SCHOOL OF LAW
CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

Societies Without Borders

Volume 8 | Issue 3 Article 2

2013

Narratives of Mass Violence: The Role of Memory and Memorialization in Addressing Human Rights Violations in Post-Conflict Rwanda and Uganda

Carla De Yeaza
New York University

Nicole Fox
Brandeis University

C. De Ycaza and N. Fox/ Societies Without Borders 8:3 (2013) 344-372

Narratives of Mass Violence: The Role of Memory and Memorialization in Addressing Human Rights Violations in Post-Conflict Rwanda and Uganda

Carla De Ycaza
New York University
Nicole Fox
Brandeis University

Received September 2012; *Accepted February* 2013

Abstract
This paper explores the question of what do Rwandans and Ugandans working on memorialization initiatives deem important when discussing the role of individual and collective memory in the aftermath of mass violence and human rights violations. Social scientists and human rights scholars have asserted the importance of memory in both reconciliation and healing after mass violence. However, it is difficult to determine the most appropriate way to facilitate reconciliation between groups who previously raped, stole from or killed one another, as there is no "one-size-fits-all" approach. While policies cannot remedy the murder of one's family, scholars, activists and practitioners argue that some action must be taken post-violence in order to address the trauma of these human rights violations (Caruth 1995; Gobodo-Madikizela 2009; Shaw 2010; Villa-Vicencio 2009). One type of reconciliation policy that has been generated in the wake of mass atrocity has been the formation of "memory committees" or individuals and organizations that work to support and promote memorialization efforts that aid both in remembering and providing redress for human rights violations. This project draws on interviews conducted by the authors with memory committee and organization members who actively engage in memory work in the Great Lakes region in Africa, specifically in Rwanda and Uganda. By understanding and analyzing the narratives of stakeholders in post-violence memory work, international and local actors can work to support effective processes on the ground in order to facilitate reconciliation.

Keywords
Africa, Great Lakes, human rights, sociology of memory, transitional justice, reconciliation.

Over the past two decades, there has been an increase in the prominence of memorials in post-conflict African societies, specifically in the Great Lakes region. The work of local and international actors in uncovering the truth about past atrocities and searching for accountability raises important questions about the contributions memorialization efforts make to post-conflict reconstruction. This paper examines the question of what memory committees in Rwanda and Uganda deem important when discussing the role of memory in the aftermath of mass violence and human rights violations. Furthermore,

this paper analyzes the reported challenges and successful efforts in the processes of memorialization work in these two case studies.

This paper serves as a nexus in which literature from sociology and legal studies can be discussed in the context of memorialization. In bridging and building upon literature from the sociology of memory and transitional justice, this research examines how memory projects in Rwanda and Uganda can promote traditional forms of justice[1] in post-conflict zones. In focusing on two post-conflict neighboring nations within the Great Lakes region that have experienced widespread and systematic violations of human rights within the context of civil war, this paper offers a new perspective in the field by providing a cross-cultural regional comparison of memorialization efforts in the aftermath of mass atrocity. The study draws on the existing literature within memory and transitional justice, and analyzes each memory project within its broader historical context, followed by a description of research questions examined, methods and sample. The paper highlights concrete findings from the two case studies, including how participants described memorials as aiding post-conflict reconstruction both theoretically and logistically, as well as what was particularly challenging for these two sites, while addressing primary differences in these respective case studies. Additionally, this paper evaluates how both cases deal with the challenges of remembering gendered based violence that occurred during past violence and concludes with implications that this study has for the field of memory studies and transitional justice.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Collective Memory Studies

Since the 1990s "memory boom" of scholarship engaging in memory politics and commemoration, social science disciplines have emerged with a new found heuristic for understanding history, identity, social movements and social relations. After the rediscovery of Maurice Halbwach's book, *On Collective Memory*, social scientists began to reexamine the ways in which the past affects the present. One central trend within memory studies explores how communities, movements and nations remember their pasts in ways that create a sense of solidarity or exceptionality within the larger global community. Much of this trend builds upon Benedict Anderson's prominent analysis of how "imagined communities" are created and maintained to make individuals, who normally would feel little connection to one another, feel allied with one another in nationalist projects (1991). "Imagining a community" refers to the practice of sharing traditions (or "inventing" shared traditions), practicing communal rituals or encouraging ideas of common descent (Connerton 1989).

One of the ways that social orders can have a "presupposed" memory is by creating commemoration projects that produce a collective narrative for a nation or community to draw on for years to come (Wagner-Pacifici & Schwartz 1991). Some of these projects focus on specific leaders of social movements such as Martin Luther King Jr., Yitzhak Rabin and George Washington (Polletta 1998; Schwartz 1991; Vinitzky-Seroussi 2002). These studies have found that the stories told of the lives and accomplishment of these individuals change over time, serving different national purposes. Polletta (1998) points to the difficulty and complications that scholars experience in aiming to understand what is at stake for different communities in trying to control narratives of the past. Emphasis on what is at stake for the control of public memory does not just apply to the examination of historical leaders, but also relates to wars, contentious politics and mass violence (Aguilar 1997; Booth 2006; Friedländer 1979; Lentin 2009; Eyerman 2004; Young 1993).

Nations, often in an effort to overcome a contentious past, create collective memories for the country to draw on for years to come.[2] Zerubavel (2003) argues that collective memory is a process of groups gaining an ample amount of social memories of their past and is a way to practice recollection so that the past becomes something that is cognitively recognizable. Zerubavel investigates the physical structures of memory (such as bridges, memorials, statues) and finds that these "sites" tell specific, folk legends, biographies, plotlines and/or narratives of historical events. These narratives have script-like plotlines that "help us string past events in our minds, providing them with historical meaning," (Zerubavel 2003:13). These studies demonstrate that physical sites of memory can shape the stories that people tell about the past. This is critical in that the ways in which a society remembers its past often shapes the way a nation handles conflict in the future (Barsalou & Baxter 2007).

While these studies are particularly helpful in framing the discussion of memorialization efforts in post-conflict societies, the sociology of memory has lacked rigorous scholarship on how gender shapes narratives of the past, memorialization efforts or how gender shapes who become experts of the past. While few scholars have been an exception to this rule, the vast majority of collective memory scholarship has lacked attention to gender on any analytical level (Olick 1996; Schwartz 1982; Zerubavel 1996). Sociologists specializing in memory and gender have focused on how women and men narrate the past differently through stories (Johnstone 1990; Ochs & Taylor 1996), how gender shapes narration of participation in social movements and the memory of those movements (McAdam 1992) and how women have been memorialized, especially in the case of the Holocaust (Baumel-Schwartz1998; Jacobs 2010; Ringelheim 1998).

The last category of scholarship, especially Jacobs (2010), working on how gender shapes the physical memorials of genocide, has been most fruitful for our case. No study to date has focused on how communities themselves work to integrate narratives of gendered violence[3] in memory projects. This study provides the first steps in understanding the ways in which individuals and communities *themselves* deal with the gendered violence of the past in memorials, and whether they view these efforts as aiding in processes of justice and reconciliation. This paper also highlights the role of memorialization more broadly in post-conflict reconstruction and redress, with gender as one element of this process.

