers cited “lack of trust, as one of the grave consequences of the genocide against Tutsi in Rwanda. Other consequences the author cited include: a deep sense of shame, embarrassment, sorrow, disgrace, anger and hatred, sickness, diseases. Some of these consequences were confirmed by..."
respondents, and they sought apologies and forgiveness as strategies for offloading burdens associated with afore-stated consequences.

Peace building scholars have likened trust as social glue that binds inter-personal, group and social relations tightly together. In this study, it is part of the integral prerequisites of Girinka Reconciliation Approach in Kamonyi District. The researcher presupposed that Girinka created trust between former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. However, trust is of many levels—one may you to keep his property and return it but cannot trust you to hide you when he is being hunted by perceived or actual enemies. Scholarly literature presented trust as a risk-taking endeavour involving a wide range of human spheres—social, psychological, emotional, and relational and many others. Entwined this way, trust is so complex, and it is pertinent to establish how Girinka has restored it between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. In this section, the researcher asked hard questions and respondents did not only provide responses, they further enriched the research findings with cultural insights relating to asked questions.

**Table 17 Girinka Created Trust between Genocide Survivors and Former Genocide Perpetrators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents, 52.0% (156) agreed, 34.0% (102) strongly agreed that Girinka created trust between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators. A total of 86% (258) of former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors confirmed that Girinka created trust between them (greed and strongly agreed). Some authors qualified trust in such post-genocide context as risk-undertaking involving constant calculations of genocide perpetrator’s intentions, motivations and actions. Considering how weighty trust is, it was imperative to test the meaning of trust by harder questions to both former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors. Noteworthy, some of the questions, were extremely hard and carried deeper cultural meaningful and risked being viewed as unbecoming in Rwanda’s cultural context. For instance, in Rwanda culture, one respondent said, no living parent is allowed to relinquish full child caring responsibilities to another person so easily. Yet, to test the quality and level of trust, the researcher asked respondents to respond to this question.

### 10.1 Leaving One’s Child to a Former Genocide Perpetrator

For most parents, a child is the most precious gift there is in human life. The strangest part of genocide against Tutsi was, even mothers distrusted, disowned and killed their own children on the basis of ethnicity. In Bamporiki’s book, *Reflections of Genocide Perpetrators* (2017), there are harrowing testimonies of mothers who killed their children. One of them, is Mujawariya Immaculee, who killed her children fathered by a Tutsi. Referring to testimonies of genocide mothers, Bamboriki acknowledged:

“When a woman turns to evil, she does it so completely. When she sets off on a path to wickedness, there can be no stopping her. If she turns her back to motherhood, she may die without ever claiming that revered status (2017).”

Paradoxically, in most African contexts, Rwanda inclusive and Kamonyi in particular, child caring role is largely associated with mothers. Whereas child-mother intimate relationship remains unquestionable, how Hutu mothers turned into murderers of their own children during the 1994 genocide against Tutsi is equally unfathomable to most scholars. The researcher cannot claim to have answers to this puzzle. However, it forms part of complexities of genocidal violence meted against Tutsi in Rwanda.

Being so, a child’s safety and security are among the topmost priorities of nearly all parents (at least among mentally stable ones) in the post genocide Rwanda and Kamonyi District. The cited behaviour of Mujawariya Immaculee (Bamboriki, 2017:97) is an indicator of how trust was severely fractured by genocide. Therefore, leaving your child under the care of a former genocide perpetrator can be one of the ultimate tests of trust (see the table below). Cheyanne Church and Mark M. Rogers (2006) remarked: “In order to monitor a change in the level of trust between groups, one might look at child care practice to see if adults from one group are permitted to care for the children from another group. (p.44). Young children are always assumed to be too weak and vulnerable to harmful agents including actual or perceived adversaries. In view of this, we formulated the proceeding statement as a litmus test aimed at gauging the level of trust between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District. The respondents were asked to rate the statement: Girinka has created trust to the extent that I can even leave my child under the care of a former genocide perpetrator/survivor without fear. By care, the researcher meant temporal child care which is a usual
practice amongst families with trustful relationships in rural parts of Rwanda. The testable statement was; Girinka has created trust to the extent that I can even leave my child with the former genocide perpetrator/survivor without fear.

### Table 18 Leaving One’s Child to a Former Genocide Perpetrator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(68)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents (genocide survivors), 45.3% (68) agreed, while 20.0%(30) strongly agreed, 12.0%(18) chose to be neutral (undecided) to the statement—Girinka has created trust to the extent that I can even leave my child with the former genocide perpetrator/survivor without fear. Summing up agreed and strongly agreed responses indicated that 65.3% (98) of genocide survivors confirming that they can leave their children as a measure of quality trust they have for former genocide perpetrators.

Note worthy, all respondents stressed the following: first, trusting the former genocide perpetrators took a lot of time and soul-searching. Secondly, respondents emphasized that Girinka spearheaded by CARSA significantly contributed to creating trust between genocide survivors and former and former genocide perpetrators. Thirdly, they underscored the preparatory encounter meetings between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators to have been transformative and foundational steps for the next stages. Genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators confirmed that although the first days of the preparatory encounter meetings were extremely stressful, they triggered what was unexpected—renewal of social interactivity, mutual solidarity, intra-personal tranquillity and conviviality—all these are bedrocks of trust.

Fourthly, sustainable trust did not get approval of both genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators. To indicate this, many respondents especially from genocide survivors noted that sustainable trust cannot be guaranteed because of existing cases of genocide ideology, reluctance to give information about uncovered genocide victims among others. However, these are not only found in Kamonyi District since they appeared as key barriers of national reconciliation in most of the reports produced by Rwanda’s National Reconciliation Commission. Whereas there is laudable progress towards trust between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators, its sustainability raised many questions amongst genocide survivors. One respondent said:

Ikizere kirambwe kuboneka bifata igininini. Niyo mpamvuu bitaragerwaho. Imitima ikinangiye iba ikonyi. Ikizere kirambwe gisaba umitima imenets—meaning—realizing sustainable trust takes long time. Unrepentant hearts act as a barrier for it. In my view, sustainable trust is a product of healed hearts as opposed to hard and unrepentant hearts (A genocide perpetrator, Gihira Cell, Gacurabwenge Sector, Kamonyi District, 13th April 2018).

Referring to complexity of achieving sustainable trust, many respondents recited a proverb in Kinyarwanda—umunzidutsi wakare cyane ntiyageye ku mutima wa muntu—translated in English as—the earliest man has never reached the farthest organ of man—his heart. Such references were made whenever the researcher asked respondents to comment on embracing sustainable trust after 1994 genocide against Tutsi in Kamonyi District. In Kinyarwanda, such references are always used to call for cautionary trusting as opposed to embracing uncontrolled sustainable trust.

“It up to now, there are people who have not known bodies of their people. Whereas we can work, freely exchange, eat and share together, sustainable trust is a heavy one to demand from us. Full trusting of someone who killed is not easy,” (A genocide survivor, Gahinga Cell, Gacurambwenge Sector, Kamonyi District, 13th April 2018).

All genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators emphasized that whereas Girinka did not consolidate restoration of positive relationships, neither quality social meetings nor trust-building process would have been achieved if there were no prior-preparations of the two categories through capacity-building forums and encounter forums. In fact, many respondents noted that had they received the cow before prior-preparatory meetings, other than slaughtering the cow or letting the cow die ought of starvation, nothing else would have happened. Prior sensitization of recipients of cows emerged strongly as a critical success factor for Girinka in Kamonyi District. Admittedly, this emerged as one of the unintended outcomes of the research as the researcher had not foreseen its importance before conducting the research. Also, in the foreseen discussions, literature revealed that the success of genocide was dependent on prior sensitization of peasant citizens sometimes “requiring the presence of an ‘important person’ from Kigali to lend the event an aura of added respectability” (Bangwanubusa, 2009:29). While the importance of prior sensitization was uncovered, the researcher did not quantitatively determine the extent it influences Girinka’s success in Kamonyi District.
10.2 Trust and Meeting Basic Human Needs

In order to test the quality of trust, the researcher asked respondents to rate the following statement: “I chose to trust former genocide perpetrator or genocide survivor to meet basic human needs—shelter, food, water, sense of belonging.” Meeting basic human needs is usually a major concern for most rural-based former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors in Kamonyi District. The researcher’s motivation for asking this question was to determine the extent the two categories equated trust with basic human needs. The higher the rate (responses)—agreeing and strongly agreeing—the lower the quality of trust between the former genocide perpetrators and genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District. Reviewed literature indicated that trust is such a precious human value that it cannot be downgraded to meeting basic human needs. This researcher emphasizes that trust is earned after a long process of investment of truth, dialogue and sincere acknowledgement of one’s genocidal acts. This makes trust a complex, but an essential outcome of changed attitudes, behaviours and relations of the two categories—genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators. Ultimately, the foregoing positive changes, if sustained for a longer period can lead to the realization of sustainable peace in post-conflict societies. The testable statement was: I chose to trust genocide perpetrators/genocide survivors to meet common life basic needs (shelter, food, water, sense of belonging).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 19 Trust and Basic Human Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.7% (25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings revealed that only 40.0% (60) of the respondents agreed with the statement, 5.3% (8) strongly agreed. At least 40.0% (60) agreed while 24.0% (36) disagreed. Added together, (agreed and strongly agreed responses), 45.3% (68) confirmed the statement while 40.7% disqualified the statement. Considering the response gaps above, arguably, trust can hardly develop because of meeting basic human needs but trusting involves deeper, intricate and interwoven arrays of human realm—social, psychological and relational. Whereas trust has been defined by some business-oriented scholars as deterministic calculations of costs and benefits of social undertaking, this analysis does not properly apply to sustainable trust, especially in the context of gruesome genocidal violence but can effectively apply in context of less intensified forms of violence. However, the empirical revelations in the table above (40%) indicated that some genocide survivors chose to trust former genocide perpetrators to meet basic human needs in the post-genocide Rwanda. Given the fact that the life of genocide survivors after 1994 genocide has been deeply despisable, cultivating trust (self-induced trust) could have been adopted for survival.

10.3 Trust and Social Contacts

Genocidal violence took place in the open hills of Rwanda. It affected the quality of social contacts between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District. Scholarly discourse on the relationship between trust and social contacts remains inconclusive, however. Trust is a major determinant of quality social contacts between perceived or actual former conflict parties. Whereas former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors do not fall within the conflict party characterization, determining the integral effect of trust on social contacts between genocide survivor and former genocide perpetrators is imperative. The testable statement was: I chose to trust genocide perpetrators to have social company (contacts).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 20 Trusting for Social Company (Contacts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7% (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FREQ.
At least 42.3% (63) of respondents agree that they chose to trust to have social company (contacts), 3.7% (6) strongly agreed, 31.0% (47) agreed 9.7% (15) strongly agreed and 13.0% (20) remained neutral (undecided). Having observed that Girinka significantly improves social contacts, it is worthy to note that social relations are enhanced by the quality of trust between former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors in Kamonyi District. D. Daly and J. Sarkins (2007) observed when victims and perpetrators of violence participate in other’s activities such as making quilts, trading in markets, building schools, there higher the prospects of reconciliation, because, participants in such activities learn to trust the other. Related to the above, genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators of Kamonyi District, the key activities bringing them together are centered around their own lives, but to a large extent, they are about taking care of the shared cow and benefits from the cow. The reason for improved relationships between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators, viewed from the perspective of D. Daly and J. Sarkins is because the two categories (genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in the context of Kamonyi District) “share a commitment to the success of the joint entreprise,” (2007:188). The joint entreprise in Kamonyi District is the cow the two categories share.

However, the research findings as reflected by the table above did not support the foregoing view. Most genocide survivors stated that having too much trust in former genocide perpetrators after 1994 genocide against Tutsi is not easy considering the time scale between 1994 and to date (2018) vis-à-vis the gravity of genocide. Reviewed literature supported the foregoing view, noting the viciousness of the genocide, human nature’s latent potential to repeat violence and unhealed wounds of genocide survivors (see Lina Melvin, 2000:17, Waller, 2002:12) as cited by Bangwanubusa (2009:21). The above hesitation on too much trust can be validly supported, after all, those that unleashed genocidal violence against genocide survivors were not aliens, but their close neighbours, intimate friends from the same hills and villages or what Zorbas referred to as “peasant neighbours and families,” (in Bangwanubusa, 2009).

### 10.4 Girinka-based trust-building and Reduction of Fear

Fear of the ‘other’ is a psychological symptom and outcome of distrustful relationship especially after dreadful genocidal violence like the one that befell on Tutsis of Kamonyi District and Rwanda as a whole. Considering the available literature evidence that trust involves continuous calculus process of costs and benefits and risk-taking nature of trusting, the researcher asked both genocide survivors and former perpetrators to rate the veracity of the following statement “Girinka built trust between us such that we can live together in the same house without fear of intentional harm.”

**Table 21 Girinka Built Trust Between us such that we Can Live Together in the same House without Fear of Intentional Harm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.0% (3)</td>
<td>9.7% (29)</td>
<td>8.7% (26)</td>
<td>47.7% (143)</td>
<td>32.3% (97)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents rate the earlier statement as follows: 47.7%(143) agreed, 32.3%(97) strongly agreed, 9.7%(29) and 1.0%(3) strongly disagreed whereas 8.7%(26) were neutral (undecided). Summing together respondent’s responses—agreed and strongly—gave 80%(240) sided with the statement reading as Girinka built trust between us such that we can live together in the same house without fear of intentional harm. Analysing this empirical finding (80%) vis-à-vis the one touching on trust and social contact, one fact emerges—trust does not simply come by on itself, it requires purposeful engagement of impactful catalysts to influence desired positive outcomes. Secondly, from the findings, it emerged that improved Girinka-based social contacts have proportional positive effects on trust between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators.

