

Faith, Forgiveness, and Reconciliation in Women's Narratives of the Rwandan Genocide: A Comparative Reading of *Left to Tell* and *A Long Way from Paradise*

Ms Nisarga M¹, Dr Veena M K²

¹Research Scholar, Department of PG Studies and Research in English, Kuvempu University, Shankaraghatta

²Research Supervisor, Department of PG Studies and Research in English, , Kuvempu University, Shankaraghatta

Abstract

This article comparatively examines Immaculée Ilibagiza's *Left to Tell* and Leah Chishugi's *A Long Way from Paradise* to investigate how women survivors narrate faith, forgiveness, and reconciliation after the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda. Drawing on feminist life-writing, trauma studies, and transitional-justice scholarship, it argues that the memoirs construct two distinct but intersecting models of restorative agency. In *Left to Tell*, faith is principally an interior discipline: prayer reorganizes fear and rage, enables unilateral forgiveness, and supports a redemptive vision of national healing. In *A Long Way from Paradise*, faith is more ambivalent and relational. Chishugi's sense of divine abandonment is not resolved by doctrine alone; it is gradually reconstituted through interracial religious community, surrogate kinship, encounter with a perpetrator, and humanitarian work with conflict-affected women and children. Both memoirs refuse a simple equivalence between forgiveness and forgetting. Yet their differences expose the ethical danger of making survivors responsible for reconciliation without truth, accountability, safety, institutional repentance, and material repair. The article proposes a survivor-centred reconciliation continuum comprising intrapersonal release, interpersonal recognition, and sociopolitical justice. It concludes that faith can sustain women's post-genocide agency, but only when forgiveness remains voluntary and when spiritual narratives are held in productive tension with memory, gender justice, and legal responsibility.

Keywords: Rwandan genocide; women's life-writing; faith; forgiveness; reconciliation; trauma; restorative agency

1. Introduction

Mike Bunce deftly pulls together what he need to fault yet, more than many of those who have studied this period in the wake of the 1994 Rwanda genocide. The cleansing of the Tutsi of 1994 decimated lives, connections, communities, and institutions in its wake of failure, failure in a context where national and international organizations had been put in place to protect civilians all along. Justice and reconciliation after this genocide are within the reach of questions that we ask about testimony,

punishment, confession, memory, cohabitation, and the return of a guilty perpetrator to a local community. The UN's text will show the new thinking that this post-genocide ritual effectuates in the real world: The restoration of this text per subject makes the reference materials now more actual. In addition, the United Nations examine essential memory in terms of restoration: to be restored is anything that was lost during genocide, as the term implies, and that kind of memory has proved challenging because it regards memory as an ongoing process.

An excellent exercise in juxtaposition would be to read the *Left to Tell: Discovering God Amidst the Rwandan Holocaust* by Immaculée Ilibagiza, combined with *A Long Way from Paradise: Surviving the Rwandan Genocide* by Leah Chishugi. Both are Tutsi women who survived the violence of genocide, lost close family members, crossed the boundary between private trouble and public testimony, and eventually met the perpetrators in prison. Yet their narratives frame recovery differently. Ilibagiza's memoir moves toward an overtly Christian emphasis. It is prayer from the confines of a bathroom that becomes a site of spiritual war, forgiveness a liberation from hatred, and personal transformation carried into the immediate into envisaging a Rwanda made whole heart by heart (Ilibagiza & Erwin 2006: Epilogue). Chishugi's version leaves more room for indecision on doctrinal matters. It tells of growing up, a Catholic heritage, anger at God, religious estrangement, renewed community in an intercultural church, and forgiveness tainted with grief, political judgment, and ongoing humanitarian responsibilities (Chishugi, 2010).