Memory and Transitional Justice

In contrast to the approach of collective memory studies within sociology, transitional justice offers a socio-legal lens of viewing memory and memorialization as ways in which post-conflict societies can address the legacy of mass atrocity. While sociology focuses on the experiences of communities in their efforts to remember the past, transitional justice literature focuses on the set of judicial and non-judicial measures that have been implemented by different countries in order to redress the legacies of massive human rights abuses. Scholar and practitioner Christine Bell characterizes transitional justice as having emerged from the field of legal studies: "The original focus of transitional justice discourse was that human rights law requires accountability in transitions, rooted in the discipline of law. Over time, this focus has been expanded to include a much broader range of mechanisms, goals and inquiries across a range of disciplines." (2009: 5). According to De Brito, "Legacies of repression have been dealt with in transitional periods through amnesties, trials or purges, through the establishment of truth commissions, by financial compensation, and with symbolic gestures such as the building of monuments or the proclamation of commemorative days of 'remembering'" (2001:1). Memorialization, or the various efforts to keep the memory of the victims alive through the creation of museums, memorials, and other symbolic initiatives such as the renaming of public spaces, has become an important part of transitional justice throughout the world (Barsalou & Baxer 2007).

These various efforts to keep memory alive can be seen both on the individual and local levels as well as in more state sponsored actions. For example, the individualized passing on of memories through artifacts, letters and storytelling can be contrasted with state-sponsored collective memorialization efforts instituted through lawmaking and transitional justice initiatives. These efforts can take the form of truth commissions, courts, reparations programs, memorials, and days of commemoration: "Actual memory of events is necessarily transient; the

people who lived at a particular time, and whose memories were shaped by the actuality of events, can pass on the artifacts of memory (in the form of written testimonies, caches of letters, family storytelling), but lack the lawmaking and mythmaking apparatus of the state" (Bassiouni 2002: 387). Both local and national based methods of transmitting memory can provide ways of reconciling trauma in the aftermath of human rights abuses within communities by giving a voice to marginalized people. One group of marginalized people that has been passed over in many transitional justice efforts, both locally and nationally, has been women.

Women's experience of human rights abuses has often been neglected in transitional justice approaches, with lack of regard for the complex injuries and violations that women suffer. Recent efforts in transitional justice have been made to enhance women's access to justice, reclaim public space and contribute to historical memory (Nesiah 2006). Women are often underrepresented in the decision-making process and as a result are marginalized in transitional justice efforts (Valji 2007). Transitional justice can help to pursue gender justice by indicating gendered patterns of abuse and promoting access to justice. By acknowledging the factors that contribute to gender inequality through structural causes, transitional justice can aid in promoting truth commissions and reparations initiatives that challenge such discriminatory practices and provide a space for dialogue. Truth commissions in Peru, Sierra Leone and Timor Leste have included elements of gender justice in their proceedings and have contributed to the drafting of legislation and policymaking in Liberia and Nepal regarding gender policies (Theidon 2007).

Contribution to the Literature

This study compares local and national memorial efforts in the East African region. By evaluating both local and national efforts, the role that the state and local communities play in memory projects can best be illuminated. By choosing two cases within the same region, one can better understand both successful memorial efforts and challenges that may be regionally specific. Our efforts to focus in particular on local narratives of memorialization is important because of the sharp contrast between state official memorial initiatives and informal practices. Memory and memorialization are often marked by a struggle in determining whose memories count and at what cost: "Memory is a struggle over power and who gets to decide the future. What and how societies choose to remember and forget largely determines their future options" (De Brito 2001:38).

This study connects bodies of literature in sociology and law to provide an analysis of the ways in which memory projects can help societies recover from and redress human rights violations through a

regional analysis of two case studies in East Africa. For as Valerie Rosoux notes, although memory studies have expanded greatly and gained significant popularity among researchers, "it may come as a surprise that the use that is made of memory in international relations has so far rarely been examined" (2004: 160). This research connects international, national and local transitional justice efforts and discussions on memorialization to address past violations of human rights in order to highlight the ways in which memorialization can help societies reconcile their past.

This study provides tangible examples of the ways in which memory can be both beneficial and challenging for regions recovering from mass human rights violations. Furthermore, by examining two cases, one supported by government bodies and one supported primarily through localized mechanisms, this research compares and contrasts the ways in which these two power dynamics shape memory efforts. Finally, this project adds much-needed analysis to the conversations in the literature about the challenge of remembering gender-based violence in both national and local memory projects.

How a country remembers its past structures the possibilities for both reconciliation and future violence. National memory projects often shape national and communal group identity politics, processes of transitional justice and post-conflict reconstruction (Bell 2006). Much of the current literature on memory studies is found in the fields of cultural studies, political science, sociology, international studies and anthropology. Building an interdisciplinary bridge between sociological memory studies and transitional justice can help to highlight the ways in which local, regional and international stakeholders can work to support effective processes on the ground to facilitate reconciliation through memorialization efforts. In this way, memorial projects can promote social reconstruction by identifying potential regional trends in memory initiatives.

REGIONAL APPROACH AND HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

A regional approach is crucial to the understanding of conflict within the Great Lakes region (and arguably other contexts as well) since crises seldom exist in isolation. When one country is experiencing civil war, genocide or famine, the ramifications and aftermath often spread into neighboring nations. This can take the form of involvement of rebel groups across borders; for example, the Rwandan Patriot Front's (RPF) origin in Uganda, government alliances between Rwanda and Uganda in opposition to the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) in Africa's World War, cross-border retaliation, and the flow of refugees across borders.

Additionally, due to the artificial creation of colonial borders in Africa after the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885, many families,

communities and cultural identities have become transnational in the sense that they do not reside only within the designated boundaries of a single nation. Because of this, scholars have increasingly adopted a regional approach to politics, economics and conflict resolution. Throughout Africa, regional approaches to addressing economic and political situations have become widely adopted through the existence of institutions such as the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), and the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region (ICGLR). As a result of this increasingly regional approach to politics and economics, it follows that a regional approach would also be adopted for the analysis of conflict.

Finally, both Rwanda and Uganda have experienced violence and human rights abuses such as crimes against humanity, war crimes, gendered violence, poverty, and colonialism during comparable time periods. Although there has been a rise in intrastate conflict post-Cold War in Africa, crises seldom exist in isolation. Challenges to peace and security need to be seen in context, as they create a complex security environment regionally. National perspectives alone would not provide a holistic approach to the analysis of conflict and responses thereto.

Rwanda

On April 7, 1994 a 100-day genocide began in the small, densely populated, central African country of Rwanda. The genocide was organized, and included elements such as hate speech broadcasted on the radio, road blockages that prevented victims from leaving the country, and false "safety zones" that in actuality were sites of mass killings (Mamdani 2001). The media reported the genocide as part of a "tribal warfare" of two warring "tribes" in a far away land (Schmidt 1994). This rhetoric of tribalism justified inaction by some of the global public, furthering the complacency of international leaders and organizations. However, the genocide was not a result of "tribal warfare"; it was the result of economic inequality masked as ethnic division, resulting from years of colonialism (Mamdani 2001). Rwanda's genocide erupted after four years of civil war and over forty years of violence between the two groups: the Tutsi and the Hutu. Since colonial rule prior to the turn of the 20th century, Tutsi were placed in positions of power by German colonizers. After World War I, Belgian colonizers caused tension and stratification between the two groups, continuing policies and practices of inequality that favored Tutsi. The oppression of Hutu under both colonial rule and neo-colonial rule after Rwanda's 1962 independence led to several decades of civil war and smaller massacres of Tutsi. The

culmination, however, was the 1994 genocidal uprising against the Tutsi, claiming the lives of over twenty percent of the nation in one hundred days.

