

Journal of Sociology, Psychology & Religious Studies



Truthfulness and Rule of Law in the Society: Bosnia and Rwanda Perspectives

Sofija Nikola & Dr. Teodora Stefan

ISSN NO: 2706 - 6622

Truthfulness and Rule of Law in the Society: Bosnia and Rwanda Perspectives

¹ Sofija Nikola, University of Belgrade, Serbia

²Dr. Teodora Stefan, University of Belgrade, Serbia

How to cite this article: Nikola S. & Stefan T (2020). Truthfulness and Rule of Law in the Society: Bosnia and Rwanda Perspectives. Journal of Sociology, Psychology & Religious Studies. Vol 3(1) pp. 110-116.

Abstract

In the occurrences of devastating conflicts during a regime, having clear information on the truth on the past is regarded as a first step in the process healing and seeking justice and is acknowledged as a human right where those who fell victims and the survivors of conflict and war are entitled to. The International law states clearly that right to know about the circumstances of serious violations of victims' human rights and about who was responsible. It is progressively regular for nations rising up out of civil war or dictator rule to make a fact commission to work during the prompt post-change period. These commissions are conceded a moderately brief period for explanation taking, examinations, and research and formal conferences, before finishing their work with a last open report. This paper gives an evaluation of the past basic talk on truth and reconciliation towards the rule of law, distinguishes the issues critics have concentrated on, analyzes why the appraisals of TJ projects have been basic, and examines whether the reactions reflect fundamental conditions under which the TJ programs were led. This paper looks at the Truth and Reconciliation process in Rwanda after the genocide in 1994. In this manner, it endeavors to reveal the results of truth, reconciliation from past human rights abuses, and how they guide build up the rule of law in a public.

Keywords: *Truth, conflicts, Human Rights, Rule of Law & Society*

Introduction

In the occurrences of devastating conflicts during a regime, having clear information on the truth on the past is regarded as a first step in the process healing and seeking justice and is acknowledged as a human right where those who fell victims and the survivors of conflict and war are entitled to. The International law states clearly that right to know about the circumstances of serious violations of victims' human rights and about who was responsible. It is progressively regular for nations rising up out of civil war or dictator rule to make a fact commission to work during the prompt post-change period. These commissions are conceded a moderately brief period for explanation taking, examinations, and research and formal conferences, before finishing their work with a last open report.

In Africa, Rwanda, South Africa, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Ghana and Nigeria share post-conflict policies arrangements called transitional justice (TJ) to accomplish responsibility for conflicts, victimhood, and wrongdoing (Caparos, Giroux, Rutembesa, Habimana & Blanchette, 2018). This paper gives an evaluation of the past basic talk on truth and reconciliation towards the rule of law, distinguishes the issues critics have concentrated on, analyzes why the appraisals of TJ projects have been basic, and examines whether the reactions reflect fundamental conditions under which the TJ programs were led. This paper looks at the Truth and Reconciliation process in Rwanda after the genocide in 1994. In this manner, it endeavors to reveal the results of truth and reconciliation from past human rights misuses and how they guide build up the rule of law in a general public.

Truth Seeking and Reconciliation on Rule of Law

In the occurrences of devastating conflicts during a regime, the right to the truth has frequently been summoned to enable the public to comprehend the basic reasons for conflicts or broad infringement of human rights (Shepard, 2019). Several nations have tried to actualize this privilege by building up truth commissions or commissions of request. Seemingly, the right to the truth may likewise be actualized by different procedures, for example, open preliminaries, the exposure of state records and the best possible administration of chronicles, and by guaranteeing free access to relevant information.

The right for people to know the truth about the fate of vanished people or information about other past maltreatment has been insisted by treaty bodies, regional courts, and global and domestic tribunals. A truth commission connects with a large number of unfortunate victims trying to comprehend the degree and the patterns of past infringement, as their causes and outcomes. The inquiries of why certain occasions were permitted to happen can be as significant as clarifying decisively what occurred (Clark, 2010). in addition, it is trusted that crafted by the commission can enable a general public to comprehend and recognize a challenged or denied history, and in doing as such bring the voices and accounts of exploited people, regularly avoided public view, to the general population. A truth commission likewise would like to avert further maltreatment through explicit proposals for institutional and policy changes.