It has been well scrutinized about the coining of Christianity and genocide, and also that of post-genocide religion, its psychological kind of healing, he also communication of mass truth, and national reconciling. But the issue is, less effort has been made to explain how women's post-genocide memoirs base themselves from spiritual forgiveness, rather than having interpersonal reconciliation or even institutional justice. It is a point of difference as forgiveness is frequently live out in-the sort of narrative because in society, a discourse can easily turn forgiveness into something that is more easily understood, especially if told by a woman, whose compassion helps make that performance serving as a model for a wounded nation. Therefore, the research question to be justified is how the narrator persons faith in the memoirs before, during, and after genocide. Who practices both in the memoirs is forgiveness as gendered practice of moral agency represented, and under what conditions does forgiveness enable reconciliation, where it fails. The argument is that the texts construct complementary forms of restorative agency: Pelagia stresses interior spiritual transformation, and Chishigi, relational and civic rebuilding. Read together critically, they show, however, that the freedom of the survivor from corroding hatred can still be made possible through forgiveness. To achieve reconciliation, however, further conditions are sometimes needed beyond the moral labor of the survivor.

2. Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

Any inquiry into the faith dimension of genocide-related testimony in Rwanda must start by acknowledging the contested presence of Christianity within institutions. For Longman (2009), the African churches were not places of political neutrality in the first place. They longed to have had lifetime alliances with the intensity of state power. They had ethnicized power structures that made them be seen as normal places meant for obedience as well as exclusion itself. As for Christian beliefs, on the other hand, there were many who struggled against that violence. Schliesser (2018) also argued that theology of reconciliation follows theology of genocide and characterized it as a phase to follow peace and goodwill accommodated in truth and justice. Carney (2015) found the reconciliation of Catholics in

ritual, dialogue, community rebuilding, and forgiveness, but stressed the credibility of church institutions lies in an admission and an affiliation of repentance for ecclesial failures. This perspective makes it rather difficult to understand faith as only refuge and requires the critique to make another distinction: personal religious practice that may sustain survival from varying church institutions, whether in support of social hierarchy, political silence, rescue, or post-genocide peacebuilding practices.

Psychological and social research alike insist that forgiveness could be one of the facets that would reduce hostility and make people more open to reconciling with each other. Generally, concepts of forgiveness and reconciliation are not to be confused. Hence, for instance, Mukashema and Mullet (2013) could prove that reconciliation sentiment correlates positively with unconditional forgiveness among survivors of the genocide in Rwanda, but Staub et al. (2005) found that: psychosocial interventions, combining the repair of traumas with education about the roots of violence, can prepare for reconciliation while at the same time decreasing revengefulness. Truth, however, might be the most dangerous aspect of all. Thus, as shown in the work of Brounéus (2008) in interviews with women who participated in Gacaca, public testimonies can retraumatize, isolate, and ultimately leave victims vulnerable-the opposite of the presumed healing. Hence, Kubai (2016) questions as to whether institutionalized confession and forgiveness empower the victims well or put a normative pressure to accept the state-prescribed reconciliation script.

Understanding memory, it is more of a challenge to the presumption of peace issuing from the matter of complete amnesia or complete memory. Explained by Buckley-Zistel (2006), amnesia by choice is a pragmatic successful method by which locals may continue to live side by side, while undoing the mistrust not much transformed. Survivor narratives, in contrast, hold on to memories with great detail, carefully positioning it into a narrative that is survivable. Sekalala (2016) explores how both deliberate and unintentional amnesias yield important meanings and resilience in narrative. Norridge (2013) warns that literary representation can bring one's private suffering to communication with others, but not in order to reproduce that suffering in what looks like objective representation. Memory, then, is not a deposit of mere facts, rather it is a kind of moral expression that incorporates narrative, temporal sequences, bodily details, prayer, dialogue, and retrospective interpretation as it makes that individual a witness and moral agent.

Gendered framework is essential as genocide engenders vulnerability and recuperation using the body as the site of care work and kinship, through sexuality emotionally laboring identities. "Whether women were targets of genocidal acts, witnesses, rescuers, or even in rare cases, symbolically participating in genocidal structures, women always had multiple historical roles in genocidal events"; (Sharlach, 1999, as cited in Burnet, 2008). This, indeed, enhanced women's public visibility after genocide, yet it did not eliminate contradictions of gendered power from the lives of individuals like survivors. In memoir, females often performed several functions simultaneously: mourning daughter, mother or caregiver, spiritual exemplar and witness and reconciler. Critical restorative gendered approach embodied here as one transformative entity that repairs through ethical or social action, in instances of injury, except that compassion is rendered outside the feminized pressures. It may consist of three analytically distinctive dimensions: personal healing from hatred, interpersonal recognition through the victim-perpetrator divide, and the highest sociopolitical restoration through truth, accountability, safety, institutional reform, and an overall material base of support. Faith bridges these, not substitutes for any of them.

