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The objective of this study is to examine the phenomenon of sexual violence as genocide by performing a comparative historical analysis of narratives of survivors of the Armenian and Rwandan genocides. Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following questions: 1) How and to what extent is sexual violence a part of the narratives of survivors of the Armenian genocide of 1915-1923, survivors of the Rwandan genocide of 1994, and across these two cases of genocide? 2) What was the impact of sexual violence on individuals within and across these two genocides? 3) What was the impact of sexual violence on the targeted groups within and across these two genocides? 4) How does survivor discourse of sexual violence as genocide compare to the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide? To answer these questions, this project, which is situated in the frameworks of phenomenology, narrative analysis, and feminist standpoint scholarship, used both qualitative and quantitative methods to analyze oral history interviews with survivors of both genocides.

Over half of the survivors in my sample (n=97, 54%) discussed sexual violence in their narratives of the Armenian and Rwandan genocides. In terms of types of sexual violence, rape was discussed most frequently across cases (24.5% of all discussions of sexual violence) and in Rwandan interviews (39%). Forced marriage was the most common type of sexual violence discussed in Armenian interviews (29.2%). I found that forms of sexual violence that do not necessarily require physical contact, such as forced nudity and harassment, also represent a large part (24.5%) of survivor narratives. In addition, sexual violence reached beyond those who experienced it personally, with many survivors who witnessed (49%) or heard about (21.6%) sexual violence including it in their genocide narrative.
In terms of consequences of sexual violence, Armenian survivors more often described consequences in cultural terms. Women and girls were frequently “taken” from the deportation routes and forcibly married to Turkish men. Survivors discussed how these women were assimilated into Turkish culture and how Armenianism is lost with each subsequent generation. Rwandan survivors focused more on physical and psychological consequences, which may be due, at least in part, to their closer temporal proximity to the events. Rwandan survivors of sexual violence experienced pregnancy and infection with HIV/AIDS as a result of their victimization. They also experienced an inability to be sexually intimate and spoke of being suicidal. The challenges these survivors faced trying to survive in post-genocide Rwanda were compounded by the consequences of sexual violence victimization.

I make two recommendations based on my findings. First, given that survivors more often spoke about non-physical forms of sexual violence and secondary exposures to sexual violence, I conclude that the International Criminal Court should adopt the definition of sexual violence developed by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and incorporate it into the crime of genocide. The definition from the Rwandan Tribunal is broader than the current definition of the International Criminal Court in that it does not require sexual violence to include physical contact. The current legal framework of sexual violence as genocide subsumes sexual violence under the act of “serious bodily or mental harm,” but I found that survivor narratives of sexual violence as genocide also focused on cultural and social consequences of genocide. Therefore, I also conclude that the legal definition of genocide should be revised to include the social and cultural harms that result from sexual violence in genocide.
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Criminology is a multidisciplinary field that is tied together by the study of a common subject matter: crime. It wasn’t until the 1980s, with the work of Mendelsohn and Von Hentig, that scholars branched out from studying crime and turned to studying victims. Ironically, while the birth of victimology was catalyzed by the events of the Holocaust (Mendelsohn, 1976), genocide studies, much like the field of criminology, has largely focused on crime: the act of genocide and the perpetrators (at all levels) who commit it. Although the involvement of victims in international war crimes trials in the 1990s led to an increase in work on victims of genocide (particularly women), the fact remains that the bulk of literature in this field remains focused on the offense and on the perpetrators. This emphasis is understandable given the challenges of studying genocide in general and genocide victims in particular. By the very nature of the crime, many of the victims of genocide are quite literally destroyed and do not live to provide an account of events.

Victimology acts as a conduit through which the victim’s voice can be heard, and what we lack most in the area of genocide studies are the voices of the victims. In general, by studying victims, we get closer to crime and its consequences than we otherwise would. In genocide, a crime that can seem very far away in time and in place, victims’ voices serve the same purpose – we become more familiar with a phenomenon that most of us have trouble beginning to even imagine. While intent is particularly important in understanding the crime of genocide, and we cannot necessarily answer questions about the intent of the perpetrators when we use victims’ accounts, victims’ voices can provide us with other valuable insights. Studying victims allows us to answer questions about their perceptions and interpretations of events, their experiences, and their feelings. In this dissertation, they help us to understand the adequacy of
current international law in addressing the crime of genocide, as well as to better understand the relationship between the group (the way the victim of genocide is defined in law) and the individual (who actually experiences the phenomenon and its aftermath).

This dissertation utilizes oral history testimony from survivors of the Armenian and Rwandan genocides to provide a comparative historical analysis of sexual violence in genocide. Just as genocide is an elusive crime to study, sexual violence is another crime where victims’ voices have been absent in the past, either due to being silenced or being stigmatized. This victimological study of sexual violence in these two atrocities serves as a channel for victims’ voices. More specifically, I examine victims’ perspectives on sexual violence in order to compare their understanding of this crime with the existing international legal framework for sexual violence as genocide. These two genocides occurred in different legal contexts: the Armenian genocide took place before the term genocide had even been coined and, therefore no laws against such a crime existed, and the Rwandan genocide was the first time genocide, and sexual violence as genocide, was prosecuted in international law. Comparing these two cases provides us with a glimpse of common themes across time and place, allowing us to get a broader view of victims’ experiences than studying a single case alone.
CHAPTER 1:
BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Sexual violence is typically thought of as a crime against the individual; it is a crime against the most intimate parts of one’s body (Askin, 2006). Despite its association with the individual, however, sexual violence has always been pervasive in times of war and other group conflicts. The victim movement in international justice, beginning with the ad hoc tribunals for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and Rwanda (ICTR) in the 1990s, contributed to a shift in the perception of sexual assault in such settings. The victim movement assisted in shifting the view of sexual violence from an inevitable consequence of war and conflict to a weapon that may be used to destroy not only individuals, but also collectivities (Henry, 2011).

*Genocide* is the term used to refer to the intentional destruction of a group. In international law, several acts may be committed with the intent of group destruction: killing members of the group, causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group, inflicting on a group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction, imposing measures to prevent births within a group, and transferring children of the group to another group (United Nations, 1948). Although sexual violence is absent from this list, one of the results of the victim movement in international justice is that the ICTR concluded that rape was used in Rwanda with the intent of destroying the Tutsi as a group ("Prosecuter v. Jean Paul Akayesu," 1998). This decision established sexual violence as an act of genocide in international case law, and it set a precedent for the International Criminal Court (ICC). The ICC’s Elements of Crimes includes the crime of genocide as defined in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (United Nations, 1948); however, it includes a footnote attached to the
act of “serious bodily or mental harm” in genocide, clarifying that this conduct may include, but is not necessarily restricted to, acts of torture, rape, sexual violence or inhumane or degrading treatment (de Brouwer, 2005; United Nations, 2011).

While sexual violence as genocide is a relatively new issue in international law, we should not overlook the fact that it has been used with this aim in historical conflicts as well. One such atrocity is the Armenian genocide of the early twentieth century. It is well established that the destruction of the Armenians was a highly gendered event – men were killed outright, while women, children, and the elderly were forced on deportation marches through the desert. Women endured not only many forms of sexual violence, but were also abducted and forcibly married to Turkish soldiers and civilians. The intention was to destroy Armenian culture.

Despite the acknowledgement of gender differences in victimization, however, there has been little research specifically on the use of sexual violence in the Armenian genocide (Derderian, 2005; Miller & Miller, 1993). Most of the scholarly discourse on sexual violence in genocide has had a legal focus. However, the Armenian genocide, which occurred before the term “genocide” had been coined to describe such atrocities, before there was an international legal protocol for dealing with such crimes, and before sexual violence was recognized specifically as an act of genocide in the legal arena, illustrates the importance of defining and understanding the phenomenon of sexual violence as genocide outside of the law.

Law itself can be described as a discourse, a way of talking about actions and relationships, but like other discourses, law is limiting in that it asserts some meanings and silences others (Merry, 1990). Individuals go to the law with a story to tell, a story of who did what to whom, a story of right and wrong, a story of guilt and innocence (Sarat & Felstiner,
The production of legal discourse involves filtering individuals’ narratives, eroding details that those individuals deem to be important, and producing a new account that may not align with the victim’s interpretation of events (Smart, 1990). Feminist scholars who critique the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide argue that although recognition in international law is critical, international courts fail to adequately capture the extent, nature, or emotional impact of sexual crimes (Henry, 2009; 2010; 2011).

The objective of this study is to examine the phenomenon of sexual violence as genocide outside the law by performing a comparative historical analysis of narratives of survivors of the Armenian and Rwandan genocides. The Armenian genocide occurred before there was any type of legal protocol for such events, and the Rwandan genocide was the first time genocide, and, more specifically, sexual violence as genocide, was prosecuted in international law. Comparison assists us in understanding the genocidal process (Hiebert, 2008) – that is, how certain acts are used to destroy a group. By examining survivor narratives that were constructed outside of a legal setting, and by comparing two atrocities that occurred in very different legal contexts, I test the adequacy of the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide by examining how well it corresponds to survivor discourse of the phenomenon. Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

1) How and to what extent is sexual violence a part of the narratives of survivors of the Armenian genocide of 1915-1923, survivors of the Rwandan genocide of 1994, and across these two cases of genocide?

2) What was the impact of sexual violence on individuals in the Armenian genocide of 1915-1923, in the Rwandan genocide of 1994, and across these two cases of genocide?
3) What was the impact of sexual violence on the targeted groups in the Armenian genocide of 1915-1923, in the Rwandan genocide of 1994, and across these two cases of genocide?

4) How does survivor discourse of sexual violence as genocide in Armenian survivor interviews, in Rwandan survivor interviews, and across both samples of interviews compare to the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide?

To answer these questions, this project, which is situated in the frameworks of phenomenology, narrative analysis, and feminist standpoint scholarship, analyzes oral history interviews with survivors of both genocides.

**Terminology**

The focus of this dissertation is the use of sexual violence in genocide. *Sexual violence* is often referred to as an act of gender-based violence, a term frequently used interchangeably with “violence against women.” The synonymous use of these two terms builds on the reality that while men may also be targeted for sexual violence (Linos, 2009), women and girls suffer primarily and disproportionately from these types of violence (de Brouwer, 2005). The statute of the International Criminal Court (United Nations, 1998, Article 7, Number 3) states that “. . . the term ‘gender’ refers to the two sexes, male and female, within the context of society.” Gender-based violence, therefore, is violence that is targeted at men and women because of their sex and/or their socially constructed gender roles. It may be sexual in nature, but also non-sexual (de Brouwer, 2005). I use the term *sexual violence* in this study, as it is gender neutral and emphasizes the sexual nature of the violence committed. I utilize the definition of sexual violence from the ICTR *Akayesu* case ("Prosecuter v. Jean Paul Akayesu," 1998):

The Tribunal considers sexual violence, which includes rape, as any act of a sexual nature which is committed on a person under circumstances which are coercive. Sexual
violence is not limited to physical invasion of the human body and may include acts which do not involve penetration or even physical contact. (Paragraphs 598, 688)

This definition is broader than many other definitions of sexual violence, which may require physical penetration or require proof of lack of victim consent. The use of a broad definition allows us to tease out the ways in which norms of masculinity serve to render not only women, but also certain groups of men, vulnerable to these types of violence (Stemple, 2009).

While rape is encompassed in the above definition, the ICC statute has explicitly listed several forms of sexual violence, including rape, but also sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy, and enforced sterilization (de Brouwer, 2005; United Nations, 1998). In addition, according to case law from the ICTY and ICTR, sexual violence does not need to include acts that involve physical contact. Forced nudity has been found to constitute the crime of sexual violence in both tribunals, as it involved “abuses of a sexual nature inflicted upon the physical and moral integrity of a person by means of coercion, threat of force, or intimidation in such a way that is degrading and humiliating for the victims’ dignity” ("Prosecutor vs. Furundža," 1997, Paragraph 186). According to this definition from the ICTR, then, other methods of dehumanization, such as verbal assaults and harassment, as well as being forced to witness sexual violence (against a family member or friend, for example), would also qualify as forms of sexual violence.

Throughout this dissertation, I also refer to the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide and sexual violence as genocide in international law. The current legal understanding of sexual violence as genocide was established primarily through the Akayesu trial of the ICTR, which determined that “sexual violence was an integral part of the process of destruction, specifically targeting Tutsi women and specifically contributing to their destruction and to the
destruction of the Tutsi group as a whole” ("Prosecuter v. Jean Paul Akayesu," 1998, Paragraph 731). Building upon the findings of the Akayesu trial, a footnote was added to the ICC’s Elements of Crimes, clarifying that the act of serious bodily or mental harm “may include, but is not necessarily restricted to, acts of torture, rape, sexual violence or inhumane or degrading treatment” (United Nations, 2011, Article 6(b)-1, Footnote 3). I use the terms legal framework of sexual violence as genocide and sexual violence as genocide in international law to refer to the definition of sexual violence in the ICC’s Elements of Crimes and the current legal understanding established through Akayesu that subsumes sexual violence as genocide under the act of “serious bodily or mental harm.”

**Overview of Sexual Violence in Conflict and in International Law**

Just as the Nazi atrocities during the Second World War led to the formulation of the concept of genocide and then brought the crime of genocide to the attention of the international community, mass rapes during the Balkan Wars and the Rwandan genocide brought sexual atrocities to the forefront of international humanitarian law. Here, I provide brief discussions of sexual violence in conflict and sexual violence in international law.

**Sexual Violence in Conflict**

The gendered nature of rape and sexual assault has led to an argument that there are parallels between the destructive nature of rape in general and the destructive nature of rape in genocide:

Just as an ethnic group can be destroyed without killing all its members, perhaps the group women illustrates how a group can be destroyed while leaving its members alive and seemingly intact, subordinated as lesser humans, with sexual atrocities distinctively performing this function. If this is right, rape in genocide – gender combined with ethnicity, nationality, or religion in genocidal rape – does to women and men on a
combined sex and racial, ethnic, national or religious basis, what rape does to women outside genocides on a sex and gender basis everyday. (MacKinnon, 2006, p. 226)\textsuperscript{1,2}

While “on many levels, rape is rape” (MacKinnon, 2006), and there are parallels between rape in general and rape in genocide, it is important for us to understand that the occurrence and consequences of rape may vary by context. Conflicts throughout history have resulted in massive numbers of rapes and sexual assaults. In fact, it is exceptional to read in detail about war without reading about rape (Askin, 2006).