The aftermath of the massive violence of 1994 was the loss of up to one million lives, hundreds of thousands of perpetrators in jails, orphaned children, HIV positive women from genocidal rape, and a demolished infrastructure. The response by the Rwandan government and many local communities to this divisive past and devastative aftermath was the creation of memorials throughout the country.[4] This includes a total of 300 memorials throughout the small country and seven national memorials/museums. Memorials and commemoration rituals have also been created outside Rwanda in Uganda, DRC, Thailand, the United States and other nations where Rwandan refugees reside. Additionally, within Rwanda, the government has enacted a national governmentally enforced commemoration period for a week following April 7th every year that leads into a 100 days of mourning where people refrain from getting married, celebrating births and/or public displays of joy.[5] These memorials have not come without challenges, especially with regards to how one should commemorate, who should be commemorated and where commemoration should take place.

Uganda

Throughout Uganda's history there have been tensions along ethnic divides, over resources and for development between the North and South. The fertile South, contrasted with the underdeveloped North, set the stage for a protracted conflict, which began in 1986, between the Government of Uganda and the rebel group the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA).[6] The divide and rule policy instituted by the British during colonialism created a rift in relations between the north and the south/west provinces in Uganda. The north was seen as hostile territory, which contributed to the British myth that the Acholi people of the north were a 'martial tribe.' The culmination of the oppression of the northern tribes, including the Acholi, under both colonial and neo-colonial rule after Uganda's 1962 independence, was a violent conflict between the Government of Uganda and the LRA.

Currently, over two million people in Northern Uganda have been displaced due to this conflict. This amounts to over ninety percent of the population in northern provinces of Gulu, Kitgum and Pader; virtually the entire Acholi population has been directly affected by this conflict. There have been over 60,000 abductions and forceful recruitments of children and youths into the rebel army, ravaging the country with massacres, mutilation, torture, rape and forced labor. Sexual and gender based violence is extremely prevalent in the region as a result of the war. Conflict and post-conflict challenges associated with the war in Northern Uganda include the issue of landmines, the destruction of

culture, targeted rapes and deaths in IDP camps, lack of representation of northern groups in government and destroyed infrastructure. This highlights the ongoing debate over peace versus justice, with the issuing of ICC warrants for top LRA leaders, while many local groups insist on promoting traditional conflict resolution practices to rebuild society. The Amnesty Act of 2000 has also been highly controversial as a tool of transitional justice to address the effects of the conflict by providing amnesty from prosecution for former combatants.[7] Many believe that this presents an ongoing threat to regional security, with the LRA spreading across borders to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Central African Republic and South Sudan.[8]

RESEARCH METHDOLOGY

This study encompasses two cohorts of participants, one from Rwanda and one from Uganda, each consisting of local participants, government officials, field practitioners, academics, researchers and policymakers working on memory committees or conferences, commemoration events and rituals or onsite memorials in Rwanda and Uganda. Participants were asked about what histories, narratives, and elements they felt were important to remember in commemorative spaces. Commemorative spaces, also termed as memorials, were defined as physical sites that included a building, equipped with a guide who told a historical narrative of past atrocities (the 1994 genocide for Rwanda, and the LRA violence in Uganda). Memorials were open to the public, utilized by both local actors and foreign visitors and supported by either the national government or local communities. Memorials often contained evidence from past violence such as human remains, destroyed infrastructure or weapons used by perpetrators.

The Rwandan cohort was comprised of 50 interviews with participants that were conducted by author one in 2011-2012 at three different memorial sites in central Rwanda. The three sites were chosen to allow for a comparative research design and isolating factors that contribute to specific dimensions of narratives about memory (rural v. urban, religious v. secular space, etc.).[9] All sites are located within a 30-mile radius of the capital city. This allowed for some regional similarity within the sites. The majority of interviews conducted at these sites were carried out in English. However, 20 of the interviews were not conducted in English, rather in Kinyarwandan, and were facilitated by a translator. The translations were double checked with a second translator for accuracy. The translator for the Rwandan cohort was a former village leader of a child headed household (CHH) community who is fluent in English, Ikinyarwanda, and Swahili and lived in Rwanda his whole life. This was important as participants recognized his dialect of Ikinyarwanda as spoken by someone who remained in Rwanda their whole life, rather than someone who migrated from neighboring

countries after the genocide. His dialect was therefore the same (or very similar) to those with whom he was speaking with during the interviews. Additionally, he is a survivor who has collected testimonies for other projects, which was ideal as he was compassionate and understanding during the interviews, some of which were emotional.

The Ugandan cohort was comprised of 50 participants interviewed in 2011. Four of the interviews were not conducted in English, rather Acholi, and were facilitated by a translator. The translator was a member of the community and fluent in English and Acholi. Participants were drawn from Gulu and Kitgum districts in Northern Uganda and included academics, practitioners and people affected by the conflict who were working on transitional justice and memorialization issues. Gulu and Kitgum comprise two regions that were most affected by the conflict in Northern Uganda, Gulu being a larger city and Kitgum being a smaller, more rural region.

All 100 interviews were transcribed by the authors or an outside professional transcription company (in the case of 30 interviews) and uploaded into atlas ti, a computer software program for qualitative data analysis. Both authors then coded for emerging themes, wrote extensive memos and evaluated findings. Data was compared for central issues raised by participants, including the use of memory in post-conflict reconciliation, the challenges of memorialization both theoretically and physically, and the negotiation process of variously situated stakeholders. The central themes that emerged from these interviews centered around the successes and challenges of memory work. The successes included how memory can include a process of documentation and how memorials have become a place for community engagement, as well as how the dynamics of creating spaces and rituals of memorialization can be healing[10] to survivors. Themes around the challenges of memorialization also emerged, including how to best deal with contested memories or memories of gendered based violence, as well as logistical challenges of building and maintaining a memorial.

While all participants in this study were highly invested in memorialization projects, we recognize that this is not generalizable for the entire population of people in Rwanda and Uganda. This method of sampling naturally led to the exclusion of people not engaged with memorials so we are not able to assess in this project how memorials may affect people who attend them once or twice. Because we sampled for people who were involved in memorialization projects on a regular basis we were able to better get at issues of challenges and benefits of commemorative spaces even though this limits generalizability.

FINDINGS

Findings from this research can be divided into three main sections: 1) ways in which participants in both cohorts found memory

projects to be helpful for community cohesion and coexistence, 2) challenges described in both cohorts both theoretically and logistically, and finally, 3) the differences between the two cases in their memorial efforts as reported by participants. The ways in which participants in both cases found memory projects to be helpful were how memorials served as sites of documentation and evidence collection, and how memorials are sites for community engagement and social networking. Participants also reported efforts to create physical memory spaces and rituals as helpful because they acknowledged human rights violations and made them public. Both cohorts also expressed significant challenges in memory work, such as the issue of how to include forgotten and contested memories, and the difficulty of remembering gender-based violence. Furthermore, participants emphasized the logistical challenges of memory work post-violence. While we found significant overlap in Ugandan and Rwandan participants, these case studies differed in that memorialization efforts in Rwanda have had considerable government support while memory initiatives in Uganda have been primarily locally- driven.

1. Positive Dynamics of Memory Work

1A. Memory as a Process of Documentation and Community Engagement

Participants in this study indicated that memory as a process of documentation can be highly effective as a way of commemorating victims while also serving as a truth-seeking initiative to establish collective memory and provide a historical account of events that occurred during the conflicts. Logistically, memorial centers provide physical places for people in the community to come together to commemorate the past and find ways to move forward through reconciliation.