Given the presented findings, specifically, on trust, it worth-while to make the following inferences: Firstly, research findings except one on trusting to meet basic human needs revealed laudable appreciation of Girinka as an influencer of harmonious relations between former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors through trust. However, trust alone cannot influence peaceful (harmonious) relationships between former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors, but a combination of other complementary integral prerequisites of Girinka reconciliation. Secondly, there is noticeable gap between trust and sustainable trust as evidenced by cautionary responses from respondents. The earlier stated Kinyarwanda proverb translated in English as—“the earliest man has never reached the man’s heart” is indicative of a long journey towards sustainable trust between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators. Scientific determination of trust and sustainable trust can be challenging, however, some of the sub-variables of trust above (two adult people—genocide survivor and former genocide perpetrator—leaving together in the same house without fear of intentional harm vs. a genocide survivor leaving his child under care of a former genocide perpetrator) sheds some nuances between the two.
Also, variance in evidence between sustainable trust and other findings, for instance on Girinka influencing attitudinal, relational and behavioural changes underpinned the fact that realization of sustainable trust is not easy, more so, after unprecedented genocidal violence like the one unleashed on the Tutsis of Rwanda. The variance further confirms the earlier stated observation from literature that [sustainable] trust is a complex social investment and a risk-taking endeavour. These reasons gain its relevance in the context of deeply severed trust like genocide against Tutsi in Rwanda. It is therefore not surprising that despite the high rate approval of attitudinal, relational and behavioural changes of the study categories—genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators by respondents—responses on sustainable trust indicated cold reservations and call for caution (refer to the Kinyarwanda proverb).

Noteworthy, whereas the researcher established Girinka’s influence on influencing integral prerequisites of reconciliation, he did not establish the following: how the two study categories laudably approved nearly all sub-variables amidst expressed cautionary reservations on sustainable trust. Can there be cordial relations, change from adversarial to cooperative behaviours and mutual understanding between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators amidst such expressed reservations on sustainable trust? Although these questions are scientifically intriguing, they remained unanswered by the researcher. However, they are reflective of the complexity of [sustainable] trust. As earlier emphasized, regaining trust, after subjecting it to consistent abuse takes greater resources—time, ingenuity and incremental risk-taking efforts by the trust-seeker.

Findings from the reviewed literature revealed that peacebuilders—state and non-state actors, scholars and practitioners should seek to restore trust between former enemies for sustainable peace to take root. Among peacebuilding scholars advocating the centrality of trust to sustainable peace is Ramzi Suleiman (2016). In fact, he qualifies it as critical for longer term harmonious and an inherent part of social interactions. Archbishop Emeritus, Desmond Tutu, one of the non-state peacebuilding actors in post-Apartheid South Africa also acknowledged the centrality of trust, he however observed rebuilding it after dreadful violence is “a supremely a difficult challenge,” (Bloomfield, 2003:Foreword). This view holds credence not only in Kamonyi District but in the larger post genocide society.

10.5 Girinka based Reconciliation and Sustainable Peace in Kamonyi District

Empirical findings for sub-variables such as truth, apology, trust, NnduminyaRwanda/Rwandaness confirmed that Girinka Reconciliation influences the Sustainable Peace. Considering the fact that reviewed literature revealed divergences; some scholars presented reconciliation as a strategy to sustainable peace while others considered reconciliation a stand-alone variable which needs special focus and prioritization in post genocide context. The post genocide Rwanda advances the former proposition as reflected by the responses from Jean Ndayisaba, the Executive Secretary of National Unity and Reconciliation Commission and many other respondents with specialist knowledge of Rwanda’s post genocide reconciliation and peacebuilding processes. Scholars diverging positions analysed and validly considered, the researcher argues that analysed findings of what the researcher considered as integral prerequisites of reconciliation confirmed that Girinka Reconciliation Approach influences Sustainable Peace in Kamonyi Districts.

The researcher further argues that if similar research instruments and analysis are applied to other districts with higher success of Girinka, the analysis would lead to closer to the same findings and conclusions. Nonetheless, it was important to ask respondents to qualify or disqualify the view that the view that Girinka Reconciliation influences the realization of Sustainable Peace in Kamonyi District.

Table 22 Girinka based Reconciliation and Sustainable Peace in Kamonyi District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(164)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The empirical findings from genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators revealed that 54.7% (164) agreed, 23.0% (69) strongly agreed, 20.3% (61) were neutral (undecided) and 1.7% (5) disagreed with the view that Girinka based reconciliation influences the realization of Sustainable Peace in Kamonyi District. Overall, agreed and strongly agreed responses combined indicated that 77.7% (233) of respondents confirmed that Girinka Reconciliation influences the realization of Sustainable Peace in Kamonyi District. The presented and analysed findings on what this researcher considered as thematic prerequisites of reconciliation—truth, apology, trust, NnduminyaRwanda/Rwandaness in Rwanda, and how Girinka influenced each of these integral prerequisites also confirmed the foregoing empirical revelation. Importantly, the empirical findings relating to how Girinka influences each of the integral reconciliation prerequisites provided solid basis and empirical support base for the empirical
finding that 77.7% of respondents confirmed that Girinka based Reconciliation influences the Sustainable Peace in Kamonyi District.

10.6 Girinka-based Friendship

Friendship can be a means to, and outcome of peaceful relationships between people in any society. According to Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer, “divisions in the past, and, particularly, the 1994 genocide against Tutsi, destroyed conviviality and friendship among Rwandans,” (2015:106). Unfriendliness coupled with other factors can lead to genocidal violence in Rwanda. The same reconciliation measurement tool noted, 97% of Rwandans (93.4% strongly agree and 3.6% fairly agree) that they have friends among people with whom they do not share the same social category (like ethnic, religious and regional). However, the RRB (2015) did not specify what caused or motivated such higher rate of friendship between Rwandans regardless of their ethnic, religious and regional affiliations.

In view of above empirical national findings, it is important to determine Girinka acted as friendship guarantor in Kamonyi District. Noteworthy, findings from Semi-Structured Interview administered to people with knowledge of Rwanda’s pre-colonial history revealed that Inka y’Ubucuti (Friendship Cow or Cow for Friendship) was deeply rooted in Rwanda’s socio-cultural relations and practices (see chap.4). Further, whereas respondents observed that materialism, specifically money exerts greater influence on the quality of friendships in Rwanda, Inka y’Ubucuti—Cow for Friendship (C4F) still exists and determines great friendship in modern Rwanda. The researcher tested the statement: The cow I passed on to the other acted as friendship guarantor, so I feel safe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 23 Girinka-based Friendship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least 83.4% (250) of respondents—genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District disclosed (agreed and strongly agreed) that the passing on of the cow to the other acted as friendship guarantor. Only 2.0% (6) disagreed, 0.3%(1) strongly disagreed and 5.3%(16) were neutral (undecided). A study focused on restoration of interpersonal relationship between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators through a coffee cooperative conducted in Southern Province of Rwanda in 2009 (the Province where Kamonyi District is found), a respondent confirmed deep conviviality between the two categories. Noteworthy, the current research studied the same categories. One respondent noted:

I swear by the truth of God: I swear by the hand…God above! We even marry each other. We live convivially, and we rescue each other…I swear. If I love survivors whom I hated before coming into cooperative, what do you want me to tell? This cooperative changed our mind-set. We are now friends of people whom we hated: people who hated us and also afraid of us (Sentama, 2009: 104)

Considering the reverence of cows in Rwanda since pre-colonial times to modern times, uncontestably, the revolving process of cows between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators cements friendship among them in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. Cow-giving and receiving remains a key indicator of deepening friendships, conviviality in Kamonyi District and other parts of Rwanda. Deepened friendship between social categories—genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators mirrors laudable strides in restoration of relationships ultimately transcending into Sustainable Peace. After all, where friendship deeply exists, enmity exits.