Some have argued that rape is not a “regrettable side-effect of war”, but that it can be used to destroy a group in times of conflict (Seifert, 1996). In this argument, the termination of a war is determined by a change in perception, a reversal in self-image and the collective conscience of the defeated group: deconstruction of material culture, persons, and elements of consciousness (Seifert, 1996; Scarry, 1985, as cited in Seifert, 1996)\textsuperscript{3}. The destruction of a group’s culture is possible through rape in war because war is not confined to the battlefield: in reality, civilian deaths often outnumber military casualties (Seifert, 1996). The civilian population is composed disproportionately of women, allowing the use of rape of female civilians to destroy a group’s culture:

In times of war, the women are those who hold the families and the communities together. Their physical and emotional destruction aims at destroying social and cultural stability. Moreover, the psychological effects mass rapes have on the community concerned may lead to the devaluation and dissolution of the entire group. The

\textsuperscript{1} I engage critically with MacKinnon’s claims in this dissertation and return to a discussion of the parallels she draws here in Chapter 7.
\textsuperscript{2} However, women are not recognized as a group in international law; and therefore, their destruction may not be considered genocide.
\textsuperscript{3} Seifert does not distinguish between war and genocide, but discusses conflict settings more generally, providing examples from Bosnia, the Holocaust, Kuwait, and Nanking. While this goal of destruction may not apply to all wars, the destruction of a group is the goal of genocide.
destruction of women and their integrity affects overall cultural cohesion. (Seifert, 1996, p. 150)

Other scholars, however, have drawn clear distinctions between rape in war and rape in genocide. To understand these distinctions, we must first understand the differences between war and genocide more generally. While most genocide scholars would argue that genocide often occurs in the context of war, war is not a necessary condition for genocide. Although war and genocide may share some characteristics (i.e. high numbers of casualties), there are vital differences between these two types of conflict. One of these differences is the aim, goal, or intent of genocide as opposed to war. As stated in the UN definition, the goal of genocide is the destruction of a group, either in whole or in part. Although a group’s destruction may signal the end of a war, this destruction is not necessarily the intent of the war’s victor. Beyond differences in intention, there are generally differences in the way war and genocide are carried out. There are typically at least two opponents in a war, with the conflict taking place between armed combatants. In contrast, genocides go beyond war in that they take place in civil society, outside of any armed conflict⁴. Genocide is “relentlessly one-sided” (MacKinnon, 2006), as often times only the genocidaires are armed. While civilian casualties may (and do) occur in war, the destruction of an entire group, whether through killing or other means, is the goal of genocide.

With sexual violence in war, women on both sides of a conflict could experience sexual assault. It “is what armed men do in groups when there is nothing to stop them” (MacKinnon, 2006). In other words, rape in war is out of control. In contrast, rape in genocide is “rape under control” (MacKinnon, 2006). It takes place in a group context because men are following orders, ⁴ This is not to say that genocide does not often take place in the context of a war, but this is not a necessary element of genocide.
or are systematically permitted. Although rape in war and other types of conflict may be considered crimes against humanity, rape in genocide is different. It does not occur simply because nothing is stopping the perpetrators, or to harm an individual, or to have sex. Women on one side of the conflict are targeted not simply because they are female, as in rape in general and rape in war, but due to their membership in a protected group (racial, ethnic, religious, or national group). Rape in genocide occurs with the same goal as the aim of the overall genocide: to destroy a group as such.

To further understand sexual violence in the context of genocide, we can draw examples from the archetypal, although not typical, example of genocide: the Holocaust. Some have argued that Nazi ideology – their central policy of race defilement – stood as a barrier to sexual violence in the Holocaust. However, we now know that Jewish women were raped during the Holocaust (Sinnreich, 2010), and other forms of sexual violence occurred as well. Bergen (2006) argues that sexual violence in the Holocaust was both typical of other wars and genocides and unique. It was typical in the acts themselves -- rape, mutilation, and violation of taboos -- but it was unique in the patterns it followed and in the meaning given to those patterns by Nazi Socialist ideology. She states:

Ideology shaped the forms that sexual violence took: it helped determine what the authorities permitted, encouraged, and rewarded; it influenced what those “on the ground” could even imagine as possible; it decided what could be recorded, in the sense that disobedience would be concealed or punished. Nazi ideology determined what types of violence furthered the goals of the Third Reich. It continues to influence what kinds of acts and violations fit into the definition of the Holocaust and thereby get admitted as relevant into discussions like this one. (Bergen, 2006, p. 180)

Bergen (2006) provides evidence for her claim by utilizing examples of how sexual violence reinforced dominant hierarchies. For instance, sexual violence allowed perpetrators to
dehumanize their victims, ultimately making their extermination easier. Although Bergen argues that sexual violence in the Holocaust functioned differently than sexual violence in other genocides due to Nazi ideology, her example nonetheless illustrates that genocidal ideology influences the ways in which violence is used to accomplish goals of destruction.

**Sexual Violence in International Law**

Sexual violence has occurred in both internal and international conflicts throughout history. In her history of rape, Brownmiller (1993) states that rape has been used in wars of religion, wars of revolution, in just wars and unjust wars, and in both world wars. While the rules or norms of practice during wartime vary across time and place, the phrase “to the victor go the spoils” indicates that soldiers’ prerogative to rape conquered women has traditionally been accepted as a rule of war (Reid-Cunningham, 2008).

Sexual violence has the paradoxical status of being considered both an “inevitable” and an “unspeakable” crime (Henry, 2011). Despite its pervasiveness, until recently, it has been surrounded by silence in nearly all areas of discourse, including the law (Henry, 2011) and history (Brownmiller, 1993). While sexual violence has recently been acknowledged as an act of torture, a crime against humanity, and an act of genocide (Cole, 2010), it was either completely left out of, or only peripherally included in, the earliest documents establishing standards for international humanitarian law. The 1907 Hague Convention Respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land did not list rape or sexual violence as a violation of the laws and customs of war. Although Article 27 of the Fourth Geneva Convention (1949) states that “women shall be especially protected against any attack on their honor, in particular, against rape, enforced prostitution, or any form of indecent assault,” none of the Geneva Conventions list rape or sexual
violence as “grave breaches” or war crimes (Rusell-Brown, 2003).

The Tokyo and Nuremburg Tribunals also failed to adequately address sexual violence. Rape was not enumerated as a war crime or a crime against humanity in either charter, and no victims were called to testify at either trial (Henry, 2011; Karstedt, 2010). Although the Tokyo Tribunal was concerned mostly with crimes committed during the Second World War, it did address the rape of tens of thousands of women in Nanking in the 1930s. However, rape was only prosecuted alongside other war crimes committed during the Nanking invasion. In addition, the sexual slavery of thousands of “comfort women” who were kidnapped and forced into Japanese military style brothels in the course of the war went unaddressed. The founding statute of the Nuremberg Tribunal did not make specific reference to rape or sexual violence, thereby not addressing the gruesome reproductive experiments and forced sterilization in Nazi concentration camps. None of these crimes were formally prosecuted, and silence continued to envelop sexual violence and its victims (Henry, 2011).

It was not until the mid-1990s, and the ICTY and ICTR, that this silence was finally broken in international law. Henry (2011) uses the term “victim movement in international justice” to refer to a new era within the history of international humanitarian law. The victim movement in international justice took place in the context of a larger global victims’ movement characterized by a newfound attention to victims of violent crime, including the American Civil Rights movement, the feminist movement, the human rights revolution, and the restorative justice movement (Henry, 2011). In international law, survivors of sexual violence were included in international war crimes trials for the first time, and the view of sexual violence shifted from seeing this crime as an inevitable byproduct of war to viewing it as a weapon of
war. The trials of the ICTY and the ICTR also established sexual violence as an act of torture, a crime against humanity, and an act of genocide\textsuperscript{5}.

\textit{Background}

Although the victim movement in international justice in the mid-1990s marked a new era for sexual violence in international law, we must not ignore conflicts that occurred prior to this movement. Just as genocide has occurred since ancient times, gender distinctions in the genocidal process are evident in historic cases as well. In the sections that follow, I provide summaries of the two cases that I analyze in this dissertation, the Armenian genocide and the Rwandan genocide, before reviewing the state of comparative research on sexual violence in genocide.

\textit{The Armenian Genocide}

Historically, the Armenian people resided in the area of the Ottoman Empire known as Eastern Anatolia, a section of present-day Turkey that bordered Russia. Along with other Christian minorities and Jews, Armenians were considered inferior to Muslims in traditional Ottoman society (Akçam, 2004; 2006). The Armenian genocide is typically identified as beginning in 1915, but the Armenians faced a continuum of violent acts from 1894-1922, including brutal massacres and pogroms (Hovannisian, 2007). This escalating violence took place against a backdrop of territorial decline and a shift of power in the Ottoman Empire. At the same time that most other minorities residing in the Balkans were in the process of separating from the Ottoman Empire, the Armenians were experiencing deteriorating conditions, including

\textsuperscript{5} See the “Conceptual Framework” section for a more in-depth discussion of the ICTY and the ICTR. For a more in-depth discussion of the supranational prosecution of sexual violence, see de Brouwer, 2005.
exorbitant taxation, oppressive administration, and attacks from the Kurds to the east.

Simultaneously, national self-awareness was increasing due to the return of many young
Ottoman Armenians who had studied in the west. As a result of these concurrent developments,
by the end of the nineteenth century, the Armenians began demanding greater protection from
Kurdish attacks and plundering, but also more autonomy.

In April of 1915, a new government of Young Turks implemented its final solution to the
Armenian question, which resulted in the death of approximately 1 million to 1.5 million
Armenians, half to three-quarters of their total population (Akçam, 2004; 2006; Miller & Miller,
1993). First, Armenian notables were gathered in Constantinople, where they were arrested and
ultimately killed. Next, Armenian villages experienced a consistent pattern of deportation. To
eliminate any defenders, able-bodied men were removed from their villages and shot. Women,
children, and the elderly were forced on death marches toward the Syrian Desert, on which they
were provided with no supplies to sustain themselves.

Many scholars have acknowledged this genocide as a highly gendered event (Derderian,
2005; Fein, 1999; Harrelson, 2010; Miller & Miller, 1993; Peroomian, 2009; Sansarian, 1989;
Smith, 1994), but despite the fact that there are clear gender differences in victimization
experiences in this case, there has been relatively little focus on the experiences of women.
Sansarian (1989) took a broad scope, considering not just the victimization experiences of
Armenian women, but also the roles of female Turks and Kurds in perpetration, collaboration,
and rescue. More recently, research that has specifically examined violence against Armenian
women in this genocide indicates that gender-based violence was present in all stages of this
atrocity: intimidation of females was used as an antecedent to the genocide; men were killed and
women were isolated; the Turks engaged in attacks on the reproduction of Armenian women through both rape and forced marriages between Armenian women and Turkish men; and the Armenian culture was destroyed through forced marriage and assimilation into Turkish society (Bell, under review; Derderian, 2005). Overall, while there has been some research on the experiences of women in the Armenian genocide, there has been little work that focuses on sexual violence specifically. There has also been a lack of comparative work in this regard, with Derderian (2005) calling for comparative studies to understand gender-based violence as a distinct and important element of the genocidal process more broadly.

*The Rwandan Genocide*

Largely due to Belgian colonialism that began during the First World War, the Tutsi had been identified as a privileged class in Rwanda, but following decolonization of Rwanda in the 1950s, the Hutu gained power, and the logic of colonialism was turned upside down. The new Hutu-led Rwandan government persecuted the Tutsi, large numbers of whom fled to neighboring countries. In 1990, these refugees launched an armed invasion of Rwanda to regain their rights in their country of origin, which resulted in a civil war that provided the context for genocide. President Habyarimana was assassinated in April of 1994, and while this was undoubtedly a catalyst to the genocide, the genocidal tendency in Rwanda was also born out of the Hutu Power movement, which held that the Tutsi must be prevented from returning to power (Mamdani, 2002). As a result of this ideology, the Hutu developed a widespread fear of return to servitude and subjugation to the Tutsi, which is one explanation for mass participation in the genocide. To eliminate resistance, moderate Hutu leaders were targeted first, and then it is estimated that over
one million Tutsi were murdered and approximately 500,000 Tutsi women were raped in a mere 100 days (de Brouwer, 2009; Mamdani, 2002).

The alleged superiority of the Tutsis also played an important role in the treatment of Tutsi women, who were viewed by Hutu extremists as sexually superior to their Hutu counterparts and as sexual weapons who would be used to infiltrate and control the Hutu community (Nowrojee, 1996). Rape was undertaken by the genocidaires as revenge against women that Hutu men coveted. Accounts from survivors indicate that women were individually raped, gang-raped, raped with objects such as sharpened sticks or gun barrels, held in sexual slavery (either collectively or through forced "marriage"), or sexually mutilated with machetes, knives, boiling water, or acid (Nowrojee, 1996). Phenomenological research with Rwandan survivors of sexual violence has illustrated that this type of victimization results in devastating consequences, including social isolation, the loss of dignity and identity, and loss of hope for the future, largely due to infection with AIDS/HIV (Mukamana & Bysiewicz, 2008).

In contrast to the Armenian genocide, rape has been a much more central part of the narrative on the Rwandan genocide. Discourse surrounding sexual violence in this case has had a diverse focus, with a large amount of work discussing the legal aspects of sexual violence in this particular conflict (Buss, 2010; de Brouwer, 2005; Haddad, 2011; Rusell-Brown, 2003), analyses of media images of sexual violence in this genocide (Williams & Bower, 2009), and examinations of health consequences of the mass rapes (Supervie, Halima, & Blower, 2010), including research on children conceived through rape (Torgovnik, 2009; Weitsman, 2008). Collections of interviews with survivors of sexual violence in the Rwandan genocide have also been published in non-academic publications meant to reach wider audiences (de Brouwer,
Due to the massive amounts of discourse on sexual violence in Rwanda compared to other genocides, it has also served as the major case study for our understanding of this phenomenon. However, there have been few attempts to compare the insights we have gained from the Rwandan case to other cases of genocide (Fein, 1999; Sackellaes, 2005; Weitsman, 2008), especially outside of a legal framework, or with cases that occurred before the victim movement in international justice.

**Comparative Research**

Relatively little comparative work has been performed on the use of sexual violence in genocide, and the comparisons that exist typically focus on legal issues and use Rwanda or Bosnia as comparison cases due to their association with the victim movement in international justice (Sackellaes, 2005; Weitsman, 2008). Despite the fact that scholars have called for more research on gender in the Armenian genocide generally (Peroomian, 2009), and for comparative work on gendered experiences specifically (Derderian, 2005), there have not been any comprehensive comparative analyses on sexual violence utilizing this case.