In both Rwanda and Uganda, memorials have become community centers where people reflect on their experiences, pay tribute to the dead and connect with other community members. Participants often explain that they spent time at the memorial in order to network with other survivors, discuss issues in their community (as many lived close to the center) or grieve with friends and family. Additionally, centers can provide employment for many community members in the area, highlighting the economic dimension to redress and efforts to deal with historical injustices perpetuated by conflict. In Rwanda, genocide survivors often volunteered or found paid employment at memorial centers where their family members were buried. Many saw their involvement in memorials as a way to honor their family members' legacy. One Rwandan survivor felt it was her duty to work at the memorials: "I lived through it, so it is my duty to tell others about what I

saw and help them grieve or learn about the dangers of genocide and [genocide] ideology. And when I work here, I get to be close to my parents remains everyday, that is very important."

Local processes of documentation of memory promote engaged participation in the process of reconciliation and rebuilding society by grassroots level groups and individuals. One Ugandan participant highlighted the importance of community involvement in memorialization efforts: "The government and communities must all work together like a family. If something happens to a child or mother or father, we must all be involved. This is the problem in Africa, where governments tend to use authority or domination on the people. We don't see the connection between the government and the people. That really gives us a lot of pain." Here, the participant emphasizes the importance of community involvement versus state-led actions to institutionalize memories.

Community centers and memorial sites also allow for oral transmission of memory through storytelling, song, performance and testimony. This is highly important to marginalized groups, as written history is often conceptualized as traditionally originating from a colonial perspective. One participant in Uganda highlighted the role of oral transmission of memory and the role of colonialism in historiography: "We must value oral tradition, how we do it in Africa. What we read in books is the white man's side of the story. We should never forget the primary source of memory, us as human beings, to pass onto our children." Memorialization efforts passed down through oral tradition can include stories shared about loved ones who had passed, encouraging words for survivors of violence, the sharing of positive news (college acceptance, jobs, births, weddings), and testimony of survival, both physical and psychological. Survivor testimony was of particular importance to many participants, as it highlights the contribution of subaltern and marginalized groups to memorialization efforts, not just intellectuals and government officials; for survivors were seen as experts in their own experience, not academics, officials, or specialists.

1B. Creating Spaces and Rituals of Memorialization

Of great importance to participants interviewed was the existence of physical spaces and locations to preserve and transmit memory, such as sites where massacres occurred, mass graves, demolished buildings, churches and refugee/IDP camps. These sites of memory and documentation serve as a historical record and educational tool for future generations. They can include photos, war murals, body maps,[11] timelines of events, memory walks and walking maps. It should also be noted that participants indicated a strong desire to include such practices and rituals in sites that do not currently have these options

present. For example, in Rwanda, one site had photos of the victims buried at that specific location. At the two other sites, neither of which displayed photos; many echoed the sentiment of this participant's desire to someday have "photos of the victims like [the site with photos] because then they have a face and they are not just a skull or bones but people know they were a person with a face and a life." Similarly, in Kitgum, participants expressed interest in incorporating the body mapping process used in Colombia and South Africa into memorialization efforts in Northern Uganda.

This particularly related to documenting the impact of sexual and gender based violence, as one could mark the impact of the violence on the body without having to speak about what occurred. In regards to the emphasis placed on the physical spaces to preserve memory, one participant also highlighted the importance of having mass graves, specifically in the region of Barlonyo in Northern Uganda:

> The reason we accepted to have this mass grave was to remind us about the kind of killing that took place in our community. The other advantage of this mass grave is that it teaches our children that it is bad to take place in conflict; the grave is a reminder of the atrocity of killing. The mass grave is physical evidence of what happened to us. You can really see what happened to us. This mass grave has helped us relate and connect to other communities, visitors who come and see it, we interact and share ideas. The other advantage of the mass grave is that we were able to keep small arms used to torture us, people can see them.

The physical space of the mass graves, as well as other memorial sites, can create a place for sharing memories through education and evidence, allowing for survivors of mass atrocity to connect with others to convey their stories and experiences.

In addition to memory being a form of cultural and historical documentation, memorials and memory spaces are often thought of as a form of violence prevention that educates the community past violence and injustice. Many participants in both cases stated that one function of these memorials in post-conflict communities is to show communities what can happen when inequality and violence escalates. For example, one Rwandan participant stated, "You must see the darkness here at this memorial before you we can have the light of peace. People come by and see what can happen if divisions are kept and can then learn from our bad past." As another Rwandan participant noted, "our best hope is the next generation; that is why we must put our effort into them so we can ensure a strong and peaceful future."

The role of days of commemoration and ceremonies to keep memory alive was also expressed as important to communities in helping to acknowledge and identify specific numbers killed, by whom, and where in order to give a voice to their stories and experiences. For example, in Rwanda, memorials often hold commemorative events on annual anniversary of the night people were killed at that site. In one research site in Rwanda, survivors spend the night of April 15th and 16th every year to commemorate the invasion of the militia that killed 10,000 people in 1994. Of additional importance in creating practices and rituals of memorialization is the preservation of traditional cultural items, such as objects and artifacts, to transmit memory intergenerationally. An example of this was related by a participant in Gulu discussing one massacre site: "We have kept some traditional cultural things in this place so people can see the objects we use to learn about our culture- to teach others about our culture when they visit us." For this participant, learning and teaching about their own culture was a central aspect of keeping memories alive.

Commemorative days or rituals can be especially important for survivors of violence; this provides a time where their suffering is publicly recognized. Communities acknowledge what occurred in the past including the multiple levels of wrongdoing, such as perpetrators, bystanders, or orchestrators of violence, and recognizes those who survived, or even rescued others. In the words of one Rwandan survivor, "all year long I go on, with such sadness in my heart for the loss of my beloved ones, and then in April the whole public says yes, this happened to you and we are sad and we are sorry." In Northern Uganda, an annual memorial prayer and candlelight vigil is held in February for the 2004 Barlonyo massacre. Participants come from various regions in Northern Uganda, including West Nile, Acholi, Lango and Teso. This is a time for individuals to unite to share their experiences.[12]

Local memorialization efforts present a space for dialogue through documentation and evidence collection and community engagement. The oral transmission of memory at sites of memory through storytelling, song, testimony and performance has had an impact on the way memorialization efforts are approached, as many marginalized groups prefer this type of commemoration versus colonially influenced writing of histories, as oral transmission promotes local ownership of these processes of memory. Creating spaces and rituals of memorialization, including photo displays, war murals, body maps, timelines of events, memory walks and walking maps, allows for the preservation and transmission of memory through a physical place, oftentimes where violence has occurred, in order for victims to reclaim the space and memory of the atrocities that took place. One Ugandan participant noted that having a local site of memory "has also helped

foster forgiveness among people, facilitate apology and the process of forgiveness in the community."

2. Challenges in Memory and Transitional Justice

2A. Contested & Forgotten Memories

Memorialization is highly politicized, as it involves multiple competing truths and narratives. Although memory projects have proven to be a helpful tool in sustaining peaceful coexistence by housing evidence of mass violence and aiding in survivor's healing process, memorialization had several challenges for participants as well. In both countries visited, participants described challenge of how to best promote the inclusion of marginalized stories that may be contested, highly political or shameful. In these two cases, some of the competing narratives include the debate over what constitutes war crimes versus what constitutes genocide, what is the role of rebel groups versus government forces.

Participants described a lack of healing and reconciliation, when parties refuse to acknowledge accounts and memories. In one community in Northern Uganda, the government has refused to acknowledge the massacre that occurred or recognize the number of those killed. One participant noted, "The problem we are having now is the issue of numbers- we know the number killed, but the government is not recognizing this number. Who really killed us, who is responsible. The government is not relating to the way we remember, and it makes us question who was responsible for doing this violence to us." For this participant and others, lack of acknowledgment of past crimes impedes the process of recovery and addressing the past in order to move forward.