10.7 Girinka and Reconciliation after Genocide in Kamonyi

Kamonyi residents underwent through horrific successive periods of ethnic discriminations, divisions and successive ethnic based killings. According to the National Policy on Unity and Reconciliation (2007) divisions, discrimination of all kinds, persecutions, killings, exile of some Rwandans and wars; all culminated in the genocide against Tutsi (p.7). Komonyi was not exempted. The foregoing statement required us to gauge the level at which former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors attribute Girinka contribution to their reconciliation. The researcher asked respondents to assess the statement: Girinka contributes to reconciliation between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators.
According to empirical findings, at least 51.3% (154) respondents concurred with the view that cow-giving (Girinka) contributes to reconciliation between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District. Similarly, 39.7% (119) genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators strongly agreed with the same assertion. Overall, 91% (273) of the respondents confirmed that Girinka contributes to restoration of relationships between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. Empirical findings from Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer (2015) revealed, 87.7% of Rwandans confirmed that Girinka contributed to national reconciliation in Rwanda. There is no significance variance between national findings (87.7%) and empirical evidence on the contribution of Girinka on reconciliation in Kamonyi District (91%). However, this researcher focuses on how Girinka Reconciliation Approach influences Sustainable Peace. There is concurrence between literature and empirical findings on contribution of home-grown solutions, for instance, Girinka in promoting reconciliation and sustainable peace in post genocide Rwanda. Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer stressed, “Rwandan culture favours social cohesion hence reconciliation.

10.8 Girinka Reconciliation and Sustainable Peace in Kamonyi District

The foregoing analysis revealed astounding level of realized Girinka based reconciliation in Kamonyi District. In the forthcoming analysis, the researcher gauges how Girinka Reconciliation contributes to realization of Sustainable Peace through tested variables—forgiveness, economic livelihood improvement and locally improvised restorative justice. In other words, these sub-variables are considered as additional influencers of Sustainable Peace in Kamonyi District. Noteworthy, security was also tested as an intervening variable for the two variables—Independent: Girinka Reconciliation Approach and dependent variable: Sustainable Peace in Kamonyi District.

10.9 Girinka and Forgiveness

Reviewed scholarly literature indicated how forgiveness is a key component for the realization of reconciliation and sustainable peace in post conflict societies. However, forgiveness after grave violation of rights and extreme human suffering is not always an easy undertaking. Forgiveness entails several elements—self-awareness and acceptance, expression of grief, desisting desires for vengeance, seeing the perpetrator in a freshly new light or what scholars of forgiveness consider as re-humanization of perpetrators. In view of above, the researcher sought to determine how Girinka influenced each of the elements of forgiveness. Empirical findings of each element provided a bigger view of Girinka influences forgiveness in Kamonyi District. In view of this, the researcher asked respondents to rate the statement: Girinka triggered me to forgive those who harmed us.

Table 24 Girinka and Reconciliation of Genocide Survivors and Former Genocide Perpetrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Undecided (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2018)
Respondents (specifically genocide survivors) agreed that 64.7% (97), 22.7%(34) strongly agreed, 10.7%(16) were neutral (undecided) and 2.0%(3) disagreed with the statement: “Girinka triggered me to forgive those who harmed us.” Whereas who ‘harmed us’ is relative, it is generally used by genocide survivors to refer to genocide perpetrators. At least 87.4% (131) of respondents confirmed that Girinka triggered forgiveness of former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District. Literature breaks down forgiveness into many elements: self-awareness and self-acceptance, expression of guilt, release of bitterness, among others. Literature stated, failure to assess the degree of each element would lead to making partial conclusions. In view of the foregoing, the researcher asked respondents to rate each element.

10.10 Self-awareness and Self-acceptance

Knowing how wounded one is and accepting one’s inner-wounds strongly emerged as some of the elements of forgiveness from scholars of forgiveness after deadly violence. However, literature pointed out that whereas some survivors can claim self-awareness and self-acceptance, self-control in front of one hard-core heartless perpetrator is not for every survivor. Given how sophisticated the psychological dimension of humans, no scholars can satisfactorily determine with scientific precision the extent of survivor’s self-control especially when exposed to their former deep-wounding tormentors.

Yet, self-awareness and self-acceptance are scholarly considered as the integral elements of full forgiveness, Sulman A. Giddo (2009). Full forgiveness (Giddo, 2009) or what David Gaertner (2011) considered as emotional forgiveness, is the highest level of forgiveness by survivors of violence. Explaining what full forgiveness is about Giddo, (2009) observed, the survivor of violence forgives the perpetrator to the extent that s/he can fully control his bodily responses or reactions upon hearing or seeing the perpetrator. In the case of Kamonyi District, Cow for Peace has rendered this view relevant as evidenced by how both genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators live side by side, increasing inter-marriage cases, co-share responsibilities of caring for the cow and so forth. The table below presents the level of self-awareness and self-acceptance among genocide survivors in Kamonyi District. The researcher tested the statement Getting a cow from a former genocide perpetrator enabled me to know myself and accept my inner-wounds.

Table 26 Girinka: Self-Awareness and Accepting One’s Inner-Wounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>6.0% (9)</td>
<td>10.0% (15)</td>
<td>52.0% (78)</td>
<td>25.3% (38)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Genocide survivors, 52.0% (78) agreed, 25.3%(38) strongly agreed, 10.0%(15) remained neutral and 6.0%(9) disagreed with the statement that getting a cow from a genocide perpetrator enabled me know myself and accept my inner-wounds. Agreed and strongly agreed responses totalled to 77.3% (116). Although the Girinka in Kamonyi District is overwhelmingly applauded by both genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators as well as Girinka programme implementers and decision-makers, Girinka’s success is attributed to preparatory encounter meetings between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators.

10.10.1 Girinka and Expression of Grief

Giddo (2009) cited mourning and acceptance of harm and loss as critical elements of genuine forgiveness. Others noted that after such gruesome violence – genocide survivors are yearning for opportunities and free spaces they can channel their deep-seated grief, bitterness and resentment. In circumstances where one’s dear ones were completely disseminated as some cases in Kamonyi confirmed, survivors hardly trust anyone except very few ones from those they share emotional burdens. Considering this, the researcher sought to establish how the cow given under cow-giving practice acted as a channel and created space for releasing grief by genocide survivors. Literature pointed expression of grief as one of the major elements of forgiveness. In view of the foregoing view, the researcher asked genocide survivors (150) to rate the following statement—the given cow acted as a channel through which I met the former genocide perpetrator to express my grief and bitterness.
Table 27 Cow as a Channel for Expression of Grief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(87)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(150)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings from genocide survivors indicated that 58.0% (87) agreed with the statement, 24.7% (37) strongly agreed, 13.3% (20) were neutral, 4.0% (6) disagreed. The total of respondents (genocide survivors) agreeing and strongly agreeing with the statement stood at 82.7% (124). Whereas reviewed literature entailed cases of genocide survivors who chose to forgive their perpetrators before even physically meeting them, worth noting, these cases remain astoundingly low in post genocide Rwanda. There were some respondents who cited that Gacaca sessions had paved the ground for forgiveness. However, some Gacaca sessions were structured, guided by ground rules which would at times limit free flow of explosive expressions by genocide survivors. The preparatory encounter meetings spearheaded by CARSA was laudably praised to have triggered such emotional explosive expressions. The provided cow provided communicational and free spaces for such explosive expression of grief and bitterness by genocide survivors.