A notable exception to the lack of comparative work on gender and genocide is Fein’s (1999) analysis, which examines gender distinctions, including the use of sexual violence, in several ancient and modern genocides. However, Fein’s (1999) work surveys many cases, rather than analyzing any specific cases in-depth. While comparison can be used as a causal tool (Baldwin, 2004; Mahoney & Rueschemeyer, 2003), it also assists us in identifying shared elements and local variations across cases (Grayzel, 2004). In genocide research, comparison assists us in understanding both the causes of genocide and the processes of genocidal destruction (Hiebert, 2008). Comparative analysis has also been identified as an important tool in
women’s history due to its “de-normalizing” function (Pederson, 2004); it problematizes
women’s experiences rather than treating them as inevitable. In this study, I draw on the
strengths of comparative methods to identify shared and divergent themes in experiences of
sexual violence in the Armenian and Rwandan cases.

*****

The objective of this study, which is situated in the frameworks of phenomenology, narrative
analysis, and feminist standpoint scholarship, is to examine the phenomenon of sexual violence
as genocide outside the law. To accomplish this, I will examine existing oral history interviews
with survivors of the Armenian and Rwandan genocides. The Armenian genocide occurred
before the term genocide had even been coined to describe such events, whereas the Rwandan
genocide represents the first ever conviction of genocide (and sexual violence as genocide) in
international law. By examining survivor narratives that were constructed outside of a legal
setting, and by comparing two atrocities that occurred in very different legal contexts, I compare
the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide to survivor discourse of the phenomenon to
determine its adequacy and make recommendations for international law.
CHAPTER 2:
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Advances in international law in the face of the conflicts in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Rwanda laid the foundation for the feminist legal framework of rape as genocide. However, there has been continued debate over the concept of “genocidal rape.” Below, I present an overview of feminist legal theory that influenced the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide. Next, I present the legal framework, along with recent feminist critiques that developed after the trials of the ICTY and the ICTR. Last, I present an integrated framework, which represents the conceptual approach for the proposed study.

Feminist Legal Theory

Feminist legal theories, which emphasize the role of law in describing society and prescribing change, form the very basis for the conceptual framework of this study. Feminism has been described as a house with many rooms (Levit & Verchick, 2006), and feminist legal theory is no exception. As we will see in the sections that follow, there are several feminist perspectives on the role of law; however, the most relevant ones for the purposes of this dissertation are dominance theory, critical race feminism, and postmodern feminism.

MacKinnon (1979) first introduced dominance theory, which focuses on the power relations between men and women: men are privileged and women are subordinated; therefore, the inequalities women experience are a result of patterns of male domination. Dominance theory is a response to more traditional forms of feminism, namely, equal rights feminism and cultural difference theory. Equal rights feminism is based in the principles of equality that inspired the

6 In this section, I refer to rape specifically, rather than sexual violence more generally, as that has been the focus of much of the legal and scholarly discourse referenced here.
suffrage movement: women are entitled to the same rights as men. Cultural difference theory, on the other hand, argues that formal equality under the law does not always equal substantive equality. Difference theory emphasizes the differences between men and women and argues that women can be “kept down” by gender neutral laws if they do not acknowledge women’s different experiences and perspectives, whether these difference be biological or cultural differences reflected in social relationships (Levit & Verchick, 2006). Dominance theory responds to these two more traditional theories of feminism by stating that the “feminine” is defined by a patriarchal culture; MacKinnon (1987, p. 45) wrote, “take your foot off our necks, and then we will hear in what tongue women speak”. Dominance theory views law as complicit with other social institutions in constructing women as sex objects and as inferior, dependent beings. In terms of violence, dominance theory argues that patriarchy includes sexual domination by men and sexual submission by women, causing women to live in fear of rape and sexual assault. Until the law protects women, they will live in a false consciousness in which they internalize the beliefs of the dominant group.

Critics of dominance theory assert that it mistakenly universalizes the experiences of white women as the experience of all women, ignoring differences of race, class, and ethnicity (Levit & Verchick, 2006). Critical race feminists reject the idea of a universal female experience, and argue that discrimination is best understood not from the center of an oppressed group’s membership, but from the margins. According to critical race feminism, while discrimination may effect all women, it functions differently depending on the intersection of an individual’s personal characteristics, including sex, race, and religion, among others (Crenshaw, 1989).
Like critical theories, postmodern feminism rejects essentialism – the idea of a universal female experience. However, unlike critical theorists, who find truth in the harmony of many voices, postmodern feminists believe harmony is impossible (Levit & Verchick, 2006). Postmodernists focus on how we create and transmit hierarchies such as gender oppression by discourse -- subtle systems of speech and actions. Postmodern analysis begins with the technique of “deconstruction”, or the examination of historical, artistic, and linguistic details to reveal the political messages and biases hidden within. Textual accounts always encode hidden messages because language is packed with information that changes based on context. Postmodern feminists use the tools of deconstruction to challenge the idea of an unchangeable rule of law: law is not objective or impartial, but created from political biases. Therefore, reliance on traditional ways of practicing law can reinforce inequalities.

**Feminist Legal Framework of Sexual Violence as Genocide**

The feminist legal framework of sexual violence as genocide was developed out of arguments informed by both critical race feminism and dominance theory. Feminist scholars and advocates worked together to help form the ICTY, but they were also divided on the approach that should be taken towards wartime sexual violence in the Balkans (Engle, 2005). This debate was not so much about whether rape had been used as an instrument of genocide in the former Yugoslavia, but whether a focus on genocidal rape functioned to downplay the extent to which all women raped during war were victims. The primary issues that divided feminists were whether the rapes of Bosnian Muslim women should be treated differently from the rapes of Serbian women, and whether they should be treated differently from rapes that happen in all wars and those that happen "every day."
One side of this dispute argued that the rape of Bosnian Muslim women by Serbian men was genocidal, and that this type of rape was fundamentally different than rape in war or rape in general. This argument was based in critical race feminism, as it asserted that what makes genocidal rape different from rape in war or rape in general is the intersection of sex with group membership in sexual victimization. Although she is a dominance theorist, MacKinnon was a proponent of the rape-as-genocide stance. She theorized that rape in war and rape in genocide share several characteristics: serving to terrorize, degrade, and demoralize the defeated, serving as symbolic rewards for the victors, and serving to interrupt reproductive continuity among the victim group. However, she states that rape in war is not the same as rape in genocide; rape is not genocidal unless the purpose of the act is the destruction of the peoples of which the raped are members. While rape in genocide may do some of the same things that it does in war, genocides, and the work performed in them through sexual assault, remain a distinct phenomenon (MacKinnon, 2006).

The other side of this disagreement argued that such a position would deny the extent to which women are always harmed in war (in this case, that both Bosnian and Serbian women were raped) and the extent to which rape is a gendered phenomenon that may be considered genocidal against all women, both in times of peace and in times of war (Copelon, 1995). Although MacKinnon was associated with the rape-as-genocide camp, coming from a dominance perspective, she too draws parallels between rape in general and rape in genocide. In theorizing why sexual assault destroys groups, she states, “Because sex is relational, sexual atrocities destroy relationships. Perhaps in part because it is seen and felt to destroy one’s humanity and relational place in [the] community indelibly and irreparably. . . rape is sometimes termed worse
than death.” (MacKinnon, 2006, p. 227) MacKinnon continues to explain that people identify closely with their sexual selves; sexuality is socially central to gender identity, both to oneself and to others. When this particular form of humanity, so central to our identities and relationships, is violated, sexual violence has the potential to destroy not only individuals, but also groups. MacKinnon (2006) goes on to speculate that this may explain how women are destroyed “as such” through sexual violence, arguing that perhaps the gendered nature of rape and sexual assault in general illustrates that just as an ethnic group can be destroyed without killing all its members, sexual atrocities may serve the function of destroying women as a group, while leaving its members alive and seemingly intact. However, women are not recognized as a group in international law; and therefore, their destruction may not be considered genocide. MacKinnon suggests that once sexual abuse in genocide is brought more fully into the open, the legal definition of genocide should be revisited to consider its group grounds (should sex be added?), its subparts (should sexual atrocities be made explicit?), and its intent element (should the intent element be there at all? should it reflect how misogyny actually works?) (MacKinnon, 2006).

Again, the feminist arguments regarding sexual violence in the former Yugoslavia drew heavily from two of the feminist theories outlined above: dominance theory and critical race feminism. The fact that rape occurred on both sides of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia, and that it serves to terrorize women everyday, is compatible with the dominance idea that patriarchy and male domination results in the sexual assault of women. This side of the argument was concerned that focusing on racial or ethnic group membership would obscure the importance of gender in sexual assault. On the other side of the debate, in the rape-as-genocide argument, it is
the intersection of personal characteristics that is important in victimization: Bosnian Muslim women were targeted because of their gender and their ethnicity. Here, as in critical race feminism, discrimination (and violence) functions differently depending on the intersection of an individual’s personal characteristics: in this case being a woman and Bosnian Muslim.

The ICTY managed the contention between these two sides of the debate by prosecuting rapes that occurred on both sides of the conflict, while simultaneously maintaining a narrative focused on the rape of Bosnian Muslim women by Serbian men. It was the first international criminal tribunal to include cases exclusively focused on the crimes of rape and sexual enslavement, and it also pioneered the approach of using rape to satisfy the elements of other crimes, including torture, enslavement, and persecution (Cole, 2010). The initial cases of the ICTY, while bringing attention to rape as a weapon of war, prosecuted Bosnian Muslim (Celebici case) and Croatian (Furundzija case) defendants for raping Serbian women. It was not until the Kunarac case, dealing with rape camps in the Foca region, that the court attended to the rape of Bosnian Muslim women by Serbian men. Although the Tribunal never formally linked rape and genocide, it did provide some recognition of this view by condemning rape as ethnic cleansing, identifying the attacks on Bosnian Muslim women as systematic, making reference to rape as part of a genocidal war, and alluding to forced impregnation as part of an anti-Muslim campaign. In the cases involving the rapes of Serbian women by Bosnian Muslims, however, the ethnicity of the defendants was rarely mentioned (Engle, 2005).

While the ICTY continued its trials, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) was formed to address the atrocities of 1994. The initial case of the ICTR (Akayesu) was ground-breaking in several respects. Jean-Paul Akayesu was the first individual to ever be
convicted of the crime of genocide and of rape as genocide. In addition, rather than adhering to a consent-based definition of rape, the ICTR defined the crime as “a physical invasion of a sexual nature, committed on a person under circumstances which are coercive” ("Prosecuter v. Jean Paul Akayesu," 1998, Paragraphs 598, 688): This allowed the ICTR to determine that rape had been used as an act of genocide in Rwanda, even though it was not explicitly listed as a genocidal act in the UN definition. The Chamber concluded that although sexual violence is not explicitly listed as an act of genocide, it could be subsumed under the definition’s existing sub-categories, including “causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group” ("Prosecuter v. Jean Paul Akayesu," 1998, Paragraph 688). Although genocide is a crime against a collectivity, the judgment states: “Sexual violence was an integral part of the process of destruction, specifically targeting Tutsi women and specifically contributing to their destruction and to the destruction of the Tutsi group as a whole” ("Prosecuter v. Jean Paul Akayesu," 1998, Paragraph 731). This judgment creates an “area of accommodation” in which harm to both the group and harm to the individual within the group are acknowledged (De Vito, 2008).

The Akayesu case set a precedent for the International Criminal Court (ICC). Genocide is listed in the ICC’s Elements of Crimes, where the crime is defined based on the definition of the 1948 Genocide Convention. However, a footnote was added to the ICC’s Elements of Crimes, clarifying that the act of serious bodily or mental harm “may include, but is not necessarily restricted to, acts of torture, rape, sexual violence or inhumane or degrading treatment” (United Nations, 2011, Article 6(b)-1, Footnote 3). de Brouwer (2005) argues that this development clearly shows the universal recognition of sexual violence as a tool to commit genocide and abandons the long-held view of sexual violence crimes as inevitable byproducts of war; however,
the Genocide Convention and the definition of genocide in the ICC statute remain unchanged (i.e. sexual violence remains unrecognized). In addition to the fact that sexual violence is not listed within the definition of genocide as an act that may constitute such, sexual violence is not defined at all under the category of genocide in the ICC’s Elements of Crimes – it is only defined under the crimes of war crimes and crimes against humanity.

**Feminist Legal Critique of Sexual Violence as Genocide**

Some feminist scholars argue that due to the inherent limitations of law and the gendered nature of these institutional mechanisms, international courts fail to adequately capture the extent, nature, or emotional impact of sexual crimes (Henry, 2009; 2010; 2011). These arguments draw from both dominance theory and postmodern feminism.

While there have been important advances in international law, including the recognition of the use of sexual violence to satisfy elements of genocide, crimes against humanity, and torture, the legacy of the ICTY and ICTR is mixed (Cole, 2010). Both tribunals have been criticized for their prosecution records: the ICTY failed to prosecute sexual violence as genocide and, despite its initial success, the ICTR largely failed to prosecute sexual violence following the *Akayesu* case (Buss, 2010). The ICTY also failed to capture the nature and context of rape in the former Yugoslavia by maintaining a consent-based view of rape as a violation of an individual’s sexual autonomy, rather than adopting the coercion-based definition of the ICTR (Cole, 2010). Perhaps one of the most glaring failures of both Tribunals is their complete neglect of certain acts of sexual violence, namely sexual enslavement and forced marriage (Cole, 2010).

Beyond the actual performance of these two tribunals, some scholars have questioned what can be known about sexual violence (and conversely, what can be known about genocide)
through the legal understanding of rape as genocide. Similar to the original critique of the concept of genocidal rape, these scholars conclude that international courts do not help explain the social, political, historical and ultimately gendered context of conflict and its aftermath (Buss, 2009; Henry, 2011). Both the ICTY and the ICTR have created dominant narratives of sexual violence as genocide (Bosnian Muslim being raped by Serbian men and Tutsi women being raped by Hutu men) that, while not inaccurate, do not reflect the full complexity of how and why sexual violence was a part of these genocides (Buss, 2009). In the rape-as-genocide legal framework, violence is understood exclusively as the product of an inter-ethnic conflict, rather than considering how other social, political and economic structures shaped the genocide. Feminist scholars have concluded that it may simply be beyond the scope of international courts to serve such complex justice goals (Henry, 2011). Instead, Buss (2009) presents an alternative approach of focusing on “what actually happens during rape situations,” which does not obscure the complex nature of sexual violence in conflict. Similarly, de Brouwer (2005) suggests that while the supranational criminal law system provides sufficient possibilities to comprehensively prosecute sexual violence crimes, the ICC and international tribunals should take into account the realities of the crimes, the seriousness of the crimes, and the needs of victims of sexual violence.