Furthermore, in Rwanda, participants disagreed as to whether crimes of war should also be included in genocide memorials. This creates a significant division among those who wish to be recognized for their suffering at the hands of the current government versus those who feel war crimes and acts of genocide are mutually exclusive categories that should remain separate. Additionally, several survivors mentioned the fear that recognition of war crimes in memorials would dilute the brutality of the genocidal acts that occurred outside of war crimes and politics.

Contrastingly, the role of forgetting in the practice of memory work also has shown to be particularly important, as we see the dichotomy between the right to forget versus the right to truth and memory. For many years, individuals in post-conflict and conflict settings have exercised this right to forget in multiple contexts, including Mozambique and Spain (Cobban 2007; Urdillo 2011). We also see the issue of the divergence between memory as a form of transitional justice versus memory as an individual experience versus historical memory,

and are confronted with the problems of addressing these divisions in the broader context of memorialization work. This raised the issue of whether either the sociological or transitional justice frameworks should be applied to the study of memory, and how this application of intellectual and discursive borders can limit the scope of memorialization projects. The issue of "forgetting" came up most often during discussions on how memorials do or don't address past instances of sexual and gender-based violence. It is important to note that the act of choosing to forget and the act of remaining silent constitute different approaches to the discussion of whether or not to memorialize.

2B. Sexual and Gender-Based Violence

The issue of how to remember sexual and gender-based violence, including gendered torture, mutilation and rape of men, women and children, posed an extremely difficult challenge in both case studies. This is in part due to the fact that the topic of sexual violence, and discussion of sexuality more generally, is culturally taboo. This raises problems within communities of marginalization and exclusion of victims of sexual and gender based violence, as well as their children.

Women have long been considered a casualty of war in which they are treated as property of the enemy to be destroyed through rape (Mullins & Rothe 2008). Theorists have argued about the pervasiveness and brutality of mass rape in recent genocides and conflicts compared to the past, but few deny the timeless ubiquity of this phenomenon. The cases of Rwanda and Uganda are unfortunately no exception to this phenomenon. With an estimated 500,000 women raped during the 1994 genocide in Rwanda and more victims abducted and raped by the LRA every day throughout the region, the problem of gender-based violence has become increasingly prevalent in transitional justice discussions and memorialization efforts (Mullins 2009).

This complicated processes of remembering gendered violence during national commemoration months or memorial projects within a context of silence, secrecy and shame among rape survivors, especially those who have since remarried, creates challenges for public testimony. This is often due to the fact that most survivors of sexual violence are uncomfortable sharing their experiences. This leads the majority of commemorative practices to rely not on survivor testimony but rather on physical memorials and guided tours. Participants discussed in both samples how gendered violence needed to be commemorated. One Rwandan participant stated, "If we silence those memories, we will forget those victims and they deserve to be recognized." This participant felt like forgetting did not honor the victims but rather felt their experience should be highlighted during commemorations or in memorials. Similarly, in Uganda, one participant explained, "The dead victims of gendered violence are often forgotten and those who have to

deal with living memories are silenced." An added complication to surviving gendered violence during times of mass atrocities, unlike of surviving physical violence, is that gendered violence can be particularly shameful and damaging to discuss in public, especially since some women would not be able to remarry or be ex-communicated by their families. This leads to very few public testimonies of gendered violence.

Similarly, both the bottom-up cultural gender norms and top-down international gender discourse have done much to silence the voices of men in terms of the discussion of sexual and gender-based violence. Culturally, men are seen as the protectors and symbols of strength, with sexual violence viewed as not possible or plausible against men, but rather almost inevitable against women during times of conflict. International gender discourses also promote an idea of men as perpetrators and women and children as victims. Legal frameworks continue to reflect this vulnerability. For example, the Great Lakes Protocol on the Protection and Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons highlights its scope of protection to include women and children, as well as vulnerable persons. United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 also emphasizes the need for protection of women and children against sexual violence in conflict. This codification of gender discourse provides a blanket amnesty to those who have perpetrated sexual violence against men.

Men's gendered vulnerability is at the heart of the victim-perpetrator paradox, as it is possible for men to be both perpetrator and victim.[13] Men also experience the effects of sexual violence through the children born of the rapes of their wives. One Ugandan participant notes, "There is a challenge that those men face when they have to look at their children every day- a living memory of what happened. They see all that has happened between the husband and wife, the stress put on their relationship, the changed family dynamic and relationship with their community. How do you live with that memory every day? There is much said about how this affects women, but not much about how this affects men. It is just as gendered and complicated to deal with." As a result, it is important for memorialization efforts to include the voices of marginalized populations, including men who have suffered as a result of sexual and gender-based violence.

The delicate balance of recognizing the gendered crimes committed without naming or describing details is difficult to manage. Most participants described at length the need to have others know of the violence perpetrated on women and men, but no consensus was drawn as to the best way to disseminate those narratives or facilitate discussion on such horrific acts. Private counseling groups were one idea supported; however, those rarely led to public memory projects. Participants felt some type of acknowledgement of the gendered violence so prevalent in both cases could eventually contribute to healing and reconciliation more

generally. The desire expressed by participants for a gender-sensitive approach to memorialization and transitional justice is one area where this study notes a need for additional research and development.

2C. Logistical & Implementation Challenges

In addition to theoretical challenges such as how to best commemorate gendered violence, participants also consistently brought up logistical challenges of memorialization. A prominent logistical challenge participants noted was the exhumation of mass graves and the debates around whether to return the bodies for traditional burial or to keep them as they are as a site of memory. In Rwanda, 18 years after the genocide, authorities are still digging up remains to rebury them, with some survivors finding the remains of their family members many years later. One participant responded that this is in part because "we had nobody trained to do this work, in the beginning the government just gave people gloves and we tried our best. We didn't have people trained to do archives, we had to develop these fields, like forensics." One Ugandan participant similarly commented, "If we had a way to identify the victims and exhume them, we would give them a proper burial by their loved ones."

The responses provided by the participants indicated challenges in regards to the costs of exhumation services, lack of expertise within local populations on how to carry out these exhumations, and the problem of outside experts in exhumations who are unfamiliar with the local culture. Additionally, financial challenges were echoed in both countries with regards to managing donor interests and mandates in funding memory work. This often leads to setbacks as to what sites should be prioritized for maintenance and improvement, and where to develop new memorial sites.

3. Differences

Although Rwanda and Uganda experienced similar challenges and benefits of memory projects, the significant differences in government involvement in the projects shaped some of the struggles. Rwanda has implemented a top-down approach to the institutionalization of memorials, whereas Uganda has adopted a more grassroots approach. This is due in part to the lack of government acknowledgment of specific acts in the Ugandan conflict.

In the case of Rwanda, the national government has been central in implementing memorials. They provided significant resources including funding, research, organization and housing of archives to most memorials, focusing on seven major national sites. Additionally, the government-funded National Commission to Fight Against Genocide[14] organizes, supports and documents the national mourning week and following 100 days. This period includes international

conferences, speeches by the president, mayors, and other government leaders during commemorations, the organization of commemorations, a network of trauma counselors, security and protocol staff and development of commemoration programs, including poems and survivor testimony.

For many survivors, the support of the government in such an extensive memorialization period is welcomed. For those who have visited Rwanda during the month of April, it would be difficult to miss the purple banners declaring "never again" or "remember," the flowers sold in the streets to place on gravesites or the nonstop media coverage on the radio and television showing commemorations and burials across the country. Participants indicated that this unavoidable ritual was both validating and emotionally trying. Participants commented that having their government support their experience as survivors of genocide made their experience recognizable: "At times I feel crazy for what I saw, I think to myself, did I really see that? Did that really happen? And then I know, yes it did, I have no parents, no one left. So to see April where people accept that it did happen makes me feel less uneasy because I know what I saw happened and people are not denying that but mourning with me." Providing a forum where survivors bear witness can help with the cognitive dissonance that trauma can cause.