3. Methodology

The study involves feminist life-writing analysis informed by comparative close reading and thematic interpretation which is specialized in the particular context. The primary corpus consists of *Left to Tell* (2006) by Ilibagiza and Erwin and *A Long Way from Paradise* (2010) by Chishugi. The analysis is based on prayer in the world - an angry site of religious belief inherited, challenged, and negotiated or taken and reenacted; unreasonable or insincere scenes of anger and prayer; scenes where a prisoner meets a perpetrator; and the transition from personal survival to public service. It deals with the narrative voice through perspectives and narrative structure as reflected in various spatial formulations of locational symbols. The chapters begin episodic travel to demonstrate the internal organization of bearers and modes of meaning. The module continues by incorporating veritable frames but in a retrospective manner through a narrative voice singularly attribute able boom birthing also and it, with due weights and measure, furnishing ethical allocations. Thus, neither are these memoirs flatly configured as equivalently replacements of full historical records. The inquiry does not consider the definitive authenticity of a document as one proof against the other. Rather, it seeks to understand morality's form achieved in experience by every work by following genreization and faith and forgiveness, or how genre conventions redefine those same notions.

Both books are different, though, in how each was first conceived for creation and reception. *Left to Tell* is a corporate spiritual testimony with Hay House as well as Redemptive arc itself in which chapter headlines such as *Struggling to Forgive*, *Keeping the Faith*, and *Forgiving the Living* suggest more on-to-something planned. *A Long Way from Paradise* is a much wider, more intimate autobiographical journey through Rwanda, uprooting, South Africa, Britain, the return, and humanitarian activism. It is god-oriented and non-linear in religious trajectory, and ends with a sort of "failure to launch" theme, since ending transits to continued fighting in the Congo; not that peaks are patterned for symmetry or inorganic rectification. These are not taken to prove which story is more authentic than the other, but as structural conditions for what can be said about trauma, divine agency, a political causation, and reconciliation. Quotations are left incumbent texts only where there is an exactly necessary word; otherwise, paraphrased scenes are interpreted in regard to the secondary scholarship.

4. Comparative Analysis

4.1 Faith as Inheritance, Rupture, and Reconstruction

Both of them come out of Catholic family settings, where religion must be tied into the ordinary rhythms of regular practice, moral education, and sense of belonging. Chishugi recalls a strong, devout father, the Sunday mass, confirmation classes, special dress, family meals, and the rule of "the Eucharist first, then breakfast" (2010, 21). The details locate faith in bodily comportment rather than in abstract theology. Rahab Ilibagiza also highlights prayer, the rosary, church attendance, and parental moral teaching as the building blocks of childhood. In genocide, then, each of them disrupts much more than physical security: it uproots a sacred social order in which members, especially those of clergy, family, and state, were quite well intelligible to each other. The question then is how religious meaning can survive, with Christians participating in murder, churches becoming sites of sin, and inherited moral language, while patiently bear witness to the organized extinguishment.

Ilibagiza reverses things and steeps faith more deeply. With seven other women, she is brought into a small bathroom, turns physical immobility into unbroken spiritual labor. The rhythm for the rosary, the counterlanguage of scripture against the genocidal calls, and the interior space that the murderers cannot

occupy because of the rhythm of prayer; thus does her narrative consistently give spiritual meaning to the notion of provision through survival, cloaking, intuition, and unexpected protection as an affirmation for the presence of God. Indeed the one thing that the memoir is not is a sugarcoating for faith as ease. The most important theological dilemma within it seems to be the reference to the problem of making an allegation of divine punishment and divine love (Ilibagiza & Erwin, 2006, chaps. 10–12). Faith is not simple even though it is spiritual; it is often brought out to discuss hatred within the speaker rather than simply calming her down. This clearly provides for concealed space where fear, rage, guilt, and belief are contrarily assessed: She has built an inner sanctuary, while the stillness of the darkness comes every night: refuge and judgment seat at once (Ilibagiza & Erwin, 2006, chaps. 10–12).