Although a major accomplishment of the victim movement in international justice was the inclusion of female victims in wartime trials, the extent to which these women have a voice is debated. By its very nature, a criminal trial focuses on prosecution of the accused. Victims do not convey their suffering in their own terms, but through the actions of the perpetrators. Their narratives are interrupted and truncated by the question-and-answer format of a trial, and they
have limited time in which to tell their story (Dembour & Haslam, 2004; Henry, 2010, 2011; Karstedt, 2010). Non-criminal and non-legal procedures and projects, such as truth and reconciliation commissions, oral history projects, and reparation projects, prioritize victims’ voices in their quests for truth (Karstedt, 2010). Uncovering the truth, therefore, is an acknowledgement of victims’ suffering as a fact and also as a wrongdoing (Cohen, 2009).

As mentioned, the feminist legal critique of sexual violence as genocide in international law draws from both dominance and postmodern feminism. Dominance theory is present in the critique of the power structures of the legal arena, which is argued to be highly gendered and not sensitive to the needs and experiences of women. Similarly, Frug (1992), a postmodern feminist theorist, asserted that legal discourse should be recognized as a site of political struggle over sex differences. Postmodern feminism focuses on the relationship between discourse and power, arguing that language, knowledge, and power are connected in ways that transmit cultural norms of gender (Levit & Verchick, 2006). Legal discourse must be deconstructed to reveal the implicit or explicit power hierarchies that are present. In the ICTY and ICTR, dominant narratives of sexual violence in genocide were produced that contain various hierarchies (for instance, gendered hierarchies in which men are the perpetrators and women are the victims, and also hierarchies of suffering in which certain forms of sexual violence were addressed and others were not). Like the dominance and postmodern perspectives, the feminist critique of the international legal framework similarly questions what we can know from knowledge constructed in courtroom settings, which are dominated by men and individuals far removed from the realities of genocide.
Integrated Framework

This study seeks to understand the phenomenon of sexual violence as genocide. To this end, it draws distinct elements from both the legal framework above and its feminist critique to set the following research priorities in comparing the Armenian and Rwandan cases.

Drawing from postmodern feminism, this framework recognizes that law itself is a discourse, or a way of talking about actions and relationships (Merry, 1990). It is an intricate, historical accumulation of rules, punishments, categories of behavior, and practices which reflect changing notions of crime, causes of behavior, and the responsibilities of the state (or international community) for social life. However, like other discourses, law is limiting in that it asserts some meanings and silences others. The legal process is a process of making meanings, a contest over defining phenomena in which the law provides only one possible set of meanings (Merry, 1990). Postmodern feminists argue that laws are not impartial or objective; instead, we must engage in deconstruction in order to reveal both implicit and explicit hierarchies and power structures contained within.

Thus, rather than beginning with the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide, the conceptual framework for this study begins with the phenomenon of sexual violence as genocide, which must be understood in the social, political, economic, cultural, historical, and ultimately gendered, context of a given conflict and its aftermath. Drawing from postmodern feminism and the feminist critique described above, this framework recognizes that the very concept of “sexual violence as genocide” creates dominant narratives of sexual violence in conflict that may not represent the full complexity of this phenomenon. While it may be crucial for sexual violence to be considered genocide for the victims and/or to more precisely reflect the context of a particular
genocide, victims still have little voice in the process that constructs and interprets international law judgments (De Vito, 2008).

In her analysis of the sexed body as produced by both legal and feminist discourse, Smart (1995) alludes to the limitations of law for reflecting victims’ understanding of events. She states that “every rape trial tells the same story” in which the natural sexed woman becomes a victimized sexed body. She says:

. . . the claim to truth has little to do with the routine of ordinary legal practice. . . Primarily the job of the solicitor is to translate everyday affairs into legal issues. On hearing the client’s story, the solicitor sifts it through a sieve of legal knowledge and formulations. Most of the story will be chaff as far as the lawyer is concerned, no matter how significant the rejected elements are to the client. Having extracted what the law defines as relevant, it is translated into a foreign language. . . . The parts of the story that are cast aside are deemed immaterial to the case. . . . This is the routine daily practice of law in which alternative accounts of events are disqualified. The legal version becomes the only valid one (Smart, 1995, p. 74).

Likewise, Sarat & Felstiner (1997) argue that because clients often do not know the law and are unable to speak its language, they cannot know “their experiences as legal events” and must be instructed as to which dimensions of their experience are legally relevant. Individuals go to the law with a story to tell, a story of who did what to whom, a story of right and wrong, a story of guilt and innocence. They utilize what Mills (1940) refers to as “vocabularies of motive” in an effort to construct shared interpretations of actions. Due to their differing understandings of the law (what Merry (1990) terms “legal consciousness”), clients may maintain a different “vocabulary of motive” than their lawyers, one that is not necessarily reflected in the legal construction of events (Sarat & Felstiner, 1997).

My conceptual framework recognizes these limitations of law for understanding and defining phenomena. I will analyze sexual violence as genocide based on survivor discourse of
“what actually happened in rape situations” (Buss, 2009), rather than courtroom testimony. In this way, I am analyzing survivors’ “vocabularies of motive,” rather than the vocabulary of the law. Like the feminist critique, my conceptual framework also recognizes that certain forms of sexual violence have been continually ignored in international law (e.g. forced marriage as a form of sexual enslavement) and omitted from the dominant narratives constructed by legal proceedings.

In my framework, I theorize that the phenomenon of sexual violence as genocide leads to the destruction of both individual victims and also the group to which they belong. The experiences of the individual and the group will necessarily impact survivor discourse of sexual violence as genocide. It is possible that the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide also impacts survivor discourse on this topic. In the Rwandan case, this could be due to its unique place in international law, whereas in the Armenian case, this could be due to a greater passage of time, which may allow for the influence of external sources on survivor narratives. The legal framework recognizes that sexual violence may be considered genocide by subsuming rape under the UN definition’s subcategory of causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group. A diagram of this conceptual framework can be seen in Figure 1 in Appendix A. The two-way nature of the arrows in this figure illustrates reciprocal relationships. For example, while the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide may impact survivor discourse on the topic, it is also possible, and we would hope that, survivor discourse on sexual violence as genocide would also influence the legal framework for this crime.

Given these insights, the proposed study is situated in the broader approach of phenomenology, an approach which seeks to explore, describe, and analyze the meaning of
individual lived experience (Marshall & Rossman, 2011); how individuals perceive it, describe it, feel about it, judge it, remember it, make sense of it, and talk about it with others (Patton, 2002). Specifically, this study is based in feminist standpoint epistemology, which utilizes women’s concrete experiences as the starting point from which to gain knowledge (Brooks, 2007). Feminist standpoint scholars argue that women’s concrete experiences provide the “ultimate criteria for credibility” when making knowledge claims about women (Collins, 1990). Standpoint epistemology has evolved over time to address critiques (e.g. Smart, 1995; Leavy, 2007) that it ultimately resorts to essentialist claims by using “women” as an identity category; feminist standpoint scholars no longer talk about the experience of women or conflate all women into one oppressed group, but recognize that women hail from a diverse range of class, cultural, and racial backgrounds, inhabit many different social realities, and endure oppression and exploitation in many different ways (Brooks, 2007). Although this work is grounded in feminist standpoint theory, as the subject matter of sexual assault is highly gendered, I also examine the narratives of men. More generally, standpoint epistemology begins with an individual's own perspectives (male or female), which are shaped by his or her experiences in social locations and social groups.

The present study will gain insight into concrete experiences of sexual violence in genocide by utilizing survivor narratives collected through oral history interviews. Narratives are spoken or written text giving an account of an event/action, or series of events/actions, chronologically connected (Czarniawska, 2004). A primary way that individuals make sense of experience, especially difficult life transitions and trauma, is by casting it in narrative form. The
The purpose of narrative analysis is to see how respondents in interviews impose order on the flow of experience to make sense of events and actions in their lives (Riessman, 1993).

The narratives that will be utilized for the proposed study were collected through oral history projects undertaken to preserve survivor accounts and create a collective memory of the Armenian and Rwandan genocides. Beginning with the actual experiences of survivors of these conflicts, this dissertation empirically examines how sexual violence was used to destroy both individuals and also the Armenians and Tutsi as groups. Utilizing survivor discourse collected outside of a courtroom setting has the advantage of allowing these victims to construct a narrative in their own terms. Of course, it is still possible that the law shapes how these survivors frame their experiences, but that is a question I aimed to answer. While each of my cases has its own particularities and takes place within a unique historical and social context, the comparative aspect of this study allowed for the identification of common themes in group destruction through sexual violence across time, place, legal context, and culture (including gender norms).

This study utilizes an integrated framework of sexual violence as genocide that draws from both the feminist legal framework and the feminist legal critique of sexual violence as genocide. My framework recognizes the importance of understanding and defining phenomena outside of the law, and as such, begins with survivors’ experiences of sexual violence in the Armenian and Rwandan genocides. I theorize a reciprocal relationship between the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide and survivor discourse: the legal framework may impact survivor discourse, and we would also hope that survivor discourse would similarly have an impact on the legal framework. In the following chapters, I will test the adequacy of the legal
framework of sexual violence as genocide by examining how well it “fits” survivor discourse of this phenomenon.
CHAPTER 3:
RESEARCH DESIGN AND ANALYSIS

This study is a comparative historical analysis of sexual violence in the Armenian and Rwandan genocides through the use of survivor narratives collected for the purpose of oral history.

Research Questions

I address the following research questions within each genocide and also across cases:

1) How and to what extent is sexual violence a part of the narratives of survivors?
2) What was the impact of sexual violence on individuals?
3) What was the impact of sexual violence on the targeted groups?
4) How does survivor discourse of sexual violence as genocide compare to the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide?

Comparison and Selection of Cases

As previously mentioned, comparison is important for history because it renders the invisible visible and aids us in questioning our own generalizations (Green, 2004; Pederson, 2004). Any comparison of similar phenomena in two different societal, national, or cultural settings has to determine conceptual equivalences that cut across the two contexts. Although insights remain grounded in the cases examined, comparative studies can yield more meaningful advice concerning contemporary choices and possibilities than studies that aim for universal truths and cannot grasp historical details (Mahoney & Rueschemeyer, 2003).

The Rwandan genocide has been chosen as a case for comparison in the few existing analyses of sexual violence in conflict due to its unique place in international law. However, we
must not ignore cases of genocide that occurred before the victim movement in international justice. The Armenian atrocities occurred before the term “genocide” was coined by Raphael Lemkin in 1943 and before there was an international protocol for dealing with such crimes. As such, it was never tried in international law, and to this day, the modern Turkish state denies that the intent of its predecessors was to destroy the Armenian people. The Armenian and Rwandan cases represent different time periods (1915-1923 and 1994, respectively), different regions of the world (Asia Minor and sub-Saharan Africa), and different legal contexts (before and after the Genocide Convention and the victim movement in international justice). The prevalence of sexual violence in both cases, however, makes them sufficiently similar to gain meaningful insights from comparative analysis.

Although there is value in comparative analyses, comparison is not without its limitations. While comparison assists us in understanding the processes of genocide and problematizes experiences such as sexual violence, differences across my two cases cannot be ignored. The genocides took place nearly 80 years apart, and the data were also collected in different temporal proximity to the events and under different circumstances (with the Armenian survivors largely being diaspora, and the Rwandan survivors remaining in their country of origin). In addition, the oral history projects and interviews also differed. The questions asked in the two cases vary in tone and in focus, both of which have the potential to impact responses. Although both oral history projects were undertaken with the larger goal of preserving survivor testimony of the genocides, each project also included distinct subgoals, including preserving information about Armenian culture and assisting with recording causalities of the Rwandan genocide (see the following section for more specific details about the data).
Sources of Data

Narratives, or stories, are sediments of norms and practices, which, as such, deserve careful attention (Czarniawska, 2004). As described, archived oral history interviews that contain survivor narratives will be utilized for the analysis. There has been a large movement in the Armenian community in the United States to preserve the past through oral history. An electronic archive of publicly available interviews (n=99) of genocide survivors conducted by the Armenian Assembly of America between 1979 and 1981 as part of their oral history project is available through the College of Business at the University of Michigan – Dearborn (http://www.casl.umd.umich.edu/686475). This archive contains 52 interviews with female survivors and 47 interviews with male survivors. The birth years of the survivors ranged from 1894 to 1909. The archive also categorized survivors by birthplace, with the interviewees representing various regions (east and west) of the Ottoman Empire. This is important primarily because the genocide itself disproportionately impacted the eastern regions of the Empire. The transcripts do not indicate in which language the interviews were conducted, but one can tell from the audio recordings that some of the interviews were not conducted in English and had to be both translated and transcribed. In most interviews, the sex of the interviewer is also unclear from the transcripts. The interviews lasted between one and three hours, and generally took the form of life histories. The interviews included many questions about Armenian culture and life before the genocide; questions regarding the events leading up to, during, and following April 24, 1915; and questions about emigration to America, the diaspora, and the future of the Armenian people. A list of some of the most common interview questions can be found in
Appendix B, although the interviews were open-ended and the questions asked depended largely on the interviewer.

The archive of interviews with survivors of the Rwandan genocide is located in the Kigali Memorial Center in Kigali, Rwanda (http://www.kigalimemorialcentre.org/old/index.html). The Kigali Memorial Center includes three permanent exhibitions, including documentation of the 1994 genocide. As part of this documentation, an oral testimony project was launched ten years after the genocide with the goal of recording and cataloguing survivor experiences. Some survivor narratives are available online in English; however, collecting, translating, transcribing, and cataloguing the interviews is an ongoing process. The archive is not currently making any interviews with survivors of sexual violence available in the online domain, largely due to the many consequences that women who experienced sexual violence continue to face in Rwandan society, including stigma, shame, and association with the spread of HIV and AIDS. For these reasons, I travelled to Rwanda to obtain the interview data in August 2012. The archive staff provided me with all interviews that had been translated to English and transcribed at that time, including interviews involving sexual violence. I received a total of 72 Rwandan interview transcripts, 39 of which are interviews with female survivors and 33 of which are interviews with male survivors. All interviews were completed between 2004 and 2011 (10-17 years after the genocide). The survivors were all born between 1943 and 1985, which means they were between 9 and 51 years of age at the time of the 1994 genocide. Interviews appear to have loosely followed a protocol that asked about background information and life before the genocide, what happened during the genocide, questions regarding the aftermath of the genocide,
and questions about the future of Rwanda. A list of general questions can be found in Appendix B. The sex of the interviewer is unclear in most cases.