Reconciliation is seen distinctively in various contexts. For a few, the full affirmation of a denied truth will surely propel reconciliation. Nevertheless, experience demonstrates that numerous individual victims' casualties may require more than the truth so as to excuse. Reconciliation is generally an exceptionally long and moderate procedure, and crafted by a truth commission might be just a piece of what is required (Thomson, 2011). "When considering and structuring a truth commission, in this way, care should be taken not to raise undue and unfair desires among the victimized people that they, or the nation, will or should feel immediately accommodated because of knowing the truth about unspeakable past abominations or, sometimes, accepting authority affirmation of a truth that they definitely knew" (Thomson, 2011).

The Government of Rwanda set out on an ambitious and extraordinary way to deal with conveying justice, utilizing both customary household courts and network based gacaca court (Rwanda Ministry of Justice, 2012). This paper analyzes the truth and reconciliation process in Rwanda touching on the utilization of Gacaca courts towards reconciliation and foundation of the Rule of Law inside Rwandan culture after the 1994 genocide.

Rwandan Perspective

After the 1994 genocide, where about 800 000 individuals were slaughtered (United Nations, 1995). Rwanda put resources into various measures to come to reconciliation between individuals in its general public. Numerous issues, bringing about a few scenes of brutality, describe the historical backdrop of Rwanda. After the savagery died down, Rwanda's administration, similar to others rising up out of time of monstrosity or restraint, had various objectives. This were to reconstruct the nation, build up a verifiable record of the genocide, guarantee that the individuals who carried out crimes did not escape without risk of punishment, give to survivors and victims' that justice was being done, and reintegrate the tremendous quantities of culprits into their networks without inciting retributive brutality against them" (Le Mon, 2017). To accomplish this, in 2002 a modernized form of the customary Gacaca courts were introduced by the Government of Rwanda to complete the accompanying: "uncovering the truth about Genocide; accelerating Genocide preliminaries; adding to national reconciliation" (Rwanda Ministry of Justice, 2012). When taking a gander at the formation of the Gacaca courts and the targets of the Government of Rwanda, the courts were relied upon to add to truth and justice and reconciliation in Rwandan culture.

The Government of Rwanda insists the significance of reconciliation inside society: With the arrival of peace, the nation's real difficulties were to fabricate its administration structure, however this was exceedingly dependent upon the second test, national reconciliation, which was expected to reestablish national solidarity and political dependability (NURC, 2010). In the case of Rwanda, criminal justice and seeking the truth concerning the genocide appear to be the central purposes of the Gacaca courts. The Government of Rwanda reinstalled courts in light of the fact that the absence of an important lawful system after the genocide, stressing the job of the Gacaca for criminal justice (Rwandan Ministry of Justice, 2012). This arrangement of justice was likewise

ready to uncover the truth about specific occasions during the genocide, in view of the dynamic cooperation of victims and culprits of the genocide” (Rwandan Ministry of Justice, 2012).

On account of the Gacaca courts, most consideration was given to criminal indictments in light of the feeling of exemption that was available in its general public: "The general condition of exemption achieved the degree of persuading one piece of the populace that any crime could be perpetrated without risk of punishment for the sake of ethnic lion's share. It was consequently important to break this cycle of exemption by indicting the culprits of this crime” (Rwanda Ministry of Justice, 2012).

Rwanda's assurance to see justice done and its encouraging in attempting such a large number of supposed culprits in under 20 years have been great. Nevertheless, some have paid a high cost. In the late 1990s and mid-2000s, specifically, “a large number of individuals were self-assertively captured, and many were charged and attempted without strong proof against them. Some may have been wrongly indicted”. The absence of protection against abusive prosecutions in a frail legal framework increased the danger of unfair trials. In 1996, Rwanda enacted another law administering the arraignment of genocide-related crimes (Rwanda Ministry of Justice, 2012). Genocide trials started in December that year in an exceptionally charged condition. “The legitimate structure for these indictments was set up, however the everyday requests on the recently transformed justice framework were unmanageable. Various litigants were sentenced without legitimate help as protection lawyers were rare and frequently too hesitant to even consider defending genocide suspects. The international nongovernmental organization and remote lawyers, however the necessities far exceeded their ability” (Rettig, 2018).