In contrast, others indicated that the inescapability of the mourning period was difficult. Since the mourning period was supported, implemented and sponsored by the Rwandan government, non-government survivors and groups had few ways to challenge this official means of mourning. One participant said "it is everywhere and sometimes it becomes too much. Seriously, everywhere and sometimes I just want to go to bed in April in peace and know that I honor my family who was killed but not have to see it everywhere." Additionally, participants indicated that the rhetoric of commemoration had an undertone of forcefully encouraging survivors to forgive so that they could present a representation of harmonious reconciliation to the outside world. One participant stated:

> The government wants me to forgive, forgive, forgive, but has anyone asked me for my forgiveness for killing my father? No. No one has told me where he is buried and even if they did, would that bring him back? No. They want the U.S. and others to see Rwanda as a model of reconciliation and we should be but we don't have to forgive to be that model.

In addition to feeling pressure to forgive, scholars have found that some Rwandan survivors don't feel included in all memorials, especially those

who have had family members killed by the RPF (Longman & Rutagengwa 2004; Straus & Waldorf 2011).

Contrastingly, in Uganda, participants indicated that the government does not seem interested in contributing to memorialization efforts in the North. This sentiment is echoed by the fact that all indictments at the International Criminal Court related to the case of Northern Uganda deal with members of the LRA, not government forces. There has been criticism of the fact that efforts are being taken to hold the LRA accountable for its actions, but that there is a lack of acknowledgement of the crimes committed by other actors, such as government forces (Schabas 2010). Such a lack of responsibility or acknowledgement inhibits the processes of memorialization and reconciliation. One participant from the Karamoja region indicated that the people of Karamoja feel that they are not even a part of Uganda, and that the government only acts when it is in its best interest. One such example is that there is currently no direct paved road from Gulu, the main city in the North, to Kitgum or other surrounding more rural areas. This indicates the need for a localized approach to transitional justice and memorialization, as relying on national or government-sponsored initiatives will not guarantee that marginalized narratives are heard. Anthropologist and transitional justice scholar Alexander Hinton, in his work on global mechanisms and local realities after mass violence, found that:

> Transitional justice initiatives are almost always entangled in fields of politics and power, ranging from the authority of the United Nations and the international community to dynamics on the local level. Structurally, these initiatives are established in a manner that foregrounds certain groups and narratives. The quest to establish the "truth," for example, is often circumscribed by political considerations that influence who is heard, what sorts of information may be considered, how that information is used in a final report or verdict, and so forth. (Hinton 2010: 14)

Hinton goes on to highlight the point that justice is enmeshed with locality and that transitional justice and memorial initiatives are often messy and fail to attend to critical on-the-ground realities such as social structure, local knowledge, complex histories and underlying assumptions of whose truths are asserted or denied, whose voices are heard or silenced (2010: 17).

Kieran McEvoy and Lorna McGregor emphasize the fact that oftentimes, national justice systems are too ineffective,

corrupt, dysfunctional or otherwise incapable of responding to the needs of transition, and in these settings, frequently victims and survivor groups, community and civil society organizations, human rights NGOs, church bodies and other grassroots-based groups have been the engines of change (2008: 3). They argue that many civil society and non-state actors are skeptical about the capacity of formal institutions of transitional justice to deliver to their communities. These ideas are echoed in the field of subaltern studies. McGregor highlights the tendency of transitional justice models resulting from national policy decisions to exclude or distort the experience of traditionally disenfranchised groups:

> By strategically or inadvertently controlling the narrative of conflict, national policy decisions often attempt to portray the state as a neutral 'third-party' in an 'inter-ethnic', 'religious' or 'political' conflict. They focus narrowly on civil and political rights violations to the exclusion of social and economic rights and the structural impact of conflict. Furthermore, they overlook or simplify the gender implications of conflict. (2008: 48)

By states adopting national policies that seek to close the books on human rights violations associated with violent conflict, governments oftentimes fail to deal with the past in a significant way and marginalize victims and other key stakeholders' rights, needs and interests.

Rosalind Shaw and Lars Waldorf (2010) emphasize the complexity of the debate over international, national and local responses to transitional justice:

> Although policymakers and scholars now routinely recognize the importance of adapting mechanisms of transitional justice to local circumstances, such adaptation tends to be conceptualized in ways that do not modify the foundational assumptions of transitional justice. Often, for example, local human rights NGOs are assumed to represent 'the local voice,' while interactions with ordinary civilians tend to be limited to top-down 'outreach' or 'sensitization' processes such as workshops and information sessions. (4)

It is therefore critical for transitional justice processes to recognize the rights of traditionally marginalized groups and to emphasize participation and local ownership of the process, giving a voice to survivors' priorities for post-conflict reconstruction, in addition to dominant national, government-sponsored narratives and processes.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper contributes to both the literature on memory and transitional justice by illuminating the ways in which memory functions in two post-conflict zones in the Great Lakes region of East Africa. Memory can serve as a resource for building a more peaceful future and engage community members in civic activities, oral testimonies and discussions about the past that can lead to coexistence and shed light on the challenges of memory work. These challenges are both theoretical and logistical. Participants in this study felt that it was vital for memory work to include gendered narratives of human rights violations even if first person testimonies are not available.

Several lessons can be drawn from the cross-cultural comparative analysis of memorialization efforts in Rwanda and Uganda. The role of memory as a process of documentation and community engagement was central to those interviewed, especially the way in which memorials and memorialization efforts can include the oral transmission of memory through storytelling, song, performance and testimony. The creation of spaces and rituals of memorialization was highly important in fostering reconciliation between groups through the existence of physical spaces and locations to preserve and transmit memory, with these sites of memory and documentation serving as a historical record and educational tool for future generations. Creating spaces and rituals of memorialization allowed for the preservation and transmission of memory through a physical place, often where violence occurred, in order for victims to reclaim the space and memory of the atrocities that took place. The inclusion of photos, war murals, body maps, timelines of events, memory walks and walking maps in the process of documenting memories was also important in promoting memorialization efforts both at a local and national level. Another function of memorials in post-conflict communities was to show communities what can happen when inequality and violence escalates. Days of commemoration and ceremonies were shown to keep memory alive by helping to acknowledge and identify specific numbers killed, by whom, and where in order to give a voice to their stories and experiences, as well as public acknowledgement of their suffering. The preservation of traditional cultural items, such as objects and artifacts, in order to transmit memory between generations also contributed to the creation of practices and rituals of memorialization.

The point that memorialization is highly politicized and contested was emphasized by the challenge of how to best promote the inclusion of marginalized stories that may be contested, highly political or shameful. Participants described a lack of healing and reconciliation when parties refuse to acknowledge accounts and memories, as lack of acknowledgment of past crimes impedes the process of recovery and addressing the past in order to move forward. Divergent narratives regarding past atrocities contributed to the problems in constructing public memorials in both contexts. Without a common historical memory, memorialization efforts continue to be contested. Sexual and gender-based violence created additional challenges for public testimony and memorialization, with physical memorials and guided tours as the most utilized forms of remembering.

Also highlighted was the need for funding, managing donor interests and building capacity to address logistical challenges such as exhumations of mass graves, including the costs of exhumation services, lack of expertise within local populations on how to carry out these exhumations, and the problem of outside experts in exhumations who are unfamiliar with the local culture.