Given that the goal of this research is to understand the phenomenon of sexual violence as genocide from the perspective of genocide survivors, oral history interviews with survivors may be the most appropriate source of data to answer the research questions at hand. However, it is important to be clear about the limitations of such data sources. Critics of oral history often note the limitations of human memory, especially given that oral histories may be collected many years after a given event. Due to memory decay, one disadvantage is that these sources are generally not strong in certain details, such as dates (Hoffman, 1996). The Armenian interviews were performed at least 60 years after the start of the genocide, and the interviewees were all at least 70 years old at the time of the interviews. This also means that victims were quite young at the time of the genocide and may see the event from a narrow perspective. While this is a limitation of the data, there are no longer any living survivors of the Armenian genocide, rendering these interviews a valuable glimpse into the past. In contrast, the Rwandan interviews were performed in much closer temporal proximity to the atrocities with which they are concerned. These oral histories were collected between 10 and 17 years after the events at hand, and thus, the survivors represent a much wider age range. Although it is possible that the Rwandan interviews possess more detail due to the shorter time lag between the events and data collection, the passage of time in both cases allows for respondents’ memories to be influenced by outside sources (Cutler, 1996). One such source of bias could be changes in laws and social norms around sexual violence, especially when comparing interviews performed from the 1970s with interviews performed in the 2000s. Another issue in oral history has to do with social
desirability -- selectively remembering, whether consciously or unconsciously, to portray oneself in more positive light. This limitation may be particularly important in the case of the Armenian interviews, as the Armenian people continue to face denial of the genocide by Turkey and lack of recognition of the genocide by other nation states.

Another limitation of oral histories in general, and these data in particular, is that samples of oral history participants are limited to those who are able and willing to share their story. In terms of my two sources of data, those individuals interviewed for these oral history projects were survivors of the genocides. Using survivor data to try to understand the phenomenon of victimization introduces bias, as those individuals who survived may have experienced victimization differently than those who did not survive. In addition, the individuals in my samples represent only a small minority of the survivor populations from these two genocides. Again, survivors who participate in oral history projects are willing to share their stories and they see value in doing so. This presents a type of response bias, as it is possible that those individuals who wish to tell their stories experienced the genocide differently or were impacted by the genocide in different ways than those who are unwilling to participate.

One of the main shortcomings of these specific sources of data is that I did not personally conduct the interviews, although, in any case, it would not have been possible to do so. In that sense, these transcripts are “secondary sources.” I had no control over the topics included in the interview protocol or when or what topics interviewers probed for more information. The questions asked in the two sets of interviews vary in tone and in focus, both of which have the

---

7 This phrase is in quotes because it is important to recognize that, although from a social science perspective, these interviews may be considered secondary because I did not conduct the interviews myself, from a historical perspective, oral history is still a primary source.
potential to impact survivor responses. While both oral history projects were undertaken with a similar overarching goal to preserve survivor testimony of the genocides, each project also included distinct subgoals, which are reflected in the interviews. For example, the Armenian oral history project sought to also preserve information about Armenian culture, whereas the Rwandan testimonies have assisted with recording causalities of the genocide. In addition, in both cases, while most questions were asked in many of the interviews, not all questions were asked of every participant. Follow-up questions also largely depended on the interviewer.

Despite the claim that oral history is history, the distinction remains between historical reality and individual perceptions of historical reality. While it is subjectively constructed and may not be strong in certain historical details, oral history allows individuals to construct a narrative inclusive of events and details that are important to them (Okihiro, 1996). Although the secondary nature of the data may be viewed as a limitation, at the same time, it allows me to determine the extent to which sexual violence is a part of survivor narratives of these genocides when it is not the central topic of the interview. This subjectivity in the construction of history is particularly relevant to the present study, as my approach is phenomenological, and I seek to understand how individuals describe and make meaning of their lived experiences of sexual violence in genocide. To what extent do survivors of these genocides recall and report sexual violence as part of the genocidal process? For those individuals who experienced sexual violence, do they view it primarily as a harm against themselves, against their group, or both? For those individuals who did not experience sexual violence, was this type of victimization a salient part of the destruction of the group to which they belong(ed)?
Oral histories are also shaped by the language and concepts available to survivors at the time of the interview (Friedlander, 1996). It is reasonable to assume that the language and concepts (e.g. the concept of sexual violence as genocide) available to the survivors of the Armenian and Rwandan genocides were different at the times of the interviews. The Armenian interviews were conducted in the late 1970s and early 1980s, before the victim movement in international justice, which brought the issue of sexual violence as genocide to the forefront of international humanitarian law. The Rwandan interviews were conducted between 2004 and 2011, well after the landmark cases of the ICTY and ICTR that dealt with sexual crimes. The extent to which these developments impact survivor discourse is currently unknown, but it is one of the goals of this dissertation to determine the level of similarity between survivor discourse and the legal framework of this phenomenon.

While these sources of data are not without bias, Jan Gross (2001) speaks of the importance of survivors’ accounts despite their shortcomings. He states,

All that we know about the Holocaust – by virtue of the fact that it has been told – is not a representative sample of the Jewish fate suffered under Nazi rule. It is all skewed evidence, biased in one direction: these are all stories with a happy ending. They have all been produced by a few who were lucky enough to survive. Even statements from witnesses who have not survived – statements that have been interrupted by the sudden death of their authors, who therefore left only fragments of what they wanted to say – belong to this category. . . and that is why we must take literally all fragments of information at our disposal . . . what actually happened . . . can only be more tragic than the existing representation of events based on surviving evidence. (Gross, 2001, p. 93-94).

Rather than being critical of survivors’ accounts, he believes we should take them as fact until we find persuasive arguments to the contrary.
Although the present study includes oral testimonies of both men and women, the topic of sexual violence is highly gendered. Oral history has been recognized specifically for its advantages for conducting feminist research:

Oral history is a basic tool in our efforts to incorporate the previously overlooked lives, activities, and feelings of women into our understanding of the past and present. When women speak for themselves, they reveal hidden realities: new experiences and new perspectives emerge that challenge the “truths” of official accounts and cast doubt upon established theories. Interviews with women can explore private realms such as reproduction, child rearing, and sexuality to tell us what women actually did instead of what experts thought they did or should have done. (Anderson, Armitage, Jack, & Wittner, 1987, p. 104)

Women’s oral history challenges what is considered historically important, and regardless of the orientation of the interviewer or the topics being discussed, it is an innately feminist endeavor (Gluck, 1977). It has also been noted as a method for preserving memories and experiences of individuals who do not have the education or literary talent to write their memoirs, which also challenges the topics and events that may be considered historically important (Hoffman, 1996). Given that genocide survivors may face many barriers to education in the aftermath of such atrocities, and thus may be at best semi-literate, oral history is an ideal source for collecting narratives from this population.

**Data Analysis Strategy**

The approach taken here is that of the extended case method, which “applies reflexive science . . . in order to extract the general from the unique, to move from the micro to the macro, and to connect the present to the past in anticipation of the future, all by building on existing theory” (Burawoy, 1998). Here, I use the term “case” to apply to a given genocide. This method is appropriate because the existing legal framework of sexual violence as genocide and the feminist critique of this framework both rely almost exclusively on the cases of the former
Yugoslavia and Rwanda. I utilized an inductive approach to provide insight into how the legal framework and its feminist critique can be integrated to reconstruct and extend both theories from the concrete case examples of the Armenian and Rwandan genocides. To meet this objective, I used several hallmarks of Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) grounded theory approach, including the creation of analytic codes and categories developed from the data, not from preconceived hypotheses; writing analytic notes or “memos” between coding data and writing drafts of the report; and sampling for theory construction, not for the representativeness of a given population (Charmaz, 2001).

Although the Armenian and Rwandan oral history projects represent relatively large samples for qualitative research (n=99 and n=72, respectively), the number of interviews for each case was not too large to include in analysis. For both oral history projects, the unit of observation is the individual. As I sought to determine the consequences of sexual violence for both individual women and the groups to which they belong(ed), analysis occurred at both the individual and group level.

The first major analytic phase of the research consisted of coding the interview transcripts (Charmaz, 2001). Codes are tags or labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest creating a provisional “start list” of codes, which should be derived from a) the conceptual framework, b) list of research questions, and c) key variables that the researcher brings to the study. My list of start codes and my final coding scheme can both be found in Appendix C. These codes are largely descriptive, in that they entail little interpretation (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Although I had previously created a list of start codes, I began with
“open coding,” an inductive process in which I let codes emerge from the data. My next step was to revise my list of start codes based on the open coding process, and begin coding again. The codes were continuously revised throughout the research process: codes were removed, new codes emerged from interaction with the data, and existing codes were broken down into sub-codes or collapsed into parent codes. Thus, although I began with a list of a priori codes, I proceeded inductively as I interacted with the data.

While the first level of coding assisted in summarizing segments of data, I also created pattern codes, which are explanatory or inferential codes that identify an emergent theme, configuration, or explanation. Pattern coding serves the functions of reducing large amounts of data into smaller analytic units and laying the foundation for cross-case analysis by surfacing common themes and directional processes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Pattern codes usually take the form of four interrelated summarizers: themes, causes/explanations, relationships among people, and theoretical constructs (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Given that this study is exploratory and descriptive in nature, my pattern codes are largely thematic, rather than causal or theoretical. Some themes emerged easily because patterning is the way we habitually process data; however, themes were also identified by going back to the research questions and looking for recurrent phrases and common threads in informants’ accounts. The themes were added into my existing list of codes and used in the next round of coding. As the study progressed, the data more easily fit into established codes (Weiss, 1994).

The most promising codes to emerge from this step of analysis (i.e. those that survived several rounds of coding) were written up in the form of a memo to expand the significance of the code (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Glaser (1978, p. 83) defines a memo as “the theorizing
write-up of ideas about codes and their relationships as they strike the analyst while coding . . . .
(I)t can be a sentence, a paragraph, or a few pages. . . . (I)t exhausts the analyst’s momentary
ideation based on data with perhaps a little conceptual elaboration.” Memos do not just report
data – they tie together different pieces of data into a recognizable cluster, often to show that
those data are instances of a general concept (Miles & Huberman, 1994). As Wolcott (1990)
notes, writing -- whether it be descriptive or interpretive writing -- is part of analysis. Initial
memos were utilized to name and specify a particular issue that cuts across a number of incidents
(identifying a theme), whereas later memos were mainly used to identify how a selected theme
can be related to other apparent themes (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995). Although the process
of coding and memoing is described linearly here, it is important to note that it is an iterative
process, which is only complete when the dissertation is finished (Weiss, 1994). See the
Research Log in Appendix D for a record and timeline of coding and memoing.

Part of the initial coding process also included identifying survivor attributes such as their
gender, age at the time of the genocide, and whether and what types of sexual violence they may
have personally experienced. This assisted in the creation of survivor profiles, which contained
variables across which analysis was performed at later stages of the research process. This type
of descriptive coding was also used to create a quantitative dataset for the present study. An
SPSS spreadsheet was created in which discussions of sexual violence were the unit of analysis.
For each discussion, I recorded a victim identifier, the interview in which the victim was
identified, the gender of the victim, the age of the victim, and dummy variables for various forms
of sexual victimization. I subsequently recoded the dummy variables to create a variable for
victimization based on whether the forms of sexual violence experienced in a given incident
required physical contact (e.g. rape would obviously require physical contact, whereas sexual harassment would not).

To answer the first research question, regarding how and to what extent sexual violence is included in survivor narratives, I performed both quantitative and qualitative analyses within and across genocides. For the quantitative analysis, I used SPSS to perform frequencies and cross-tabulations within each case to describe the number of survivors who personally experienced sexual violence, the various types of sexual violence that were discussed in each case, and the attributes of individuals who discussed and who experienced sexual violence. The “variables” feature in the software MaxQDA was also used towards this end, as it contained the information collected to create the survivor profiles previously described. For the qualitative analysis, the software MaxQDA was used to help identify the most common and frequent codes pertaining to sexual violence, and memos were used to flesh out the themes behind these labels. Cross-case analysis was accomplished by comparing the salience of sexual violence as an overall theme in the two samples of interviews and by examining ways in which additional themes of sexual violence were manifested similarly or differently across cases.

To address the second and third research questions, regarding the impact of sexual violence on individuals and groups in these cases of genocide, I again engaged in both within and cross-case analysis. Survivors spoke generally about consequences of the genocides, not always referring specifically to sexual violence, so my first steps of analysis involved identifying codes for consequences of the genocides overall versus those that were specific to sexual violence. After identifying themes of individual and group destruction for each genocide, I compared these themes across types of sexual violence experiences to the extent that this was
possible. To assist in this within-case analysis, I utilized an effects matrix (see Appendix E), a type of conceptually ordered display to assist in displaying data that will faithfully represent the changed state of persons, relationships, or groups (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Cross-case analysis for the second and third research questions involved comparing themes of individual and group destruction across the Armenian and Rwandan cases of genocide.

The fourth research question asks how survivor discourse of sexual violence as genocide compares to the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide. To address this research question, I compared the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide against my major findings and inductive themes that arose in the analysis of the previous three research questions. I performed cross-case analysis by comparing the themes that held across both cases to the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide. This assisted me in determining how well the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide fits two very disparate cases, in identifying themes in survivor discourse that have implications for international law, and in determining the relevance of law to individuals’ definitions of their lived experience.

**Research and Data Integrity: Validity, Reliability, & Triangulation**

Just as quantitative analysis must manage issues of validity, reliability, and triangulation, so must sound qualitative research. Traditionally, validity in qualitative research is defined as determining the degree to which researchers’ claims about knowledge represent participants’ realities of social phenomenon (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Creswell and Miller (2000) put forth a framework in which the procedures for validity are determined based on both the viewpoint or lens for establishing validity and also on paradigm assumptions. The lens may be that of the researcher, participants, or individuals external to the study, and the paradigms addressed by
Creswell and Miller are postpositive, consisting of rigorous methods and systematic inquiry; constructivist, based on pluralistic and interpretive perspectives of reality; and critical, questioning how narrative accounts are constructed, read, and interpreted.

Creswell & Miller (2000) identify two validity procedures through the lens of the researcher that I will use in the present study: triangulation, which is located in the postpositivist paradigm, and researcher reflexivity, which is located in the critical paradigm. Triangulation is a validity procedure in which researchers search for convergence among multiple or different sources of information (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Triangulation within this study was achieved through the comparisons made across interviews within and across each genocide. Although there has been relatively little work on sexual violence in the Armenian genocide, triangulation across studies is also possible for both genocides, and is discussed to the extent possible throughout the results chapters. Additionally, given that the researcher is the instrument in qualitative analysis, it is important to consider how the researcher’s frame of reference and experience will impact the research process. Researchers bring particular perspectives, training, biases, and knowledge to the research process, all of which shape our interpretation of the data (Corbin & Strauss, 2008), and researcher reflexivity involves reflecting on the forces that shape the researcher’s interpretation (Creswell & Miller, 2000).