The ending was that gacaca left a varied legacy. “Its positive accomplishments incorporated the courts' quick work in handling a colossal number of cases; the interest of neighborhood networks; and the open door for some genocide survivors to realize what had befallen their relatives” (Schabas, 2005). Gacaca may likewise have helped a few survivors discover a method for living peacefully with the culprits. At the same time, many gacaca hearings could have resulted to trials that were unfair (Magnarella, 2018). There were confinements on the capability of the accused culprits to have to possibly defend themselves; various cases of terrorizing and debasement of guard observers, judges and different gatherings; and flawed basic leadership because of deficient preparing for lay judges who were required to deal with complex cases.

Despite the fact that the laws that introduced the Gacaca courts appeared to be set up comprehensively depicting the errands and instruments of the Gacaca courts, it is flawed if these laws gave the Gacaca courts the devices to locate every bit of relevant information that needed to prompt reconciliation (Amstutz, 2016). The way that the crimes of RPF warriors during the Genocide were not permitted to be discussed during Gacaca preliminaries, is an incredible flaw of the entire procedure (Amstutz, 2016). Particularly in light of the fact that one of the destinations of the Gacaca was to 'build up the truth', the administration intentionally kept this from occurring. The job of the legislature in setting up the command of the Gacaca was enormous, and this job was likewise noticeable during different components of the Gacaca, particularly when it was

basically. Government authorities were undermining members of Gacaca before they were making their declarations, which caused not every bit of relevant information was told. Along these lines, the order of the Gacaca courts did not add to accomplishing reconciliation to a degree that was really conceivable, rather settling on a choice that caused restricted open doors for reconciliation” (Magnarella, 2018).

Bosnia Perspective

The Bosnian war dragged on for three and a half years and it has left behind a very divided country in its wake. I would say that ethnic cleansing was instrumental in driving the conflict to an acute point of no return.

A civil war or an act of aggression, a clash of religions or a tragic conflict – these are just some of the many different descriptions of the 1992-95 conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina, during which around 100,000 people lost their lives. Twenty-two years after the start of the fighting, this is still a highly-disputed issue in the country, and is often used by politicians to stir up ethnic instability. Because of this, historians suggest, a common definition of the character of the war is unlikely in Bosnia any time soon.

Representatives of Croat, Serb and Bosniak victims’ associations have entirely different views of the conflict. But they all believe the war was a defensive one, which began after they were attacked by others.

Discussion

Truth-seeking initiatives can assume an incredible job in recording and recognizing human rights infringement. Memory activities likewise add to open comprehension of past maltreatment (ICTJ, 2016). Building up truth can start a procedure of reconciliation, as forswearing and quietness can expand question and social polarization. A political request dependent on transparency and responsibility is bound to appreciate the trust and certainty of inhabitants and natives (Gonzalez & Varney, 2013). Truth-chasing and truth telling is progressively considered as a fundamental piece of harmony working after a conflict (Thomson, 2011). Mendeloff asserts that truth-educating supporters have four cases regarding the harmony advancing impacts of truth-seeking: "it guarantees justice, advances social and mental recuperating, cultivates reconciliation, and discourages future crimes, all of which help unite harmony in war-torn social communities" (Mendeloff, 2014). Besides, Mendeloff claims that "in profoundly partitioned war-torn social orders in which people are compelled to live together, truth-seeking may help dampen security fears that could start conflict in case of state weakness".

Amstutz (2016) contends that truth-telling can be utilized for individual gains, brought about by financial or political weight. Along these lines, truth-advising prompts new feelings, and diminishes the opportunity to reconciliation and dependability (Amstutz, 2016). Also, on account of truth-telling unprejudiced nature must be ensured, and information must be cross-checked. Or else the truth could merit nothing. “Uncertainty brought about by truth-telling is a wide-shared issue in transitional justice. Despite the fact that transitional justice needs to give recuperating and

reconciliation, the way toward accomplishing this shows genuine flaws” (Brounéus, 2018). Giving security to members in truth-telling processes is critical in accomplishing reconciliation.

Conclusion

While truth commissions do not replace the need for prosecutions, they do offer some type of past accounting, and have in this way been exceptionally compelling in circumstances where arraignments for monstrous crimes are inconceivable or impossible attributable to either an absence of limit of the legal framework or de facto or de jure amnesty. Responsibility of a truth commission may likewise reinforce any arraignments that do happen later on and along these lines encouraging the rule of law. Truth-telling activities can assume an amazing job in archiving and recognizing human rights infringement. Memory activities likewise add to the open comprehension of past maltreatment.