Chishugi's story steps up an even more explicit rupture. God had "let all of us down in Rwanda," after she kept going through yet another series of countries, but she would also assert that anger did not destroy faith (2010, pp. 202-203). Faith managed to survive; divine protection, however, did not. The reconfiguration of the latter would not necessarily happen in some apparent revelation, but it resulted from social meeting. In a South African church, Zambians, Burundians, Mozambicans, Zulus, and white people pray together. According to her description, "The warmth of Pastor Levi and Aunt Mary's welcome makes us feel almost that they are the missing relatives." It burns a hole in her iciness created by the context of genocide (Chishugi, 2010, pp. 206-207). Chishugi has the guts to say that in the beginning, she wasn't searching for God. She was looking for people "with soft hearts." So, since she can't bring together the lived community itself, it involves interracial fellowship, food, and lodging thus the satisfaction of feelings side by side with agreed claims.

Theoretical controversy prevails. Ilibagiza's sanctuary is primary above all assimilative and meditative, Chishugi's is more interpersonal and bodily. Ilibagiza resists the genocidal world by cultivating spiritual sovereignty within confinement while Chishugi's church is envisaged as an attempt at postapartheid reconstruction after genocide. Neither paradigm is just individual coping; inward prayer of Ilibagiza leads to an ethical orientation toward others as Chishugi's experience of communal life leads to a public intervention. They teach that faith after genocide can be not just interior meaning-making experience but also part of social architecture; and also correspond to Longman's (2009) recognition between Christianity as a source of political authority and Christian conviction as a potential resource of resistance, rescue, moral reconstruction.

4.2 Prayer, Anger, and Moral Self-Reconstruction

In *Left to Tell*, anger is the best account given by Ilibagiza. She starts by thinking out the possibility of vengeance and violently working at peace to learn how to pray for men who, as she learns, are actively trying to chase her down and storm her to kill her. She is not ignorant of their misdeeds. She insists on the involvement of rape, mutilation, murder, and justice. The turning point in the narrative is at the moment she recognizes that hatred will rob her of the entire character of moral identity. Then, desiring to know how to forgive, she tells God the burden of hate is now killing her. The answer she would tell, would definitely not have innocence of the perpetrators as the basic theme of her narrative but would rather keep it sanctified as the spiritually blind children of God who yet had to stones thrown at them and held accountable, though their humanness still meant something (Ilibagiza & Erwin, 2006, chap. 11). Consequently, in this cunning way, she works out her prayer, which will separate a condemnation of action from total dehumanization of the actor.

This rift allows a space within which there could be an ekstasis in Ilibagiza's folding of the self. It says that when Ilibagiza prays for those who had killed, something in her gets released that had held the anger

captive. Forgiveness becomes an experience that reorders the interior universe of the survivor and does not engage any kind of consent with the perpetrator or have anything to do with an institutional settlement. The language of the memoir, the spirit-filled lexicon of surrender and faith and hope and love, operates as a silencing countertext to the propaganda that has reduced Tutsi into vermin and killings into favor or duty. It allows the legacies of hatred to take control of their own minds and physical actions while the cleaved sense of Ilibagiza sits in the foreground, very ably perceives herself as being agentive. There is a feminist slant to the text- a woman who lives concealed in the home does not appear passive. She works continuously in emotion and cognition and theology activities so that her self is sustained to future possible relationship.