The cases of Rwanda and Uganda demonstrate the complexity and diversity of memorials supported by local and national projects. This highlights not only the diversity of memory projects themselves but also the varied needs and rights of the participants that interact within these spaces. The regional approach adopted here emphasizes that there is no one-size-fits-all model for memory projects. Still, there are lessons to be learned from these memorialization efforts about gendered violence, the process of documentation, and the pros and cons of various types of memorialization efforts that can aid in the development of memorials as a form of transitional justice.

Violence within the Great Lakes region has yet to cease, and the possibility exists for future memory projects in Burundi, the DRC and Kenya.[15] This study evaluates regional benefits and challenges of memorialization efforts for future implementation and research. This project also points to the need for future research to understand how regions memorialize gendered violence, including repatriated refugee memory projects and the ways in which grassroots and national efforts may work together. After mass violence in cases such as Rwanda and Uganda, communities cannot bring back the lives, dreams and hopes that were lost during the chaos of war and mass violence; however, participants have indicated that memory projects can help to ease the suffering of survivors and aid in the prevention of future violence. Understanding how memorialization efforts can exist within communities and national narratives as a mechanism of transition from mass violence to peace is vital to reconciliation efforts both in the Great Lakes and throughout the world.

References

Agreement on Accountability and Reconciliation Between the Government of the Republic of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army/Movement, Juba Sudan. June 2007: 3.1.

Aguilar, P. 1997. "Collective Memory of the Spanish Civil War: The Case of the Political Amnesty in the Spanish Transition to Democracy'. *Democratization*, 4(4): 88-109.

Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections On The Origins And Spread Of Nationalism*. New York, NY: Verso Publishing.

Barsalou, J. and V. Baxter. January 2007. 'The Urge To Remember: The Role Of Memorials In Social Reconstruction And Transitional Justice,' *USIP Stabilization And Reconstruction Series*, 5.

Bassiouni, M. C. (ed.) 2002. *Post-Conflict Justice*. Ardsley, NY: Hotei Publishing.

Baumel-Schwartz, Judith Tydor.1998. *Double Jeopardy: Gender and the Holocaust*. Portland, OR: Vallentine Mitchell.

Bell, C. 2009. 'Transitional Justice, Interdisciplinarity and the State of the 'Field' or 'Non-Field''. International Journal of Transitional Justice, 3 (1): 27.

Bell, D. 2006. *Memory, Trauma And World Politics*. Palgrave Macmillan Press: New York, NY.

Booth, W. J. 2006. *Communities Of Memory: On Witness, Identity And Justice*. Ithaca: Cornell University Publishing.

Caruth, C. (ed). 1995. *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Caruth, C. 1996. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative and History*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cobban, H. 2007. *Amnesty After Atrocity? Healing Nations After Genocide And War Crimes*. London: Paradigm Publishers.

Connerton, P. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Crawford, A. 2010. "If 'The Body Keeps The Score': Mapping the Dissociated Body in Trauma Narrative, Intervention, and Theory." *University Of Toronto Quarterly* 79:702-719.

De Brito, A., C. Gonzaléz-Enríquez and P. Aguilar (eds.) 2001. *The Politics Of Memory: Transitional Justice In Democratizing Societies*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Eyerman, R. 2004 "The Past In The Present: Culture And The Transmission Of Memory." *Acta Sociologica* 47:159-169.

Friedländer, S. 1979. *When Memory Comes*. New York: Farrar Straus Giroux.

Gobodo-Madikizela, P. and C. Van Der Merwe. 2009. *Memory, Narrative and Forgiveness: Perspectives on the Unfinished Journeys of the Past.* UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Hamber, B. and R.A. Wilson. 2002 "Symbolic Closure Through Memory, Reparation And Revenge In Post-Conflict Societies." *Journal of Human Rights* 1:35-53.

Hinton, A. (ed.) 2010. *Transitional Justice: Global Mechanisms And Local Realities After Genocide And Mass Violence*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Huyssen, A. 2003. Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Jacobs, J. L. 2010. *Memorializing the Holocaust: Gender, genocide, and collective memory*. London; New York: I.B. Tauris.

Johnstone B. 1990. *Stories, Community, and Place*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Justice and Reconciliation Project (JRP) 23 February 2012. "Victims From Northern Uganda Attend Barlonyo Prayers In Solidarity." Available at

http://Justiceandreconciliation.Com/2012/02/Victims-From-Northern-Uganda-Attend-Barlonyo-Prayers-In-Solidarity/ (retrieved 15 July 2012).
Lentin, R. 2009. "Memories For The Future." *International Sociology* 24:173-184.
Longman, T. and T. Rutagengwa. 2004. "Memory, Identity And Community In Rwanda." In E. Stover and H. Weinstein (eds.) *My Neighbor, My Enemy: Justice And Community In The Aftermath Of Mass Atrocity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Mamdani, M. 2001. *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism And The Genocide In Rwanda.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
McAdam, Doug. 1992. "Gender as a Mediator of the Activist Experience: The Case of Freedom Summer." *The American Journal of Sociology 97*:1211-1240.
McEvoy, K. and L. McGregor (eds.) 2008. *Transitional Justice From Below: Grassroots Activism And The Struggle For Change*. Oxford: Hart Publishing.
Mullins, C. W. 2009. ""He Would Kill Me With His Penis": Genocidal Rape In Rwanda As A State Crime." *Critical Criminology* 17:15-33.
Mullins, C. W. and D. Rothe. 2008. *Blood, Power, And Bedlam: Violations Of International Criminal Law In Post-Colonial Africa*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
Nesiah, V. 2006. "Truth Commissions and Gender: Principles, Policies And Procedures." *International Center For Transitional Justice*. Available at http://www.ictj.org (retrieved 15 July 2012).
Polletta, F. 1998. "Legacies and Liabilities of an Insurgent Past: Remembering Martin Luther King, Jr., on the House And Senate Floor." *Social Science History* 22:479-512.
Ochs E, Taylor C. 1995. The 'Father Knows Best' dynamic in dinnertime narrratives. In *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*, ed. K Hall, M Bucholtz. London: Routledge: pp. 97–120.
Olick, Jeffrey K. & Robbins, Joyce.1998. "Social Memory Studies: From Collective Memory to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices." *Annual Review of Sociology 24*: 105-140.
Quinn, J. (ed.) 2009. Reconciliation(s): Transitional Justice in Postconflict Societies. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
Riaño-Alcalá, P. and E. Baines. 2011. "The Archive in the Witness: Documentation in Settings of Chronic Insecurity." *International Journal For Transitional Justice*, 5:412-433.
Ringelheim, J. 1998. "The spilt between gender and the Holocaust" in D. Ofer and L. Weitzman, eds, *Women and the Holocaust*. New Haven: Yale University Press
Rosoux, V. 2004 "Human Rights and the 'Work Of Memory' In International Relations." *Journal Of Human Rights* 3:159-170.
Ross, A. and C. Lekha Sriram. 2012. "Closing Impunity Gaps: Regional transitional justice processes?" *Transitional Justice Review* 1:3-30.
Schabas, W. (2010) "Victor's Justice: Selecting "Situations" At The International Criminal Court." *John Marshall Law Review* 43:535-552.
Schmidt, W. E. 11 April 1994. "Deaths In Rwanda Said To Be 20,000 Or More." *The New York Times*.
Schwartz, B. 1991. "Social Change And Collective Memory: The Democratization Of George Washington." *American Sociological Review* 56:221-236.
--------- 1982. "The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study in Collective Memory." *Social Forces 61*:374-402.
Shaw, R. and L. Waldorf (eds.) 2010. *Localizing Transitional Justice: Interventions And Priorities After Mass Violence*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Straus, Scott And Waldorf. Lars. (2011) *Remaking Rwanda: State Building And Human Rights After Mass Violence*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
Theidon, K. 2007. "Gender in Transition: Common Sense, Women, and War." *Journal of Human Rights* 6:453-478.