My graduate training and education is in criminology, and prior to beginning my genocide research, my work focused on the intersection of race and gender in victimization. Examining sexual violence in the context of massive human rights violations was not a far leap from research I had already been engaged in, as I had experience with gender-based violence and the victimization of marginalized groups. This area of inquiry seemed new and exciting to me,
and I was also motivated by the fact that it had been badly under-researched, especially in the field of criminology. While I had worked on some projects with qualitative components, I had never personally conducted qualitative research before beginning this dissertation. My training was primarily in positivist methods, and as such, the way I initially approached the project was not well-suited to narrative inquiry. I had originally formulated my research questions to ask about sexual violence in genocide, rather than *survivors’ narratives of sexual violence in genocide*. Not long into the coding process, I had to revise my research questions to reflect the fact that I was only obtaining information that the survivors chose to share with the interviewer, and my research questions became more phenomenological in nature -- seeking to understand how individuals describe and make meaning of their lived experiences of sexual violence in genocide. Given my focus on sexual victimization, when I began my analysis, I also made the assumption that I would be studying *victims* of sexual violence. As I coded interviews, I realized early on that the stories I was reading were stories of *survival*. While victimization experiences were part of the narratives of these survivors, the focus of their stories was on how they survived the genocides and how they continued to survive following the genocides.

Beyond triangulation and researcher reflexivity, I engaged in two other validity methods identified by Creswell & Miller (2000). The credibility of a study is established not solely through the lens of the researcher, but also by turning to individuals external to the study, such as readers or auditors. Creswell & Miller (2000) suggest creating an “audit trail” or documentation of the inquiry process through memoing, keeping a research log of activities, and recording data analysis procedures clearly. Through the process of documenting a study and the review of this documentation by an external “auditor,” the narrative account becomes credible. My research
log is included in Appendix D to this dissertation. From a critical perspective, the ability to debrief with peers also provides credibility to a study, as external individuals act as sounding boards for ideas, play devil’s advocate, challenge the researcher’s assumptions, and ask difficult questions about methods and interpretation (Creswell & Miller, 2000). As Creswell and Miller (2000) suggest, I engaged in this process with my committee throughout the entire study. My committee members acted as auditors by assisting in decisions regarding coding and analysis and by reviewing and responding to memos and preliminary drafts of chapters.

**Ethical Considerations: Data Management and Confidentiality**

The Armenian oral history interviews are available online, but I have downloaded and stored them on a secure computer and external hard drive. Upon travelling to Kigali and obtaining the interview data from the Kigali Memorial Center, I also stored the Rwandan interviews on a secure laptop computer and external hard drive. Both sources of data are password protected, and they will be removed from the computer following completion of the dissertation. I used the qualitative software package MAXQDA to manage and analyze the data. To maximize the protection of the survivors and their families, the data was anonymized by generating codes for each interview before it was imported to the software. Survivors will not be identified in the dissertation or any resulting publications. IRB approval was received on July 10, 2012.
CHAPTER 4:
QUANTITATIVE RESULTS: NATURE AND EXTENT OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE
ACCORDING TO SURVIVOR INTERVIEWS

This chapter addresses the study’s first research question: How and to what extent is sexual violence a part of the narratives of survivors of the Armenian genocide of 1915-1923, survivors of the Rwandan genocide of 1994, and across these two cases of genocide? Discussion of the results pertaining to this question will proceed in two stages. In this chapter, I present frequencies and descriptive statistics based on quantitative coding of discussions of sexual violence to describe the extent to which sexual violence is included in the narratives of survivors of the Armenian and Rwandan genocides. In the next chapter, I present results based on qualitative analysis of how sexual violence was discussed in these narratives.

Unit of Analysis

There were several considerations when deciding upon the unit of analysis for the quantitative portion of this study. I considered using survivors, victims, experiences of sexual violence, and discussions of sexual violence all as units of analysis. Using the survivor (each interviewee) as a unit of analysis would have resulted in a very small sample size because although many survivors in my sample discussed sexual violence, they did not necessarily personally experience it. Instead, I considered using the victim as the unit of analysis, but this presented other problems. Many times, one victim experienced multiple types and instances of sexual violence. It seemed problematic not to record all of the information about sexual violence when using the victim as the unit of analysis instead of the experience. For example, while I could record all the different types of sexual violence experienced by a given person, I could not
record any of the contextual information this way, and it also would be unclear whether different types of sexual violence happened together or in different instances. Utilizing experiences of sexual violence as the unit of analysis addressed these concerns, but raised others. Namely, there were issues with the level of specificity in survivor narratives. Sometimes it was unclear whether the survivors were discussing an experience of sexual violence that had already been mentioned or whether they were discussing a new event. With discussions of sexual violence as the unit of analysis, I was able to maintain the most information from survivor narratives, as well as get a sense of how survivors spoke about sexual violence.

Given the focus of my dissertation being on survivor narratives of sexual violence in genocide, and given the biases in my samples, I know I cannot provide an accurate quantitative estimate regarding the extent of sexual violence in these genocides, but I can provide an accurate representation of how sexual violence is discussed by survivors. With this in mind, below I provide results at two different levels of analysis. First, using the individual as the unit of analysis, I answer questions about how many survivors in my sample discussed sexual violence and how many victims of sexual violence were found in my data. It is important to remember that survivors spoke about experiences with sexual violence other than their own; therefore, I use the term “survivor” to refer to the interviewee and the term “victim” to refer to the victim of sexual violence, as these individuals are not necessarily the same person. Next, I answer questions about how survivors discussed sexual violence by utilizing discussions of sexual violence as the unit of analysis. To be clear, with discussions of sexual violence as the unit of analysis, I am only analyzing data from those survivors who included sexual violence in their narrative.
Who Discussed Sexual Violence?

To address this question, the survivor (i.e. interviewee) is the unit of analysis. I examined this question in the overall sample as well as in male and female subsamples. Overall, 54% (n=97) of survivors discussed sexual violence at least once in their genocide narratives. Approximately 56.7% (n=59) of Armenian survivors and 49.3% (n=37) of Rwandan survivors discussed sexual violence in their interviews. In terms of gender, across both genocides, 57.4% (n=54) of females and 49.4% (n=42) of males discussed sexual violence. In the Armenian interviews, 59.3% (n=32) of females and 54.0% (n=27) of males discussed sexual violence. In the Rwandan interviews, 55.0% (n=22) of females and 42.9% (n=15) of males discussed sexual violence. A breakdown of who in the total sample discussed sexual violence can be seen in Table 4.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genocide</th>
<th>% Total Sample</th>
<th>% Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>56.7 (59)</td>
<td>59.3 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwandan</td>
<td>49.3 (37)</td>
<td>55.0 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Sample</td>
<td>54.0 (96)</td>
<td>57.4 (54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=96 (instead of 97) here because one interview in the Rwandan sample was a group interview with two male and one female survivors. Sexual violence was discussed in the interview, but it was not clear who was speaking at that point in the transcript.

We can also examine gender in terms of only those individuals who discussed sexual violence. Of those individuals who discussed sexual violence in both cases, 57.4% (n=54) were female and 43.3% (n=42) were male. Of those individuals who discussed sexual violence in the Armenian genocide, 54.2% (n=32) were female and 45.8% (n=27) were male. In the Rwandan genocide,
sample, of those individuals who discussed sexual violence, 59.5% (n=22) were female and 40.5% (n=15) were male. Table 4.2 presents information about those survivors who discussed sexual violence, broken down by gender and genocide.

Table 4.2: Survivors Who Discussed Sexual Violence, by Gender and Genocide (N=96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genocide</th>
<th>% Male</th>
<th>% Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>45.8 (27)</td>
<td>54.2 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwandan</td>
<td>40.5 (15)</td>
<td>59.5 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43.3 (42)</td>
<td>57.4 (54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As in Table 4.1, N=96 (instead of 97) here because one interview in the Rwandan sample was a group interview with two male and one female survivors. Sexual violence was discussed in the interview, but it was not clear who was speaking at that point in the transcript.

How Many Victims of Sexual Violence Were Identified in the Data?

Survivors spoke not only about their own experiences with sexual violence, but also the experiences of others. In some cases, they spoke about the victimization of individuals, and in other cases, they spoke about group victimization. In order to examine how many victims of sexual violence were identified in the data, it was necessary to break the sample of victims down into individual versus group victims.

To examine how many individual victims of sexual violence were identified in these survivor narratives, individual victims (not to be confused with survivors/interviewees) are the unit of analysis in Table 4.3. Across both cases of genocide, there were 119 individual victims of sexual violence identified. As might be expected, most of these 119 victims were female.

---

8 Note that survivors could identify more than one victim of sexual violence in their narrative. As illustrated in Table 4.1, these 119 victims were identified across 97 interviews.
 Armenian survivors identified 68 individual victims (61 females, 7 males), and Rwandan survivors identified 51 individual victims (45 females, 6 males).

Table 4.3: Individual Victims of Sexual Violence, by Gender and Genocide (N=119)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genocide</th>
<th>% Male</th>
<th>% Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>10.3 (7)</td>
<td>89.7 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwandan</td>
<td>11.8 (6)</td>
<td>88.2 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.9 (13)</td>
<td>89.1 (106)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survivors spoke about the victimization of three types of groups. It was common for survivors to discuss the victimization of groups in general (e.g. “women were raped” or “people were sexually mutilated”). General statements such as these were distinguished from sexual violence against specific groups, whether or not the group included the survivor (e.g. “We were forced to take our clothes off.” vs. “They were forced to take their clothes off.”)

**Who Were the Most Common Victims of Sexual Violence in Survivor Discussions?**

In the question above, victims were the unit of analysis, which allows us to have some idea about the characteristics of victims in this data. Here, I examine discussions of sexual violence as the unit of analysis to provide information about what types of victims were discussed by survivors most. That is, what were the characteristics of the most common victims in survivor narratives of sexual violence in the Armenian and Rwandan genocides?

Overall, the most frequently discussed victims of sexual violence were groups in general (see Table 4.4). Again, this refers to discussions of sexual violence where the survivor speaks in
general terms (e.g. “Women were raped.”) (33.6%, n=98). As with the analysis above, this indicates that although an individual may not personally have experienced sexual violence, it is still a salient part of the genocide experience and thus is included in narratives of the genocide that are meant to preserve history for future generations. Following general discussions, discussions of personal experiences of sexual violence were the next frequently discussed (21.2%, n=62). In other words, 21.2% of the sample experienced sexual violence.

Table 4.4: Victims of Sexual Violence, by Genocide (N=292)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim Type</th>
<th>Genocide</th>
<th>Armenian % (n)</th>
<th>Rwandan % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survivor</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>7.0 (11)</td>
<td>38.1 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>5.7 (9)</td>
<td>1.5 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>5.7 (9)</td>
<td>6.7 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relative</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>13.3 (21)</td>
<td>2.9 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend/neighbor</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>8.2 (13)</td>
<td>10.0 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown individual</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>8.2 (13)</td>
<td>8.2 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (survivor included)</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>3.2 (5)</td>
<td>2.2 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (survivor not</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>3.8 (6)</td>
<td>10.4 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>included)</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (in general)</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>45.6 (72)</td>
<td>19.4 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>100.0 (159)</td>
<td>100.0 (133)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 also presents the victims of sexual violence for each case. In Armenian interviews, a group in general was the victim in 45.6% (n=72) of discussions, and in the Rwandan interviews, a group in general was the victim in 19.4% (n=26) of discussions. In the
Armenian interviews, this is followed by discussions of other relatives (13.3%, n=21) and then friends/neighbors (8.2%, n=13) or unknown individuals (8.2%, n=13) experiencing sexual violence. In the Rwandan narratives, the most commonly discussed victim of sexual violence was the survivor (38.1%, n=51). Personal experiences with sexual violence may be more common among Rwandan survivors due to age differences between the survivors in each sample at the time of the genocides. Armenian survivors were generally very young at the time of the genocide and may have been less likely to experience sexual violence as result. The fact that personal experiences with sexual violence were very commonly discussed in Rwandan narratives also indicates that the Rwandan data is likely driving the overall pattern. Discussions in which the survivor was the victim of sexual violence in the Rwandan sample were followed by discussions in which a group in general was victimized (19.4%, n=26), followed by discussions in which friends or neighbors (8.9%, n=26), other relatives (8.6%, n=25), and unknown individuals (8.2%, n=24) were the victims.

As described above, survivors sometimes discussed the victimization of individuals and sometimes discussed the victimization of groups. To examine the gender of victims of sexual violence in these discussions, I also distinguished between individual and group victims. Table 4.5 presents victim gender by genocide for individual victims and Table 4.6 presents victim gender by genocide for group victimization. The units of analysis in both of these tables remain discussions of sexual violence, as I am analyzing which victims were most commonly spoken about. Given the gendered nature of sexual violence, it is not surprising that survivors across both cases of genocide overwhelmingly spoke of female victims of sexual violence (whether the victim was an individual or a group).
Table 4.5: Victim Gender (Individual), by Genocide (N=167)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genocide</th>
<th>% Male (n)</th>
<th>% Female (n)</th>
<th>% Total (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>9.2 (7)</td>
<td>90.8 (69)</td>
<td>100.0 (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwandan</td>
<td>8.8 (8)</td>
<td>91.2 (83)</td>
<td>100.0 (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.0 (15)</td>
<td>91.0 (152)</td>
<td>100.0 (167)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Victim Gender (Group), by Genocide (N=122)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genocide</th>
<th>% Male (n)</th>
<th>% Female (n)</th>
<th>% Mixed (n)</th>
<th>% Total (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>4.9 (4)</td>
<td>90.2 (74)</td>
<td>4.9 (4)</td>
<td>100.0 (82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwandan</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>87.5 (35)</td>
<td>12.5 (5)</td>
<td>100.0 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.3 (4)</td>
<td>89.3 (109)</td>
<td>7.4 (9)</td>
<td>100.0 (122)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Types of Experiences With Sexual Violence Were Discussed?

As mentioned above, not all of the experiences of sexual violence discussed in the interviews were firsthand experiences (i.e. experienced directly by the survivor sharing his or her narrative). In addition to discussions of personal victimization by sexual violence, survivors also discussed sexual violence that they witnessed and sexual violence that they heard about. Individuals also spoke about sexual violence that they were not certain had occurred, but that they presumed had taken place. For example, a survivor might say something like “I am sure he raped her,” even though s/he did not hear about this happening or witness it occurring. In these cases, we do not know whether the sexual violence actually occurred, but it is the survivor’s assumption that it did. Some survivors also spoke about sexual violence that they had anticipated personally experiencing. For instance, a survivor might state that she hid herself because she knew the men would rape her. In these situations, the sexual violence did not take place, but the survivor felt that it was imminent. The breakdown of the type of sexual violence
experiences discussed in each case can be seen in Table 4.7. Again, the unit of analysis here is discussions of sexual violence.