Both interviewed respondents however cited the preparatory encounter meetings to have been emotionally dreadful but later proved to be positively impactful to them. First encounters between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators required identification of psychological and emotional burdens each special social category carried, exteriorization and ritual-like detachment from emotional burdens through burning of identified psychological and emotional burdens. Whereas respondents praised burden identification and exteriorization steered by CARSA organization, the researcher did not scientifically test how sessions of burning emotional and psychological burdens contribute to relief and sustained release emotional loads occasioned by genocide against Tutsi in Kamonyi District. It is however worth noting that Girinka has acted as a communicational channel through which genocide survivors expressed to their grief former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District.

10.10.2 Girinka And Release of Bitterness and Removal of Desire for Vengeance

Carrying out revenge tends to be the most plausible human behavior especially after enduring gruesome genocidal violence. Whereas literature pointed out that genocidal violence can be one of the unforgivable crimes (see Coicaud & Jönsson, 2009), there are a lot of other scholars who observed that living unforgiving life denies the genocide survivor to live a happier and healthier life (Giddo, 2009). In fact, nearly all scholars concurred with the foregoing view. Crucially, testimonies gathered from literature underlined that those who were deeply hurt find forgiving extremely complex. For instance, reviewed literature revealed that it took Raymond F. Paloutzian his entire adult life come to terms with two complex human realities: forgive or not to forgive his former tormentor (2009). Importantly, literature stressed that releasing bitterness enables forgiveness and reduces the desire for carrying out vengeance after dreadful violence. Although this point somehow relates to the former, the noteworthy point is the relationship between the cow, release of bitterness and prevention of retaliatory revenge by genocide survivors. Establishing how cow enabled the release of bitterness and the desire for vengeance was scholarly inviting especially in post genocide Kamonyi District of Rwanda. The researcher tested the statement: Getting a cow from a former genocide perpetrator enabled me to release inner bitterness and desire for vengeance.

Table 28 Cow Enabling Release of Bitterness and Desisting Vengeance Desires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As empirical findings above revealed, 44.0% (66) respondents agreed while very strongly agreed, 13.3% (20) were neutral. Combined response rates for agreed and strongly agreed stood at 73.3% (110). A former genocide perpetrator remarked: “He told me he had forgiven me just for the sake of ‘mental peace’ but the cow I received from him cleared all that and he confessed to me that it [cow] erased bitterness and anger he had for me,” (former genocide perpetrator, Nyamitenga Sector, Kabashumba Cell, 21st April 2018). This view is supported by Desmond Tutu (1999) who noted: “forgiveness gives people [the forgiver] resilience, enabling them to survive.” He further observed, “to forgive is indeed the best form of self-interest since anger, resentment and revenge are corrosive.”

One major fact needs greater emphasis, 73% of strongly agree and agree responses affirming that getting a cow from a former genocide perpetrator enabled me release inner bitterness and desist from carrying vengeance from genocide survivors summed up the David Gaertner’s definition of “decision-based forgiveness: cognitive letting go of resentment and bitterness and need for vengeance,” (2011:8). He however observed, such undertaking is “is an act of will, a choice to let go, and it is not always the end of emotional pain and hurt,” (2011).

10.10.3 Girinka and Re-humanization of Perpetrators

Unhealed survivors of extreme violence tend to see perpetrators through lenses of their past dreadful (genocidal) actions. Put other way, unhealed survivors present perceptions of perpetrator are formed by their past genocidal violence. Yet, Giddo (2009) and a host of many other scholars of forgiveness emphasized, full forgiveness—total forgiveness—requires the survivor to see the perpetrator in new light—in a new shape, inside-out. The writer stretches it farther by noting that such forgiveness enables the survivor to control his emotional and bodily reaction upon encountering his former tormentor. Contextually, rehumanization of the perpetrator is the extent by which the genocide survivor considers his/her former tormentor as a human being who can be trusted and as such, s/he relate with him/her like other. Such change is evidenced by intermarriages among other. The earlier observed empirical evidence and forthcoming ones for instance, intermarriage levels (4%, 12) and 80% confirmation rate by genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators that Girinka built trust between them such that they can live together in the same without fear of intentional harm and many others, pointed to Giddo’s assertion.

Poloutzian (2009) stressed forgiveness of such kind requires “creating a new personality identity,” (p.79). Literature cited such self-recreation as the hardest element of forgiveness and this research concurred with the foregoing view. According to Raymond F. Poloutzian (2009): such undertaking cannot be is not “an easy a gamble, but a rare and saintly,” (p.79).

Some scholars referred to this process as re-humanization of former violence perpetrators by the survivor (Gaertner, 2011; Fow, 1996; McCullough, 2000). This is the stage that markedly demonstrates the ripeness for forgiveness, healing, reconciliation and firmer foundation for sustainable peace. In view of this scholarly-grounded prescription, the researcher sought to test its empirical veracity in Kamonyi District and asked the genocide survivors to rate this statement: The cow made me see the perpetrator’s unseen positive part (humanity).

Table 29 Girinka and Re-humanization of Perpetrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Empirical findings indicated that 52.0% (78) agreed, 32.7%(49) strongly agreed and 10.7%(16) were neutral with the statement that Cow for Peace made genocide survivors see perpetrator’s unseen positive part or what scholars referred as rehumanization of the former genocide perpetrator. 84% (110) of respondents confirmed that as a result of Girinka, genocide survivors were able to see the positive side of the former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District of Rwanda. Considering the severity of genocidal violence, such change of worldview demonstrates a major step made towards reconciliation and restoration of new relationships between the two categories.
Respondents were also asked to rate the following statement—“getting a cow from a former genocide perpetrator and genocide survivor enabled me to be more benevolent and sympathetic to perpetrators/survivors.” Responses to this were as follows: agree 50%, strongly agreed 21.5%, undecided 5.3%, disagree 12.7% and strongly disagree 10.7%. Respondents who agreed and strongly agreed with the foregoing statement combined totalled to 71.5%. The observed positive communications, active interactions and reciprocity between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District affirmed the above quantitative empirical evidence.

10.10.4 Girinka and triggering of confessions

Confessions of one’s past wrongs paves the ground for forgiveness, healing for both genocide survivor and former genocide perpetrators. In abide to understand how Girinka enabled confessions, we asked respondents to rate how Girinka enabled the genocide perpetrators to confess their genocide deeds and show of remorse. The researcher asked respondents to rate the following statement: The cow enabled the perpetrators to confess their deeds and show of remorse hence contributing to healing.