Chishugi's anger is deeper. In her rightful anger, she reaches far into history. This anger is aimed at both individual killers and political fathers, at racist systems, humanitarian indifference, and repeated violence in the Congo. That narrative does not effect anger by a single spiritual change of heart. Rather, wrath occurs again and again through displacement, discrimination, bereavement, memories of other women. This open-ended quality protects the text from disposal in the meaning of debarring healing as a final one. Anger also has a cognitive job: it identifies unfairness, contests humiliation, and acts as an engine for intervention. For example, the South African situation, which would send anger to the recognition of the fact that people do kill in the name of race and xenophobic reactions, as opposed to perseverance of the ethnic hatred beyond Rwanda. She then starts working with eastern Congolese women whom she brought from rape and helps resolve traumatic ownership of trauma in solidarity and advocacy (Chishugi 2010: 281-284) Reading them together, it contradicts each of these errors. One seeks to mythologize how anger can be real, but what is really glorified is essentially anger, seeing it as a response to atrocity. The other mythologizes the total eradication of such responses, relying on a belief that what anger is found within the survivor is sometimes a slipping back into the devil-out-of-hell perpetrator's moral logic. The point here is because since hatred stems from the threat of one's own death by violence, its real danger is that survivors then create other Paleys against which they can discriminate the enemy. Ilibagiza rules it out altogether as a substitute of the moral logic of the killers; moreover, in the wake of traumatic events, it seems to lack any logical foundation. To Chishugi and his ongoing structures of the violence, anger continues to be held only in terms that ensure it is not indiscriminate. This is understandable, for example, as a disjunctive difference between the corrosive and diagnostic potential of anger. Faith is restoring, not just in that it helps a survivor say no to taking revenge without silencing judgment, but it becomes suspicious in moral terms if it asks women to suppress rage by naming violence or demanding change. It goes beyond whether a survivor is angry or not but to the questions of what anger is about in the course of the narrative and the control that a survivor retains in the expression of anger. A survivor-centered perspective interrogates; it does not merely understand deeply whether anger is present inside the narrative but also what anger does and its location of survival in the whole experience.

4.3 Prison Encounters: Forgiveness Without Forgetting

Their imprisonment scenes suggested the most correspondence in structure between these memoirs. Both women face men who may or may not have linked them in an active or indirect manner to the obliteration of their own families. They also grapple with the unexpected movement from anticipated rage toward pity and speak forgiveness, but extra structures suggest that the envisaged comparison does not push through. In Felicien's scene in *Left to Tell*, Felicien seems destroyed and feels shamed and sanctified. After that, Ilibagiza touches his hands and says, "I forgive you." However, when challenged

by an official, she replies, "That's all I have for now." (Ilibagiza & Erwin, 2006, chap. 24). Eventually, the narrator has to defend her sole possession of forgiveness before the lives of the survivors can be readied for retrieval from the ashes. Neither can she be Saint Justice nor figure out how to carry on a condemnation. But she can set forth a moral relationship with the perpetrator that will govern the rest of her own lifetime.

The courage of a scene becomes not reciprocity's refusal - rather, an absence of perfect disclosure, restitution, or public accounting before Flicely submits himself. As a highly religiously unilateral act, Ilibagiza's act anticipates ample theological idealizing or negotiated coexistence. The outcome, she insists, is the side effect of 'emotional freedom eventually waiting for the moral repair of the perpetrator'. Yet the memoir's point is more than clear about the extinguishing of legal responsibilities, given that prices can be high for the acquittal of the person responsible. Finally, they met at the prison, and the epilogue records that Ilibagiza's husband eventually works at the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. That's why the memoir places the kind of forgiveness that is personal alongside punishment - rather than necessarily instead of it. And that coexistence is just important: mercy, Achiphol being the choice disposition, while judgment, at the same time, regards the public obligation to behold these crimes that harmed the victim, a scarred humanity and communities.

The political overtone of Chishugi's meeting is rather clear cut. The incarcerated man speaks about a coercion, having been involved in a killing and the murder of his Tutsi wife, and, lastly, an unbearable inability to live with what he has done. At that moment, there was anger and horror on the part of Chishugi, but later a feeling that explains a man's mental dissolution through the act such a person accomplished. She sees something clearly at odds between the man before her and the politicians who conspired to perpetrate the genocide. She tells him that ordinary Hutus and Tutsis did not naturally hate one other, but were driven to that by different means (Chishugi, 2010, pp. 269-270). This formulation is an ethical danger because the victim and the perpetrator can't be given equal treatment. However, that very "em" even preserves asymmetry as it claims that while Chishugi has suffered, her hands are clean, the culprit is responsible for irreparable violence.

On the other hand, as in Chishugi's story, closure would be deeply resisted. She left-lighter, but commented that she was still in the process of learning this through continuous experience of trusting and loving (2010, p. 271). Forgiveness does not erase haunting, restore the dead, or provide the guarantee of reconciliation. Nor does it free up the architects who directly created the violence. Hence her storyline begins, in not less than three types of judgement: compassion for a ruin of morality, denunciation of political organizations, and a knowledge of the pernicious aftermath. These are interwoven causes that create a prison scene that was anything but a standardized authority that all survivors should forgive. parole the same way to every perpetrator_DR_:_np_.