Across both cases of genocide, witnessed sexual violence was discussed the most across all survivors (49.0%, n=143). Discussions of witnessed violence were followed in frequency by discussions of violence that was personally experienced (21.6%, n=63) or violence that was heard about (21.6%, n=63). Presumed (3.1%, n=9) and anticipated (4.1%, n=12) violence made up relatively small proportions of discussions of sexual violence. As in the analysis above, the high frequencies of discussions of witnessed violence and violence that was heard about from others indicate that although an individual may not personally experience sexual violence, it is still a salient part of their genocide experience, and it becomes part of their personal narrative of having experienced the genocide.
Table 4.7: Type of Sexual Violence Experience, by Genocide (N=292)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genocide</th>
<th>% Firsthand (n)</th>
<th>% Heard (n)</th>
<th>% Witnessed (n)</th>
<th>% Presumed (n)</th>
<th>% Anticipated (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>7.5 (12)</td>
<td>17.0 (27)</td>
<td>65.4 (104)</td>
<td>3.8 (6)</td>
<td>6.3 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwandan</td>
<td>39.1 (52)</td>
<td>27.8 (37)</td>
<td>29.3 (39)</td>
<td>2.3 (3)</td>
<td>1.5 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.6 (63)</td>
<td>21.6 (63)</td>
<td>49.0 (143)</td>
<td>3.1 (9)</td>
<td>4.1 (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When looking at type of experience across the two cases of genocide, the pattern for the Armenian genocide is similar to the overall pattern. Armenian survivors most frequently discussed witnessed violence (65.4%, n=104), followed by sexual violence that was heard about (17.0%, n=27). Fewer survivors discussed sexual violence that was personally experienced (7.5%, n=12). In the Armenian case, it was almost as common to speak about sexual violence that was anticipated (6.3%, n=10) as sexual violence that was personally experienced.

In the Rwandan case, on the other hand, the most commonly discussed experiences of sexual violence were firsthand experiences of the survivors themselves (39.1%, n=52). This was followed by discussions of witnessed sexual violence (29.3%, n=39) and sexual violence experiences that were heard about from others (27.8%, n=37). Anticipated sexual violence
was only discussed twice (1.5%) in the Rwandan interviews. Differences in these patterns could be due to the fact that Armenian survivors were generally much younger at the time of the genocide than Rwandan survivors, and they may have been less likely to personally experience sexual violence as a result. It is also possible that Rwandan survivors were more likely to have personally experienced more serious forms of sexual violence than Armenian survivors. These discussions of personal experiences with sexual violence do not necessarily reflect actual patterns of victimization in the genocides, however. For example, many Armenian women who were forcibly married never escaped Turkey, and therefore, were not part of this interview sample.

What Types of Sexual Violence Were Discussed?

When examining types of sexual violence discussed in these narratives, it made sense not only to code for specific types of sexual violence, but also to create more general categories. In particular, I thought it was important to distinguish between types of sexual violence requiring physical contact versus those not necessarily requiring physical contact. For example, harassment and threatened violence do not necessarily involve physical contact, and forced nudity often did not involve physical contact either, but rather coercion or threats. I chose to code in terms of whether a particular type of violence required physical contact, rather than in terms of whether physical contact was actually made, as this was not always clear from the narratives. Table 4.8 presents frequencies for both specific types of sexual violence and general categories of sexual violence based on the requirement of physical contact. Vague references to sexual violence were coded as neither requiring nor not requiring physical contact, as this was not discernible from the narratives. Distinguishing among forms of sexual violence based on a requirement of physical contact is important because it has implications for the definition of
sexual violence in international law (i.e. should it be broad and inclusive of acts that do not require contact, such as harassment? Or should it be narrower and include only acts that are physically violent?). Examining survivor narratives can help us to understand how individuals who personally experienced and witnessed these types of victimization define the phenomenon of sexual violence.

Some of the types of sexual violence in Table 4.8 require a certain level of clarification before I present results. While some of the types of sexual violence have extremely low frequencies and some categories might have been easily combined, I believe it was important to maintain separate categories that indicate coding decisions made throughout the analysis process. First, I coded instances where individuals were assaulted in a sexual nature (e.g. a woman’s breasts were beaten) as molestation. I did not have an “assault” category, as I felt such a category would be extremely broad and overlap considerably with other categories. I would also like to note that the mutilation category includes instances of forced circumcision, which occurred in the Armenian genocide. The categories of rape and gang rape could be combined, which would cause rape to constitute an even larger proportion of discussions of sexual violence (29.6%, n=86). But, in some discussions of rape, it was difficult to determine whether a single perpetrator or multiple perpetrators committed the violence. I only coded gang rape in the case where survivors explicitly stated that the rape was committed by multiple perpetrators, but this kind of explicit discussion was rare (an observation that I believe is important in its own right). Similarly, forced marriage and sexual slavery are two other categories that might easily be collapsed into one, since forced marriage often encompassed or implied sexual slavery. I only coded for forced marriage when the terms marriage or husband or wife were actually used, and I coded for sexual slavery otherwise. Similarly, although the word “taken” was used to mean both
kidnapped into forced marriage and raped, I only coded for taken when that specific term was used. I believe that maintaining these distinctions is useful in terms of how sexual slavery (as the broader category) was discussed.

It is also important to remember that discussions of sexual violence are the unit of analysis here. This means that the data in this analysis only comes from survivors who discussed sexual violence at least once in their interviews. However, we cannot overlook that some survivors spoke about sexual violence with a much higher frequency than others. For instance, one Rwandan survivor who was held in sexual slavery and also witnessed sexual violence against others discussed sexual violence over 30 times. This particular survivor experienced rape on a regular basis, and her high frequency of discussions of rape could make it appear that rape was discussed more frequently across interviews than it actually was discussed. It is important to keep in mind, then, that the number of discussions here may be driven by a small number of interviews. To address this issue, I included a column in Table 4.8 to indicate the number of survivors who discussed each type of sexual violence. If this number is very small and the number of discussions is very high, then the number of discussions is being driven by a small number of participants.
Table 4.8: Type of Sexual Violence, by Genocide and Physical Contact (N=218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sexual Violence</th>
<th>Armenian % (n)</th>
<th>Rwandan % (n)</th>
<th>Total % (n)</th>
<th># Respondents Per Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>11.3 (19)</td>
<td>39.0 (60)</td>
<td>24.5 (79)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang rape</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>4.5 (7)</td>
<td>2.2 (7)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral sex</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.6 (1)</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molestation</td>
<td>3.0 (5)</td>
<td>3.2 (5)</td>
<td>3.1 (10)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutilation</td>
<td>3.6 (6)</td>
<td>7.1 (11)</td>
<td>5.3 (17)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced marriage</td>
<td>29.2 (49)</td>
<td>4.5 (7)</td>
<td>17.4 (56)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken</td>
<td>22.0 (37)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>11.5 (37)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual slavery</td>
<td>0.6 (1)</td>
<td>4.5 (7)</td>
<td>2.5 (8)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced Abortion</td>
<td>1.8 (3)</td>
<td>3.2 (5)</td>
<td>2.5 (8)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SV requiring physical contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>71.5 (120)</th>
<th>66.6 (103)</th>
<th>69.3 (223)</th>
<th>140</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>2.4 (4)</td>
<td>1.3 (2)</td>
<td>1.9 (6)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>5.4 (9)</td>
<td>11.0 (17)</td>
<td>8.1 (26)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nudity</td>
<td>11.3 (19)</td>
<td>17.5 (27)</td>
<td>14.3 (46)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SV not requiring physical contact

|                       | 19.1 (32)  | 29.8 (46)  | 24.3 (78)  | 60  |

Vague Reference to SV

|                       | 9.5 (16)   | 3.2 (5)    | 6.5 (21)   | 18  |

Note: The totals for each genocide in this table are greater than the total number of discussions for each genocide seen in Table 4.4 (N=159 and N=133, respectively). This is because each discussion of sexual violence might contain information about multiple types of sexual violence. For instance, if someone discussed their sister being harassed and subsequently raped, this is coded as one discussion and two types of sexual violence. Therefore, this table presents proportions and frequencies of references to sexual violence, and there may be more than one reference to sexual violence per discussion of sexual violence.

*Recall that the total number of survivors who discussed sexual violence is 97; however, this is not the same as the column total here because survivors may appear in more than one row if they discussed multiple types of sexual violence in their interviews.
In terms of specific forms of sexual violence, rape was discussed most frequently overall, being present in nearly one-quarter of all discussions of sexual violence (24.5%, n=79). Rape was followed by forced marriage (17.4%, n=56) and forced nudity (14.3%, n=46). Overall, the least common types of sexual violence discussed were oral sex, harassment, abortion, and sexual slavery.

Table 4.8 also shows discussions of types of sexual violence by genocide. Forced marriage constitutes almost one-third (29.2%, n=49) of all discussions of sexual violence by Armenian survivors, with “taken” being the next most frequently discussed (22.0%, n=37). Taken was used to refer to being raped and returned or to being taken into forced marriage. Rape (11.3%, n=19) and forced nudity (11.3%, n=19) are the next most commonly discussed types of sexual violence in the Armenian dataset, followed closely by vague references to sexual violence (9.5%, n=16) that were not sufficiently descriptive to code as a given type.

Rwandan discussions of sexual violence were much more frequently about rape (39.0%, n=60) than Armenian discussions. The next most common type of sexual violence discussed in the Rwandan interviews was forced nudity (17.5%, n=27), followed by threatened sexual violence (11.0%, n=17).

The differences across cases in types of sexual violence discussed may be due to several circumstances. As mentioned previously, it is possible that the high frequency of rape discussions in the Rwandan data may be driven by a small number of survivors who experienced repeated serious forms of sexual violence, including rape. It is likely that victims of the Armenian genocide who experienced rape were less likely to be included in my survivor sample, either because they did not escape Turkey following the genocide, they did not survive the genocide, or they did not survive long enough to be interviewed. It is also quite possible that
there were different norms regarding discussing sexual violence at the times of these oral history projects. The Armenian interviews were collected in the 1970s and 1980s, when it was considered less acceptable and more taboo to discuss sexual violence than it may have been at the time of the Rwandan interviews in the early 2000s and beyond. Of course, it is also always possible that the frequency of discussions of sexual violence actually reflect the salience of various types of sexual violence in these survivors’ memories of the events.

Overall, discussions of sexual violence were much more frequently about types of sexual violence requiring physical contact (69.3%, n=223) than types of sexual violence not requiring contact (24.3%, n=78). This pattern is true in both the Armenian and Rwandan cases. Although forms of sexual violence that do not require physical contact were discussed less frequently overall, they were still a salient part of the genocide experience in both cases, representing nearly one-quarter (24.3%) of all discussions of sexual violence. They made up 19.1% of Armenian discussions of sexual violence and 29.8% of Rwandan discussions of sexual violence. These discussions of non-physical forms of sexual violence have implications for the definition of sexual violence in international law (i.e. perhaps it should be broad and inclusive of acts that do not require contact rather than being narrow and including only acts that are physically violent) that will be addressed in more detail in the discussion section.

In addition to examining individual types of sexual violence, I also examined multiple forms of victimization. As mentioned above, it is possible that a discussion of sexual violence included more than one form of victimization (for example, if a victim experienced more than one form of sexual victimization at the same time or experienced multiple forms of sexual victimization one after the other). Table 4.9 and Table 4.10 present the results for this analysis. Although the numbers are relatively small in any given cell, these tables give us some idea which
types of sexual violence were discussed together, and in turn, which types of sexual violence may have co-occurred in these genocides.
Table 4.9: Multiple Forms of Sexual Violence in a Single Discussion (total sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1=rape, 2=gang rape, 3=oral sex, 4=molestation, 5=mutilation, 6=forced marriage, 7=taken, 8=sexual slavery, 9=abortion, 10=harassment, 11=threatened sexual violence, 12=forced nudity, 13=vague reference to sexual violence
Table 4.10: Multiple Forms of Sexual Violence in a Single Discussion, by Genocide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Armenian genocide is above the diagonal, Rwandan genocide is below the diagonal. 1=rape, 2=gang rape, 3=oral sex, 4=molestation, 5=mutilation, 6=forced marriage, 7=taken, 8=sexual slavery, 9=abortion, 10=harassment, 11=threatened sexual violence, 12=nudity, 13=vague reference to sexual violence
In Table 4.9, we see that across both cases, the forms of victimization that are most frequently discussed together are forced marriage and rape (n=4), forced marriage and being “taken” (n=4), mutilation and forced abortion (n=3), and molestation and nudity (n=3). In Table 4.10, frequencies of multiple forms of victimization from Armenian interviews are presented above the diagonal and frequencies of multiple forms of victimization from the Rwandan interviews are presented below the diagonal. In the Armenian interviews, forced marriage and being “taken” were most frequently discussed together (n=4). In the Rwandan interviews, mutilation and forced abortion were most frequently discussed together (n=3). It is clear that these results were driving the findings above presented across cases. These relationships are examined more in depth in the qualitative analysis in the next chapter.

**Do the Types of Violence Discussed Vary by the Experience of the Survivors?**

Below, Table 4.11 illustrates the distribution of discussions of each type of sexual violence across the type of experiences (firsthand, heard about, witnessed, presumed, and anticipated). The unit of analysis here is discussions of sexual violence, but again, I included a column with the number of survivors who discussed each type of sexual violence to indicate if results might be driven by a small number of respondents. This analysis shows that, while some forms of sexual violence are discussed relatively equally across experience type (e.g. rape), many other forms of sexual violence (e.g. mutilation, forced marriage, abortion, nudity, and “taken”) were much more likely to be discussed as types of sexual violence that were witnessed rather than heard about or personally experienced.
Table 4.11: Type of Sexual Violence Discussed, by Type of Experience (N=322)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Experience</th>
<th>Type of SV</th>
<th>% Firsthand</th>
<th>% Heard</th>
<th>% Witnessed</th>
<th>% Presumed</th>
<th>% Anticipated</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vague</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5 (2)</td>
<td>19.0 (4)</td>
<td>33.3 (7)</td>
<td>14.3 (3)</td>
<td>23.8 (5)</td>
<td>100.0 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.0 (19)</td>
<td>32.9 (26)</td>
<td>32.9 (26)</td>
<td>6.3 (5)</td>
<td>2.5 (2)</td>
<td>100.0 (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang rape</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1 (4)</td>
<td>14.3 (1)</td>
<td>28.6 (2)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>100.0 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>100.0 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molestation</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0 (5)</td>
<td>10.0 (1)</td>
<td>40.0 (4)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>100.0 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutilation</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.6 (3)</td>
<td>5.9 (1)</td>
<td>76.5 (13)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>100.0 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frctd Mrg</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4 (4)</td>
<td>24.1 (13)</td>
<td>61.1 (33)</td>
<td>1.9 (1)</td>
<td>9.3 (5)</td>
<td>100.0 (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex slavery</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0 (4)</td>
<td>12.5 (1)</td>
<td>25.0 (2)</td>
<td>12.5 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>100.0 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>12.5 (1)</td>
<td>87.5 (7)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>100.0 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3 (2)</td>
<td>33.3 (2)</td>
<td>33.3 (2)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>100.0 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0 (13)</td>
<td>19.2 (2)</td>
<td>30.8 (2)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>100.0 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nudity</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.4 (14)</td>
<td>13.0 (5)</td>
<td>54.3 (25)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>100.0 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7 (1)</td>
<td>13.5 (5)</td>
<td>78.4 (29)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>5.4 (2)</td>
<td>100.0 (37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As in Table 4.6, the total N in this table is greater than the total number of discussions (N=292). This is because each discussion of sexual violence might contain information about multiple types of sexual violence. For instance, if someone discussed their sister being harassed and subsequently raped, this is coded as one discussion and two types of sexual violence. Therefore, this table presents proportions and frequencies of references to sexual violence, and there may be more than one reference to sexual violence per discussion of sexual violence. *Number of Respondents per row
Do Men and Women Discuss Different Types of Sexual Violence or Different Types of Experiences With Sexual Violence?