Table 30 Cow Enabling Former Genocide Perpetrators to Confess their Deeds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(47.3)</td>
<td>(24.0)</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(71)</td>
<td>(21.7)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>(71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least 47.3% of respondents agreed, 21.7%(33) strongly agreed, 3.3%(5) disagreed while 24.0%(36) remained neutral (undecided). Agreed and strongly agreed summed up, gave 69%(104) of respondents. Confession of perpetrator’s genocidal acts was cited by scholars as a powerful ingredient of forgiveness. Asked how cows enabled confessions by former genocide perpetrators, Genocide survivors disclosed that became a strong cord socially tying both genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators together. For instance, the more the two categories spent time together, fed the cow together, or when the perpetrator (in most cases a male) would be milking the cow and the genocide survivor (a female) is supporting the perpetrator to milk by holding the calf, sometimes the perpetrator break and express sympathies and remorse to the genocide survivor.

Successful confessions have been cited by genocide survivors as a firm stepping stone for knowing the truths, forgiveness and healing. Through genuine confessions, a perpetrator unlocks himself, releases unknown information, for instance, who did what, where, how, his role and so forth. According to genocide survivors, this deep confession process has been helpful in uncovering the whereabouts of genocide perpetrators and unloading guilt burdens from genocide perpetrators even before being forgiven by genocide survivors. There is no sharp disagreement between empirical evidence and scholarly literature on view that effective confessions trigger healing for both former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors. How perpetrator’s confessions catalysed forgiveness was put into evidence by one genocide survivor: “When the perpetrator comes to you and asks for forgiveness, this constitutes a good step s/he has made, which promotes reconciliation, and you [find yourself] not escaping forgiving him,” in NURC’s RRB (2015:89).

The Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer (2010) noted that “80.4% of Rwandans held that genocide perpetrators expressed remorse and requested for forgiveness” (p.88). While the Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer (2015) indicated that “93.9% Rwandans contended that genocide perpetrators apologized for their genocidal acts” (RRB, 2015:88). To stress the causal relationship between apology and forgiveness further, for instance, one citizen, a teacher from Kirambo Teacher Training College, Burera District, Rwanda told RRB team,

“I must say, none can reconcile with somebody who does not acknowledge his/her guilt. This means that the great role is on the perpetrators. When someone comes to you and apologizes, and requests for forgiveness, this means that s/he has acknowledged the guilt; therefore, you cannot deny him/her forgiveness” (RRB, 2015:89).

Whereas perpetrator’s confessions have been cited as critical for healing, reviewed literature emphasized that healing from deep traumas takes time, investment of concerted efforts and resources. Assessment of how genocide survivors have healed stretched beyond the scope of this study. Similarly, there is ample evidence pointing to the economic improvement as central to restoration of good relations, promoting societal harmony and even achieving individual, household and the larger societal prosperity. The following section delves into this.
10.10.5 Girinka and Economic Livelihood Improvement

There is strong evidence base showing the causal relationship between reduced poverty, increased prosperity and higher peace prospects. Whereas the degree at which peace propels prosperity cannot be determined with precise scientific/statistical accuracy, the unprecedented speed at which Rwanda realized economic milestones after 1994 genocide was astonishing. Factors that propelled Rwanda’s economic milestones have been cited by different people in varying ways. Learning from Rwanda’s case, specifically, her recovery from genocidal violence, the researcher concurred: there is a strong link between peace and prosperity, and vice versa. This view and the forthcoming ones need to be informed by Rwanda’s socio-economic state immediately after 1994 genocide against Tutsi—at almost at the bottom (zero) base in all socio-economic indicators. Using Rwanda’s Dambisa, illustrated the economic costs of conflicts, noting that the country (Rwanda) “suffered 63 percent drop in GDP per capita as a result of its 1990 conflict,” (Dambisa, 2018:36). Paul Collier and Hoeffler, whom Dambisa cited, are renowned analysts of the economic costs of conflicts and their consequences on peace building processes in post conflict societies and economies.

Karbo & Nelson (2010) suggested that re-orienting former conflict parties from warfare to welfare is a path to sustainable peacebuilding. Using the foregoing argument, engaging former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors into joint economic activities, seizing available economic opportunities significantly contribute to poverty reduction, re-orient their destructive Them vs. Us mind-set to a shared sense of we-ness/Rwandaness.

Established evidence from the previous sections revealed that the realization of such relational and mental shift—new reorientation—of former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors is not only a monumental change for achieving economic prosperity, but a foundational milestone building for building a prosperous peace in the future of post genocide Kamonyi District of Rwanda. In view of the evidence from the reviewed literature, it was worthwhile to ask respondents their perspectives about Girinka’s economic benefits or what we referred to as Girinka and economic livelihood improvement. To emphasize (remind), the interest was to establish the interface between Girinka’s social—reconciliatory—dimension (Girinka’s fourth objective) and improvement of respondent’s economic livelihood in Kamonyi District. The researcher tested the following statement: Girinka and Economic Livelihood Improvement—(meeting basic human needs: milk/food, paying school, pay medical bills.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Strongly Disagree} & \text{Disagree} & \text{Neutral} & \text{Agree} & \text{Strongly Agree} & \text{Total} \\
\text{Percentage} & \text{Percentage} & \text{Percentage} & \text{Percentage} & \text{Frequency} \\
\% & \% & \% & \% & \% \\
\hline
1.0% & 4.3% & 7.7% & 48.3% & 38.7% & 100 \\
(3) & (13) & (23) & (145) & (116) & \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Out of 300 respondents, 48.3% (145) agreed, 38.7 % (116) strongly agreed,4.3% (13) disagreed, 1.0%(3) strongly disagreed with the statement: the received cow improved my economic wellbeing (meeting basic human needs: milk/food, paying school, pay medical bills. Only 7.7% (23) remained neutral (undecided). A total of 87% (261) of respondents—genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators) in Kamonyi District—observed that Girinka improved their economic wellbeing.

Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer, also emphasizes part of the motivations for reintroduction of Girinka by Paul Kagame, President of the Republic of Rwanda in 2006 was “ in response to the alarmingly high rate of childhood malnutrition, and as a way to accelerate poverty reduction,” (2015:114). National Coordinator of Girinka programme in RAB and NURC Executive Secretary, confirmed that Kagame’s reintroduction of Girinka was to achieve two interwoven objectives: economic livelihood improvement—economic prosperity—and realizing peace through improved social cohesion and reconciliation by recipients of cows in Rwanda. Research respondents—Genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District commended the decision of reviving Girinka in post genocide Rwanda based on their own achieved socio-economic milestones. Citing several case-studies from Europe, Asia, Latin America, Dambisa Moyo’s latest book: Edge of Chaos (2018) stated: “it is clear that economic and political decisions are the primary drivers that accelerate or decelerate economic success;” (2018:37). Viewed that way, Girinka is both a socio-economic and political decision with greater potential to accelerate Rwanda’s socio-economic growth if lessons from Kamonyi piloting process are not only learned but effectively translated into practical interventions in many parts of Rwanda.