United Nations document S/2004/616. 23 August 2004. "The Rule of Law and Transitional Justice in Conflict and Post-Conflict Societies: Report of the Secretary-General."
UNSC Res. S/2012/365. 25 May 25, 2012. "Report of the Secretary-General on the Situation of Children and Armed Conflict Affected by the Lord's Resistance Army."
Urdillo, U. 2011-2012. "Impunity For Enforced Disappearances In Contemporary Spain: The Spanish Search For Truth." *Interdisciplinary Journal Of Human Rights Law* 6:41-60.
Villa-Vicencio, C. 2009. *Walk with Us and Listen: Political Reconciliation in Africa*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
Valji, N. 2007. "Gender Justice And Reconciliation," *Dialogue On Globalization*. Berlin: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (Fes).
Vinitzky-Seroussi, V. 2002. "Commemorating A Difficult Past: Yitzhak Rabin's Memorial." *American Sociological Review* 67:30-51.
Wagner-Pacifici, R. and B. Schwartz. 1991. "The Vietnam Veterans Memorial: Commemorating A Difficult Past." *American Journal Of Sociology* 97:376-420.
Young, J. E. 1993. *The Texture Of Memory: Holocaust Memorials And Meaning*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Zerubavel, E. 2003. *Time Maps: Collective Memory And The Social Shape Of The Past*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
----------. (1996). "Social Memories: Steps to a Sociology of the Past." *Qualitative Sociology 19*:283-299.

Endnotes

[1] The term traditional justice primarily refers to indigenous practices of dispute settlement and reconciliation, or informal systems of justice. Traditional justice has been acknowledged as being a central element to the process of transitional justice. "[D]ue regard must be given to indigenous and informal traditions for administering justice or settling disputes, to help them to continue their often vital role and to do so in conformity with both international standards and local tradition" (United Nations 2004: 12). Additionally, "Traditional justice mechanisms, such as *Culo Kwor, Mato Oput, Kayo Cuk, Ailuc* and *Tonu ci Koka* and others as practiced in the communities affected by the conflict [in Northern Uganda], shall be promoted, with necessary modifications, as a central part of the framework for accountability and reconciliation." (LRA Agreement 2007: 3.1)

[2] Creating collective memories, often through truth commissions or truth telling processes can have healing possibilities however as some scholars have noted, imaging the nation as a collective with psychological trauma (and have needs) can subordinate diverse individual needs of its citizens (Hamber & Wilson 2002)

[3] The UN Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women refers to gendered violence as "any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering…including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life." According to Health and Human Rights Info, gender-based violence has become an umbrella term for any harm that is perpetrated against a person's will, and that results from power inequalities that are based on gender roles. (See http://www.hhri.org/thematic/gender_based_violence.html)

[4] In addition to other legal and policy implementations such as banning the discussion or requirement of ethnicity, re-education courses for students and perpetrators, and reconciliation committee and departments within parliament.

[5] This is beginning to change as Rwandans engaged in marriage celebrations this past year (2012) after the first initial week of mourning.

[6] Most characterize the conflict as spanning the period from 1986-2006 due to the ceasefire agreement in 2006 between the Lord's Resistance Army and the Government of Uganda; however, the LRA has continued to conscript child soldiers and attack villages throughout the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Central African Republic and South Sudan and continues to pose a threat to regional security in East Africa. In October 2011, Barack Obama sent 100 U.S. troops to aid anti-LRA forces in the capture of leader Joseph Kony. In March 2012, the African Union also announced plans to deploy 5,000 troops from Uganda, South Sudan, the Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of the Congo to join in the hunt for Kony.

[7] The first trial of the Ugandan High Court's International Crimes Division established to hear cases dealing with war crimes relating to the conflict concluded in 2012 against former LRA combatant Thomas Kwoyelo. The Court found that Kwoyelo was in fact entitled to amnesty under the 2000 Act. Critics argue that this ruling should be overturned, as amnesty should not apply to international crimes.

[8] For more on the cross-border implications of the LRA conflict, *see* UNSC Res. S/2012/365, "Report of the Secretary-General on the situation of children and armed conflict affected by the Lord's Resistance Army," May 25, 2012.

[9] The first site is a memorial in a secular building located on the outskirts of the capital city, with an active reconciliation program and significant social services offered to survivors. This site only recently properly buried those who were found in mass graves in 1994, with a burial ceremony being held on the morning April 11, 2012. The second memorial is located in a former church where 10,000 women and children were massacred in 1994. This site is located in a rural area, surrounded by a community of survivors from the area. This third memorial is well funded and polished; it has an extensive museum and draws much attention from the international community and is located in the center of the capital city of Kigali. All memorials were built on sites of former mass graves or killings.

[10] Healing here refers to the restorative process of redressing trauma in order to foster reparation.

[11] Body mapping was originally developed for working with people with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa. According to Allison Crawford, "the therapeutic goal was to get individuals with HIV/AIDS to connect with their physical and emotional symptoms of HIV/AIDS as a vehicle for education, self-expression, and sharing" (709).

[12] *See* the Justice and Reconciliation Project, "Victims from northern Uganda attend Barlonyo prayers in solidarity," Feb. 23, 2012 at http://justiceandreconciliation.com/2012/02/victims-from-northern-uganda-attend-barlonyo-prayers-in-solidarity/.

[13] Similarly, it is also possible for women to be both perpetrators and victims of violence. This is seen with women who are abducted and forced to serve as combatants or to aid in the rebel movements in other ways, such as domestic servants. The fact that the line between perpetrator and victim is blurred should not take away from the need for a gender-sensitive approach to memorialization.

[14] National Commission to Fight Against Genocide: http://www.cnlg.gov.rw/

[15] Currently, there are discussions and processes of transitional justice already taking place in all three countries, including truth commissions and trials at the local and international levels.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation (grant #1202694), the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, and the Brandeis Research Circle on Democracy and Cultural Pluralism.

Carla De Ycaza (MA Human Rights Studies, Columbia University; BA Political Science and Classics, Vassar College) is a PhD candidate in International Human Rights Law at the Irish Centre for Human Rights, focusing on post-conflict transitional justice in Africa. She is a lecturer at the Center for Global Affairs at New York University and serves as Editor in Chief of the *Interdisciplinary Journal of Human Rights Law*. She also serves as editor of the Dialogues on Historical Justice and Memory Research Network at the Institute for the Study of Human Rights at Columbia University. She has worked with civil society organizations in Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi and the Democratic Republic of the Congo and has published in the *Human Rights Review*, the *International Studies Review*, the *African Journal of Conflict Resolution*, and the *New York International Law Review*.

Nicole Fox received her BA in Women's Studies and African and African American Studies at University of California at Davis with honors. She received her master's in Global Gender Studies at State University of New York at Buffalo. She is currently a PhD candidate at Brandeis University writing her dissertation on memorials in post-genocide Rwanda. Her dissertation titled, "Moving Beyond Violence: The Role of Memory and Nationalism in Post-Genocide Rwanda," was awarded a National Science Foundation Dissertation grant, a grant from the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion and a Andrew W. Mellon Dissertation Year fellowship. She has published in *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *Sociology of Health and Illness*, and the *International Journal of Sociology of the Family*.