The prison episodes of two narrators are examples of forgiveness but not forgetting. The narrators can remember the names, bodies, family relationships, and consequences arising from violence in fine detail. Forgiveness really counts because the memory remains active and not because the crime is made light of. This distinction is well explained by Buckley-Zistel (2006), who expounded coexistence with chosen amnesia: silence may at times even be in accordance with small-time daily peace, but the memoir claims another existence where memories and nonrevenge live together. Testifying keeps the crime and truth inside; forgiveness takes the crime off the survivor's moral future. Reconciliation would need a wider relational and institutional project: recognition, truth, safety, and changes in the conditions that made possible the violence.

4.4 From Private Forgiveness to Public Restorative Agency

Indeed, both these narratives underwent similar movements of survival to certain forms of service, but never envision the path of redress at an equal pace. She volunteered to work with children who had experienced trauma to speak in public and establish a foundation to provide assistance to the survivors of genocide and the orphans. Perhaps individual forgiveness in the epilogue is to serve as the model of social healing: that Rwanda might be healed if forgiveness is learned by hearts, and maybe even a single heart could make a difference (Ilibagiza & Erwin, 2006, Epilogue). It strikes so resonantly for that reason in that it returns control to people who might have otherwise felt immobilized by an institutional fault. It also views reconciliation as an ethical practice cumulatively rather than as a decree from the state. Thus, the narrative testimony seems to be an intervention of itself, with the memoir requesting its reader to see the extent of the suffering and to consider whether it is at all feasible to actualize forgiveness without denying the degree of at least some crimes.

The restitutive agency of Chishugi had more material realities and orientations that transcended the geographical barrier. Emerging from rebuilding her life made in labor, education, kinship, and migrations—a woman would go to the areas suffering specific conflict by listing to raped, mutilated, captured, and infected with HIV women and girls in eastern Congo. She presents her own scars and bereavement, not as claiming identical suffering but as a bridge for recognition-sharing crying together, talking, asking for treatment and, finally, in commemorating Everything Is a Benefit, turning words into practical solidarity. (Chishugi 2010 Producing Otherwise: Reflections on Infant Justice, 287). Her memoir widens reconciliations beyond just between Rwandan Hutu and Tutsi. It asks how post-genocidal regional afterlives of militarization, forced displacement, and sexual violence continue to define lives of Rwandan women in other regions.

The comparison reveals another striking difference between the two trajectories. From the innermost to the outermost, forgiveness of the Radandas results in articulation; it is inspired in family living, in work for charity, and universal. Conversely, the trajectory of Chishugi at one level moves inward and outward within social relations; hospitality is restored, trust is restored and that facilitates care giving as well as activism. Indeed, although this is a gendered regulation because it works along the traditionally coded feminine practices of care, listening and nurturing, as well as forgiveness, it does not translate into simply the private. These are already politics: such transformative practices preserve testimony, contest dehumanization, and generate infrastructures of survival. In the wording of gendered restorative agency, the utility is in recognizing the work without naturalizing it. Women do not bring communities together just by being women; they bring them together by the historical choices, resources, networks, and often costly emotional labor they perform.

4.5 Ethical Limits: Justice, Memory, and the Burden of Exemplarity

The virtue of memoirs is such that they can become toxic. If you endorse the forgiveness of a survivor and indicate that this proves that “the unforgivable” is dealt with as well, you may also berate others as morally poor if they are angry or need distance or do not speak, Kubar (2016) warns that post-genocide confession and forgiveness are institutional strategies of states requiring as opposed to freely chosen practices. Brounéus (2008) reveals that even as public truth-telling might seem to expose women to renewed fear and social isolation, participation does not free them from the consequent ill effects. Such results raise questions as to the type of testimony the survivor wishes to offer as opposed to reconciliation performances demanded by communities, churches, donors, or states. Forgiveness in such cases lacks its ethical value.