Dambisa’s Edge of Chaos (2018) provided an in-depth analysis of economic growth at macro levels and she knowledgeably narrowed it to basic micro levels. “Economic growth is about satisfying the most basic of individual human needs,” (p.4). She...
posited, “Growth offers the individual an opportunity to improve their own livelihood. For example, a work who earns a bonus or extra income, can use that money to obtain better health care, education, transportation, and food,” (Dambisa, 2018:5). Rwanda Governance Board (2014) conducted research Assessment of the Impact of Homegrown Initiatives, including Girinka’s economic impact. The report highlighted how Girinka impacted socio-economic livelihood of cow recipients in post genocide Rwanda.

**Table 32 Parameters of household on socio-economic status before and after Girinka**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters of Household socio-economic Status BEFORE Girinka</th>
<th>Status %</th>
<th>Parameters of Household socio-economic Status AFTER Girinka</th>
<th>Status %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Households living in their own houses</td>
<td>88.5 %</td>
<td>Households living in their own houses</td>
<td>96.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Households who never afforded means per day</td>
<td>31.4 %</td>
<td>Households who afforded eating more than 3 meals a day</td>
<td>55.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Households with limited capacity to pay primary school fees</td>
<td>17.2 %</td>
<td>Household limited capacity to pay primary school fees</td>
<td>70.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Households limited capacity to pay secondary school fees</td>
<td>8.5 %</td>
<td>Household limited capacity to pay secondary school fees</td>
<td>63.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Households without capacity to meet health costs of one of their members upon falling sick</td>
<td>45.7 %</td>
<td>Households without capacity to meet health costs of one of their members upon falling sick</td>
<td>6.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to RGB (2014) at least 38.7% got income from sell of manure, 33.5% from sell of milk, cross-breed rearing 26%. Overall, 87.5% (385) of Girinka recipients, according to findings from RGB (2014) confirmed increased income. In Kamonyi District, 87% (261) respondents confirmed that Girinka improved their economic wellbeing. Considering that besides being genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators, recipients of cows under Girinka according to National Coordinator of Girinka were extremely poor people selected by their own neighbours under Ubudehe programme. Ubudehe is Rwanda’s home-grown approach of mutual help or mutual assistance used in determining poverty levels in Rwanda, RGB, (2014). Ubudehe responded to existing variance in definition of poverty amongst scholars, development planners and policy-makers. According to the National Coordinator of Girinka, the recipients of cows are in the first and second poverty levels as per Ubudehe poverty categorization. People in the first poverty category are those in abject poverty (umutindi nyakuyya) while those in Budehe’s second category are the very poor (umutindi), RGB (2014:14).

### 10.10.6 Girinka and Peaceful Prosperity in Kamonyi District

In the earlier analysis, the researcher alluded to the view that, improved economic livelihood—wellbeing—breeds peace. In pursuit of the same line of argument, scholars, for instance, Martha Mutisi (2010) have coined development-peace nexus, implying that the two concepts are interwoven and mutually reinforcing. However, there are noticeable exceptions, considering the case of Libya and occurrence of both intrapersonal and inter-personal conflicts in developed societies. International Alert referred to the interplay of peace and development as “Peace through Prosperity” sometimes referring to it as ‘peaceful prosperity’ (International Alert, 2015:9).

However, the development translating into sustainable peace thesis has been overly criticized by Dambisa Moyo’s Dead Aid (2009) William Easterly’s the White Man Burden (2006) Mary Anderson's Do No Harm Approach (1999), who observed some development interventions, for instance, cases of foreign aid interventions in developing societies which have caused more societal harm than good, polarized the rich-poor gaps among other ills. This noted there are home-grown economic improvement strategies—locally improvised resources and capacities that can accelerate economic development for peace in Rwanda. In Rwanda, Girinka, for instance, significantly influences economic livelihood improvement in rural parts of Rwanda. Equally important, Girinka’s role in the economic livelihood improvement for sustainable peace (see proceeding table). After all, the 4th objective of Girinka is centred on restoration of fractured social cohesion and reconciliation in Rwanda along with objectives touching on economic livelihood improvement. Considering this, the researcher asked genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators to rate how cow-giving—the pass on of a cow to the other guarantees peace through improved economic livelihood for the aforementioned categories. The researcher tested the following statement: Girinka’s passing on of the cow to the other guarantees peace through improved economic livelihood.
Table 3 Girinka’s Passing on of the Cow to the Other Guarantees Peace through Improved Economic Livelihood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Freq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(161)</td>
<td>(115)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 92% (276) of respondents (agree and strongly agreed) confirmed that Girinka’s pass on of cow to the other—genocide survivor or former genocide perpetrator, guarantees peace through improved economic livelihood in Kamonyi District. Only 7.0% (21) remained neutral (undecided) and 1% (3) disagreed with the statement. This empirical revelation (92%) of respondents affirming that Girinka’s pass on of the Cow guarantees peace through improved economic livelihood in Kamonyi District confirmed what International Alert earlier highlighted as “Peace through Prosperity” (International Alert, 2015:9). Importantly, Internationally Alert, an international peacebuilding organization observed that, the more communities and countries get what it considered as “peace factors”, [in place]—meaning “job creation, business opportunities expansion, high income generation, fair access to safe and decent livelihoods and better provision of services by governments,” the higher the peace prospects for the same communities and countries (2015:9).

10.10.7 Girinka-based Restorative Justice and Sustainable Peace

To many Rwanda, Gacaca—the traditional restorative justice—sparked off and accelerated the journey of restoring home-grown solutions to realize immediate, short-term and long-term development and peacebuilding objectives in post genocide Rwanda. However, scholarly reservations on Rwanda’s revival of home-grown solutions have been raised, even among peacebuilding scholars and practitioners. There is ample literature base urging for caution when applying home-grown approach to multi-faceted peace building challenges. Nonetheless, the researcher asked both genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators to rate the following statement—Like Gacaca justice, Girinka can promote sustainable peace more effectively than other classical peace building methods in Kamonyi District. The table below presents the empirical findings and the analysis followed subsequently. The researcher tested the following statement: Like Gacaca justice, Girinka can promote sustainable peace more effectively than other classical peacebuilding methods in Kamonyi District.

Table 34 Like Gacaca Justice, Girinka Can Promote Sustainable Peace More Effectively than other Classical Peace Building Methods in Kamonyi District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total Freq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(163)</td>
<td>(117)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 93.3% (280) (agreed, 54.3% and strongly agreed 39%, 117) confirmed that like Gacaca justice, Girinka can promote sustainable peace more effectively than other classical peacebuilding methods in Kamonyi District. Only 5.7% (17) were neutral and 1% (3) disagreed. Empirical findings from Semi-Structured Interviews, reinforce the foregoing statistical revelation (93.3%), specifically how cows influenced the amending of formerly severed relationships through quasi courts steered by wise men. For instance, respondents, specifically elders with knowledge of Rwanda’s pre-colonial epoch cited Inka y’Icyiru—Cow for Peace (Cow 4Peace)—meaning cows charged from the perpetrator to the survivor or offended purposely to break generational enmity and potential for future vengeance. The wise-men used to charge the offender cows to repair harm, restore fractured friendships and build harmonious relationships. This elucidates Girinka’s power to promote peace more effectively than resorting to classical judicial systems. One respondent reminisced:
... After listening [analysing] the causes of the conflict and thoughtfully ponder upon the gravity of the case usually over potent local brew, wise men would ask the offender to give Inka y’icyiru (Cow for Peace). Once Cow for Peace would be charged and given, it marked the end of inter-generational enmity, (SSI, 30th April Rukiri, . Rwanda)