Truth can assist victims with finding closure by uncovering the subtleties of the occasions they endured, for example, the destiny of coercively disappeared friends and family or why certain individuals were focused for maltreatment. In addition, knowing the truth about past occasions empowers legitimate grieving practices, basic to most societies, accomplishing individual and shared mending. Also, successful truth looking for is all around put to fortify other transitional justice measures, for example, arraignments, reparations, and institutional change. This is on the grounds that truth-chasing measures can give significant and solid information on which to construct injured individual libraries and criminal cases, create basic aptitudes for pertinent partners, and give a significant stage to victims to voice their encounters and requests.

Victims of human rights abuses can't overlook the encounters and thus states have an obligation to safeguard the memory of such crimes. For this, structural remembrances, exhibition halls, and dedicatory exercises are irreplaceable instructive activities to build up a verifiable open record that is past forswearing and to help anticipate reiteration. In various instances, by propelling celebration exercises, common society has been the impetus for states to accept their obligations. It is particularly essential to maintain this right given abusive routines regularly intentionally revise history and deny outrages so as to legitimize themselves, fuel question, and even impel new cycles of violence. Seeking the truth for the preservation of a historical record and remembrance prevents such kind of crimes to reoccur in the societies.

Nonetheless, uncovering the truth has turned out to be deliberately imperative to huge numbers of the destinations of the worldwide criminal preliminary. Be that as it may, certain reporters have forewarned against this methodology. Suspicion about the capacity of the worldwide lawful procedure to manage enormous occasions of universal legislative issues due to the inescapable twisting that happens when political settings are liable to lawful procedure.

References

- Amstutz, M. R. (2016). Is reconciliation possible after genocide?: The case of Rwanda. *Journal of Church and State*, 48(3), 541-565.
- Brounéus, K. (2018). Truth-telling as talking cure? Insecurity and retraumatization in the Rwandan Gacaca courts. *Security Dialogue*, 39(1), 55-76.
- Buckley-Zistel, S. (2006). Dividing and uniting: The use of citizenship discourses in conflict and reconciliation in Rwanda. *Global Society*, 20(1), 101-113.
- Caparos, S., Giroux, S. V., Rutembesa, E., Habimana, E., & Blanchette, I. (2018). Twenty years later, the cognitive portrait of openness to reconciliation in Rwanda. *British Journal of Psychology*, 109(2), 362-385.
- Clark, P. (2010). *The Gacaca courts, post-genocide justice and reconciliation in Rwanda: Justice without lawyers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Grayson, H., Hitchcott, N., Blackie, L., & Joseph, S. (Eds.). (2019). *After the genocide in Rwanda: Testimonies of violence, change and reconciliation*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Le Mon, C. J. (2017). Rwanda's troubled Gacaca courts. *Human Rights Brief*, 14(2), 4.
- Magnarella, P. J. (2018). *Justice in Africa: Rwanda's Genocide, Its Courts and the UN Criminal Tribunal: Rwanda's Genocide, Its Courts and the UN Criminal Tribunal*. Routledge.
- Mendeloff, D. (2014). Truth-seeking, truth-telling, and postconflict peacebuilding: Curb the enthusiasm?. *International studies review*, 6(3), 355-380.
- Moghalu, K. (2015). *Rwanda's genocide: the politics of global justice*. Springer.
- Rettig, M. (2018). Gacaca: truth, justice, and reconciliation in postconflict Rwanda?. *African Studies Review*, 51(3), 25-50.
- Schabas, W. A. (2015). Genocide trials and Gacaca courts. *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, 3(4), 879-895.
- Shepard, M. (2019). *The Art of Reconciliation in Rwanda* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University).
- Thomson, S. (2011). The darker side of transitional justice: the power dynamics behind Rwanda's Gacaca courts. *Africa*, 81(3), 373-390.
- United Nations (1995). *Outreach Programme on the Rwanda Genocide and the United Nations*. Retrieved on 19th June 2019 from; <http://www.minijust.gov.rw/index.php?id=11>.