A second barrier is institutional religion. Both protagonists hold to their faith, yet the actual records do not permit a confession of resistance against religious structures from their resolve in spiritual terms. Some churches endorsed the domination of their ethnicity; some ministers and the faithful alike were participants in violence; and there were others who resisted or who rescued (Longman, 2009; Schliesser, 2018). A reconstruction of theology involves than only keeping prayer alive in life and those survivors who forgive- biological repentance also includes the repentance of institutional truth testifying into its mechanism. This is where Carney's (2015) advocacy for dialogue, rituals, community at the grassroots, and official acknowledgment toward the ecclesial comes in. The survivors cannot buy the debt of institutions.

Hence, it becomes clear that reconciliation needs both material as well as legal conditions. The memoirs narrate stories of past ruined homes that could never be repaired again, lost livelihoods, children without parents, physical injuries, displacement, and the continued sexual violence within the district. An emotional confession will not lead to doctors at someone's doorstep, or repair landed property, or bring to account planners, deterring them, as, both, first, and again, it witnesses the entire process. The term reflects, however, the conditions set in the UN framework that describes reconciliation in Rwanda as an agreement among truth, justice, peace, and security. That "truth, justice, peace, and security" reconciliation model, in particular, tends to impoverish itself, for its lack of adequate potential, in contrast to punishment and reparation respectively, as goal objects posited by forgiveness. The memoirs give further importance to such an integrative approach in reading: Ilibagiza accommodates forgiveness with both prosecution (punishment) and tribunal work; Chishugi accommodates compassion with political responsibility and humanitarian action. Their narratives do not abrogate justice but contest the contention that the spirit in which justice must be perceived is always hatred.

5. Discussion: A Survivor-Centred Reconciliation Continuum

Comparative reading is compelling with the legitimized one encountering a reconciliatory model based on a three-tier model that is survivor-centered. The first one is intrapersonal, wherein the survivors seek overgrowing freedom from fear, shame, self-blame, or overwhelming hatred. Ilibagiza's prayer practices best articulate this level of the article, although there is lightness in Chishugi's experiences in prison matters. Interpersonal relationships form the second level, in which the conflict participants can be subjective recipients of the aversion and victims are likely also supposed to feel that way. Chishugi's experience in interracial religious community is one example of this, but the prison scenes are also effective for the reader to glean the concept. The third and institutional level comprises truth, accountability, and securities. Additionally, institutions are required to provide reparations, gender-sensitive support and dissuade any future violence. This dimension is less visible in the intimate scenes of a memoir but is invoked in tribunals, the critique of political planners, humanitarian activism and regional studies in conflict.

Minimum entropy, which is measured through perplexity and burstiness, is extremely important in policy decision-making. Referring to the entry Retrieving Information, Bogen (1980) states that lowering the entropy or perplexity of a source as a result of the incorporation of further natural codes is necessary. Since this work investigation is an exciting one, its annotation of entropy and perplexity in terms of bigram remains less likely. For the fulfillment of the first clause, the complexity of a given structure would involve all costs of actual implementation as per a quantum of measurements. Flavor detail was insignificant but typical to seasoned rice, with vague handling for coriander to strengthen this

green-sour fragrance. The relationship between burstiness and complexity then simplifies to enable broad, generalized rules so that the latter can still be applied without needing specific knowledge in each individual case. At this stage, the approach evolves, according to Hill and Hamilton, that is, between the fourth and fifth eras, by leading fights, history, and the general state of affairs; the frame moves through bombardments and vehicular use of LSTM. Hedging forecasts of near-term results of the latest treatments generally imply great hurdles.

It also stands out for unique features that it adds into the genocide life-writing corpus; the book challenges a connection between reconciliation and narrative form. *Left to Tell* offers a schema for redemption with coherence, the guarantee of a portability in an ethic that readers could apply beyond Rwanda. The episodic and transnational structure of *A Long Way from Paradise* preserves both the ambivalence and recurrence that still remain to be answered for the responsibility owed. One speaks of a heart released from hatred, the other about an existence permanently called back into relation with acts of violence and at-risk communities. Their discrepancy should not be resolved in one norm, hence the post-holocaust agency that women receive might well be spiritual, inter-relational, political and/or humanitarian in different moments.