It can be noted that application of Cow 4Peace to administer justice to the aggrieved acted as practical evidence of Girinka-based justice. This process fits what Sentama (2009) advanced as key values of restorative justice—encounter, amends and integration (p.48). By encounter, what Sentama meant “creating opportunities for both victims [genocide survivors as per Rwanda’s operative term] and offenders [former genocide perpetrators], and community members, who want to meet and discuss the crime and its aftermath,” (2009:48). This is in line with the empirical findings about the nature delivering justice under Cow for Peace arrangement in pre-colonial Rwanda (see the quote above) and reinforced by the statistical empirical revelation, (93.3%), in the table above. Whereas Sentama noted that by encounter, survivors and offenders, and community members got opportunity to meet, discuss the crime and its aftermath, he did not indicate the outcomes from such discussions/meetings. This is the gap Girinka-based justice filled especially when wise-men brought together the two parties and a few community members to review the case; its merit and demerits and finally make impartial judgement—charging the offender the cow(s) for Peace.

However, neither the literature nor the empirical findings does specify whether the gravity of the case attracted more number(s) of cows and the criterion for determining such. Findings from Kamonyi District revealed that Girinka indicated that whereas Girinka has economic objectives (thus revealing out the economic/monetary value), the socio-cultural value of cow-giving and receiving is emphasized than the quantity of cows. Elders interviewed to determine the nature of Girinka in pre-colonial Rwanda strongly agreed with the foregoing fact.

Noteworthy, the guiding principle for such practices differed from retributive justice and exhibited principles of restorative justice: reparative, transformative, corrective, relational and problem-solving as discussed by Brown et al., (2009). Details about differences of retributive and restorative justice, see forms of justice, Chapter two..

Considering empirical facts from literature and Semi-Structured Interviews, it was worthwhile to rate the extent Girinka enables genocide survivors and former genocide resolve their disputes.

10.11. Girinka and Resolution of Disputes through Traditional Justice Methods

After genocide, Kamonyi and other parts of Rwanda] faced great numbers of people clamouring for justice hence causing unprecedented backlog of cases in classical courts in Rwanda. Partly, this led to reintroduction of Gacaca. Reviewed more critically, classical court approach presented more demerits—for instance, its win-loss nature exposed risks of fracturing the social fabric of Rwandan society deeper. Despite having ended the genocide that utterly shattered the social fabric, reviewed literature attested that before colonialism, Rwandans enjoyed social conviviality, preferred resolving emerging disputes through locally agreeable dispute resolution mechanisms such as Gacaca (traditional justice steered by men of integrity) and Abunzi (local mediators or conciliators).

After genocide against Tutsi, this mode of locally improvised dispute resolution mechanism was reintroduced and is regaining emphasis than opposed to the lengthy and costly court processes. In consideration of the foregoing process, the researcher asked the respondents to rate the statement: Restored friendship through Girinka influences us to resolve our disputes via available traditional dispute resolution committees than resorting to classical courts. As a reminder, this research found out that at least 83.4% of respondents—genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District disclosed (agreed and strongly agreed) that the passing on of the cow to the other acted as a friendship guarantor. The following statement: Restored friendship through Girinka influences us to resolve our disputes via traditional dispute resolution committees than resorting to classical courts was tested.

Table 35 Girinka and Resolution of Disputes through Traditional Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>1.3% (40)</td>
<td>5.7% (17)</td>
<td>53.3% (160)</td>
<td>39.7% (119)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least 93% (279) of respondents (agreed plus strongly agreed responses) revealed that restored friendship because of Girinka influences genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators to resolve their emerging disputes via available traditional dispute resolution committees than resorting to classical courts. Given the fact that such traditional mechanisms such as Abunzi Committee emphasize mutual understanding, preservation of good relations, harmonious existence, the disputants are more predisposed to maintaining good neighbourly relations, friendship than a win-loss approach of classical courts. The latter is
always more predisposed to fracturing social positive fabric and harmonious relations than the traditional judicial mechanism. After all, Sentama (2009) and as many other scholars asserted, restorative justice, “puts emphasis on restoring relationships between parties in a conflict, instead of inflicting punishment, (p.48). Benefits of restorative, traditional justice mechanisms are extensively stressed in chapter two. What is worthy of emphasis is that justice timely and effectively delivered leads to realization of sustainable peace after deadly violence like genocide. Considering that 93% of genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators in Kamonyi District restored friendship because of Girinka influence them to use locally available disputes resolution mechanisms than resorting to classical justice model is a good indication of laudable progress towards the realization of sustainable peace in Kamonyi District. Reviewed literature emphasized the centrality of restorative justice to the realization of sustainable peace in post conflict societies.

11. Conclusion

Modelled on post genocide operatizing context, the revitalized Girinka Reconciliation Approach contributes to the addressing Them vs. Us ethnic walls erected by Belgian colonialists and polarized by subsequent political elites after independence leading to 1994 genocide against Tutsi in Kamonyi District. The reduction of Tutsi-Huta ethnic divide in Kamonyi District was empirically supported by 83% (249) out of 300 respondents who confirmed the statement. At least 89.6% (210.4) out of 300 respondents affirmed that the revolving process of Girinka between genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators leads to strong inter-ethnic bonding.

Further, the research concluded that for sustainability of reconciliation gains and peacebuilding milestones in Kamonyi District, peacebuilders—policy-makers, practitioners, even genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators from this District need to consider security as a key opportunity. This conclusion was derived from 90.7% responses rate of genocide survivors and former genocide perpetrators who confirmed that without security, reconciliation and peace processes in Kamonyi District would be a dream. Whereas literature revealed that security has expanded to include other holistic notions, the researcher specifically focused on state-driven national security whose absence respondents confirmed can adversely constrain the realization of reconciliation and building sustainable peace in Kamonyi District. In view of this, security was found to be a critical intervening factor for reconciliation and peacebuilding process in Kamonyi District.

Similarly, it emerged from empirical evidence and literature that measuring changes in human attitudes, behaviours and relationships is extremely difficult especially after gruesome genocidal violence like the one that befell Tutsi of Rwanda. Difficulty of measuring attitudes, behaviours and relations of former genocide perpetrators and genocide survivors can affect the sustainability of peace as failure to precisely measure such changes makes management of reconciliation processes difficult. Alluding to complexity of measuring human behaviours, some scholars compared such an endeavour as shooting a moving target. Basing on 30 % (90) confirmation rate in this study, the researcher concurred with the foregoing assertion. Based on realized contributions of Girinka Reconciliation Approach in influencing the realization of sustainable peace milestones in Kamonyi District, the researcher recommends scaling up Kamonyi Girinka reconciliation approach to the remaining 29 Districts of Rwanda building on good practices and lessons learned from Kamonyi District (piloting of objective four). Such policy decision to occur, generated evidence from this research, need to be considered for effective policy planning, policy implementation and monitoring. The researcher noted evidence from studies like these ones need to be simplified into plain storie and narratives not only to be understood by policy-makers, but by their policy advisors and policy-implementers.
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