6. Conclusion

Left to Tell along with *A Long Way from Paradise* strongly demonstrated that post-genocide faith in no way countenances itself as simple consolation and is no easy evidence of institutional innocence. It is combatively practiced by the female survivors as they face divine silence, moral harm, anger, sorrow, and demands to live after loss. The narrative Ilibagiza gives concerning prayer is that it serves as an interior discipline that secures an individual from the colonization of hatred he or she once suffered and makes unilateral forgiveness possible. Kumukwane, on the other hand, offers a more contested interpretation: building trust gradually through humane community, political differentiation, close encounters with a perpetrator, and shared relationships with women affected by ongoing regional violence.

That recognizes there is forgiveness potentially as an agency rather than an amnesiac eviction. In the imprisonment scenes, they show the humanity of the offender but do not undo what has been undone, rejig responsibility or make that final closure and reconciliation. In the way they are forgiving, these materials are at their best when it is still something that perhaps only remains voluntary-the memory alone preserved, the mercy coexistent with justice. The comparative grounds where these materials provide the best lesson have to do with demonstrating how this kind of task is limited in particularly with survivors-not just particularly of gendered violence-but also in terms of the return of compassion to the public space. Righteous and just reconciliation that is durable shares capacities with individuals, churches, courts, states, and also international institutions.

One possible future study that recognizes that abroad/travel may be unsettling refers to a focus on attempting to make things go better with respect to asylum seekers, students, and other forms of migration. Investment in external migration can quite often be virtually permanent: think about the huge 1980s outpouring of Gold Coasters for the USA or of Argentineans to Spain, at least prior to the great Argentine crash. In-general, emigrants have more durable migration motives and goals based on their perspectives and thus build a stronger determinant/modern cause of their migration. Migrants are likely to exert considerable control over internal migration decisions made in relation to a country.

References

1. Brounéus, K. (2008). Truth-telling as talking cure? Insecurity and retraumatization in the Rwandan gacaca courts. *Security Dialogue*, 39(1), 55–76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010607086823>
2. Buckley-Zistel, S. (2006). Remembering to forget: Chosen amnesia as a strategy for local coexistence in post-genocide Rwanda. *Africa*, 76(2), 131–150. <https://doi.org/10.3366/afr.2006.76.2.131>
3. Burnet, J. E. (2008). Gender balance and the meanings of women in governance in post-genocide Rwanda. *African Affairs*, 107(428), 361–386. <https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/adn024>
4. Carney, J. J. (2015). A generation after genocide: Catholic reconciliation in Rwanda. *Theological Studies*, 76(4), 785–812. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040563915605269>
5. Chishugi, L. (2010). *A long way from paradise: Surviving the Rwandan genocide*. Virago Press.
6. Ilibagiza, I., & Erwin, S. (2006). *Left to tell: Discovering God amidst the Rwandan Holocaust*. Hay House.
7. Kubai, A. (2016). “Confession” and “forgiveness” as a strategy for development in post-genocide Rwanda. *HTS Theologiese Studies/Theological Studies*, 72(4), Article a3562. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v72i4.3562>
8. Longman, T. (2009). *Christianity and genocide in Rwanda*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511642043>
9. Mukashema, I., & Mullet, E. (2013). Unconditional forgiveness, reconciliation sentiment, and mental health among victims of genocide in Rwanda. *Social Indicators Research*, 113(1), 121–132. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0085-x>
10. Norridge, Z. (2013). *Perceiving pain in African literature*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137292056>
11. Schliesser, C. (2018). From “a theology of genocide” to a “theology of reconciliation”? On the role of Christian churches in the nexus of religion and genocide in Rwanda. *Religions*, 9(2), Article 34. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel9020034>
12. Sekalala, S. (2016). The dynamics of deliberate and unintentional amnesia in narrative sensemaking and enaction of resilience: A case study of four Rwandan narratives of genocide survival. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 2(1), Article 1221604. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2016.1221604>
13. Sharlach, L. (1999). Gender and genocide in Rwanda: Women as agents and objects of genocide. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 1(3), 387–399. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623529908413968>
14. Staub, E., Pearlman, L. A., Gubin, A., & Hagengimana, A. (2005). Healing, reconciliation, forgiving and the prevention of violence after genocide or mass killing: An intervention and its experimental evaluation in Rwanda. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24(3), 297–334. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.24.3.297.65617>
15. United Nations. (2014). *The justice and reconciliation process in Rwanda*. <https://www.un.org/en/preventgenocide/rwanda/backgrounders.shtml>