To answer this question, the unit of analysis is discussions of sexual violence. Overall, discussions of sexual violence by men were most frequently about forced marriage (30.9%, n=29), followed by rape (16.0%, n=15), and “taken” (16.0%, n=15). In contrast, the most frequently discussed type of sexual violence by women was rape (32.3%, n=64), followed by forced nudity (16.2%, n=32) and forced marriage (13.6%, n=27). Women discussed rape and threatened violence twice as often as men. These data can be seen in 4.12 below. As with previous tables, I have included a column indicating the number of survivors who discussed a particular type of sexual violence to identify instances in which a small number of survivors may be driving the results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of SV</th>
<th>Men % (n)</th>
<th>Women % (n)</th>
<th># Respondents Per Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vague</td>
<td>6.4 (6)</td>
<td>7.6 (15)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>16.0 (15)</td>
<td>32.3 (64)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang rape</td>
<td>1.1 (1)</td>
<td>3.0 (6)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral sex</td>
<td>1.1 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molestation</td>
<td>2.1 (2)</td>
<td>4.0 (8)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutilation</td>
<td>5.3 (5)</td>
<td>6.0 (12)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced marriage</td>
<td>30.9 (29)</td>
<td>13.6 (27)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual slavery</td>
<td>2.1 (2)</td>
<td>3.0 (6)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>5.3 (5)</td>
<td>1.5 (3)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>2.1 (2)</td>
<td>2.0 (4)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>5.3 (5)</td>
<td>10.6 (21)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nudity</td>
<td>14.9 (14)</td>
<td>16.2 (32)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken</td>
<td>16.0 (15)</td>
<td>11.1 (22)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 (94)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 (198)</strong></td>
<td><strong>218</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recall that the total number of survivors who discussed sexual violence is 97; however, this is not the same as the column total here because survivors may appear in more than one row if they discussed multiple types of sexual violence in their interviews.
In terms of experiences with sexual violence, discussions of sexual violence by men (63.8%, n=60) and women (41.9%, n=83) were most frequently about witnessed violence. Not surprisingly, discussions of sexual violence by women were more frequently firsthand experiences (25.3%, n=50) than men’s (13.8%, n=13). See Table 4.13 below for a complete breakdown of type of sexual violence experience discussed by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Experience</th>
<th>Men % (n)</th>
<th>Women % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firsthand</td>
<td>13.8 (13)</td>
<td>25.3 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard</td>
<td>16.0 (15)</td>
<td>24.2 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed</td>
<td>63.8 (60)</td>
<td>41.9 (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presumed</td>
<td>2.1 (2)</td>
<td>3.5 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated</td>
<td>4.3 (4)</td>
<td>4.0 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vague</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>1.0 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 (94)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 (198)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

This chapter used quantitative data gathered from interviews with survivors to address the question “How and to what extent is sexual violence a part of the narratives of survivors?” Results of this analysis illustrate the gendered nature of sexual violence not only in general, but specifically in genocide. More than half (54%, n=97) of the survivors in my sample discussed sexual violence, with females (57.4%, n=54) discussing sexual violence more frequently than males (49.4%, n=42). In addition, survivors recall sexual violence as a phenomenon that impacted an entire gender group. In the overall analysis, as well as in both genocides, the most
frequently discussed victim of sexual violence was a general group, such as “girls” or “women.” When individual victims of sexual violence were described, these victims were also women in the majority of discussions.

An examination of the types of sexual violence present in survivor discussions provides yet another illustration of the gendered nature of sexual violence. Women discussed rape and threatened sexual violence twice as often as men. Men more frequently discussed forced marriage and women being “taken.” This speaks to the gendered nature of sexual violence in the context of genocide, as the coercive environment of genocide means a constant threat of sexual violence for women. Female survivors discuss this threat of violence, as well as the most commonly thought of, or most salient form of sexual violence (rape), twice as frequently as men do when presenting their genocide narrative. These results support Derderian’s (2005) work on the Armenian genocide, in which she concludes that sexual violence and intimidation of women were present at all stages of the genocide. Men’s discussions of forced marriage and women being “taken” also speak to the gendered nature of sexual violence, but in a different way.

Although it is not explicitly stated, the frequency of these discussions may be an indication of emasculation, where the men of the victim group felt that they could not protect their women from (quite literally) being taken from them. In her Shattered Lives report on the Rwandan genocide for Human Rights Watch Africa, Nowrojee (1996) states:

> Being female is a risk factor; women and girls are often targeted for sexual abuse on the basis of their gender, irrespective of their age, ethnicity or political affiliation. Rape in conflict is also used as a weapon to terrorize and degrade a particular community and to achieve a specific political end. In these situations, gender intersects with other aspects of a woman's identity such as ethnicity, religion, social class or political affiliation. The humiliation, pain and terror inflicted by the rapist is meant to degrade not just the individual woman but also to strip the humanity from the larger group of which she is a part. (p. 2)
She illustrates how sexual violence, a crime primarily against an individual, also has the potential to harm an entire ethnic or social group. Nowrojee’s statement supports the idea that discussions of sexual violence by individuals who did not personally experience it may be an indication of a broader harm.

In fact, in addition to the gendered nature of sexual violence, one message that may be taken away from comparing sexual violence in narratives of these two genocides is that it is necessary to maintain a broad definition of sexual violence in international law. The ICTR considered sexual violence (which includes rape):

> as any act of a sexual nature which is committed on a person under circumstances which are coercive. Sexual violence is not limited to physical invasion of the human body and may include acts which do not involve penetration or even physical contact ("Prosecuter v. Jean Paul Akayesu," 1998, Paragraphs 598, 688).

This definition is broader than many other definitions of sexual violence (such as those definitions utilized in the ICTY), which may require physical penetration or require lack of victim consent. The International Criminal Court (ICC), which represents the future of international law for genocide trials, only defines sexual violence under its war crimes (Article 7(1)(g)-6) and crimes against humanity (Articles 8(2)(b)(xxii)-6 and 8(2)(e)(vi)-6) statutes, stating

> The perpetrator committed an act of a sexual nature against one or more persons or caused such person or persons to engage in an act of a sexual nature by force, or by threat of force or coercion, such as that caused by fear of violence, duress, detention, psychological oppression or abuse of power, against such person or persons or another person, or by taking advantage of a coercive environment or such person’s or persons’ incapacity to give genuine consent (United Nations, 2011).

Like the definition from the ICTR, the ICC’s definition of sexual violence is broad in that it defines sexual violence as an act occurring in a coercive environment. However, unlike the ICTR, the ICC does not specifically state that acts of a sexual nature do not necessarily involve
physical contact. Despite the fact that the ICTY took a more narrow approach to defining sexual violence, forced nudity was found to constitute the crime of sexual violence in both the tribunals for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia, as it involved “abuses of a sexual nature inflicted upon the physical and moral integrity of a person by means of coercion, threat of force, or intimidation in such a way that is degrading and humiliating for the victims’ dignity” ("Prosecutor vs. Furundža," 1997, Paragraph 186).

The present analysis supports maintaining the definition of sexual violence established by the ICTR and building upon case law that recognizes the broad and far-reaching consequences of sexual violence. According to the definition of the ICTR and the logic of the Furundža case of the ICTY, certain methods of dehumanization, such as verbal assaults, harassment, and even witnessing violence, may also qualify as forms of sexual violence if they are of a sexual nature. My results indicate that although forms of sexual violence that do not require physical contact were discussed less frequently than forms of sexual violence requiring physical contact, they were still a salient part of the genocide experience in both the Armenian and Rwandan genocides. Sexual violence experiences that did not necessarily require physical contact represented nearly one-quarter (24.3%) of all discussions of sexual violence across interviews from both cases. In a “continuum” theory of sexual violence, which is often used to describe rape culture, each individual rape is viewed as comprising various stages, including verbal threats and other forms of action and harassment leading up to rape (Madorossian, 2002). While some argue that a continuum of sexual violence links language and rape in a way in which obscene remarks, threats, and other forms of harassment are equivalent to rape (Marcus, 1992), in a true continuum, there is time and space between these various actions, although the earlier forms of violence are not necessarily taken as “lesser” forms of violence. The high frequency of
discussions of non-physical forms of sexual violence in these interviews support the idea that these types of violence also have lasting effects.

Secondary exposure to sexual violence, whether it be through actually witnessing sexual violence or hearing about it taking place, was also quite common across both cases. Across both genocides, nearly half (49.0%) of all discussions of sexual violence were about witnessed violence and nearly a quarter (21.6%) of all discussions of sexual violence were about sexual violence that had been heard about from others. Following the definition from the ICTR, secondary exposure to sexual violence may be a form of “double victimization,” in which sexual violence is inflicted upon two separate parties in the course of one sexual act. The primary victim experienced an act of sexual violence, and a second victim was forced to witness or hear about this act of sexual violence under the coercive circumstances of the genocide. The manner in which being exposed to sexual violence impacted these secondary victims will be discussed in the following chapter. The comparison of sexual violence in narratives of the Armenian and Rwandan genocides, two cases that differ across time and place, indicates that although a broad definition of sexual violence was an outcome of the Rwandan tribunals, such a definition can apply more widely to other cases of genocide and should be adopted by the ICC.

While there are similarities in narratives from the Armenian and Rwandan genocides, there are differences across these two cases that also warrant discussion. One difference between the Armenian and Rwandan interviews is the frequency of discussion of personal victimization. In the Armenian interviews, survivors commonly discussed the sexual victimization of individuals they knew, including relatives and friends or neighbors, whereas in the Rwandan interviews, survivors more commonly described firsthand experiences of personal victimization. This difference may be due to the fact that most of the Armenian survivors were quite young at
the time of the genocide, and were therefore less likely to personally experience sexual violence. It is also possible that with greater time having passed since the genocide, Armenian survivors had more time to learn about the victimization of others.

The types of sexual violence discussed across the two cases of genocide also differ. Rwandan survivors more frequently discussed rape than Armenian survivors. In contrast, survivors of the Armenian genocide were more likely to discuss forced marriage or women being “taken.” This difference may not represent actual differences in frequencies of these types of victimization across the two genocides, but may be due to other factors. First, it is possible that explicitly discussing sexual violence (such as rape) may have been less socially acceptable at the time the Armenian interviews were conducted. It is also possible that when Armenian survivors discussed forced marriage or women being “taken,” rape and other forms of sexual violence were implied. This will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter, under concurrent victimization.
CHAPTER 5:
QUALITATIVE RESULTS: NATURE AND EXTENT OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE
ACCORDING TO SURVIVOR INTERVIEWS

Although the quantitative results presented in the previous chapter give us some information about the extent to which sexual violence is a part of the narratives of Armenian and Rwandan genocide survivors, these results do not present a complete picture. This section presents qualitative results that go beyond the previous quantitative analysis to address not only the extent to which sexual violence is a part of the narratives of survivors of the Armenian genocide of 1915-1923, survivors of the Rwandan genocide of 1994, and across these two cases of genocide, but also how sexual violence is included in these narratives. This qualitative analysis for research question one examines the salience of sexual violence as an overall theme in survivor narratives and also identifies additional themes in survivor descriptions of sexual violence.

Salience of Sexual Violence as an Overall Theme

Beyond analyzing frequencies, I also examined how salient a theme sexual violence is in these interviews -- that is, do the discussions include only general, passing statements about sexual violence, or do they include in-depth descriptions?

Overall, discussions of sexual violence in the Armenian interviews are much more general than those in the Rwandan interviews. This difference could certainly be expected due to a number of factors, including the passage of time and the norms at the time of the genocide and at the time of the interviews. The Armenian genocide began in 1915 and interviews were conducted in the 1970s and 1980s, whereas the Rwandan genocide took place much more recently, in 1994, and interviews took place from 2004 to 2011. It is possible that in many more
years, the Rwandan survivors will also come to describe their experiences in much more general
terms, rather than describing specific victimization experiences. It is also possible that the
Armenian discussions are more general due to the fact that these interviews were conducted in
the late 1970s and early 1980s, a time when it was less acceptable to discuss sexual violence
(which can still be considered a taboo subject today).

However, perhaps the most plausible reason for differences in depth of discussion is that,
as might be expected, the overall frequency of discussions of sexual violence in the Rwandan
interviews is driven by those who personally experienced sexual violence (39.1% in the
Rwandan interviews compared to 7.5% in the Armenian interviews). Those who experienced
prolonged victimization experiences (e.g. sexual slavery) provide the most detail, describing
what the perpetrators said and even giving details about the physical nature of the assaults. For
example, one man who survived sexual violence in the Rwandan genocide recounted specific
physical elements of his experience:

One of them got a piece of cloth and another one tied me here and they started raping
me. Then as days went on, they could drug me and then [I] started to enjoy it. They were
also taking the same drugs, which sometimes they would put in tea [for me] and some
through my nostrils. After taking the drugs I would see their breasts swelling. I hadn’t
seen this before, I just heard about it. I started to like it in that one was on top of me and
another was in my mouth. (RWA_01_M)

In another interview, a Rwandan woman who had been held in sexual slavery described how her
captor insisted that she laugh as he assaulted her:

I would do it and go on him, he would tell me to laugh so as to show the trust I had for
the Hutu. That Hutu killed your brothers and we even made you drink blood. That he
hoped I was happy, I told him that I couldn’t laugh. I asked him that if they had killed his
parents or brothers would he laugh. No he said, but told me that was the reason I
remained so as to die brutally. He would tell me to laugh, I would tell him that I
couldn’t. He would say that me not laughing is like I don’t have libido...he was going to
kill me because I didn’t have libido. He was so cruel and he planted marijuana because
he was a soldier. He would bring raw marijuana and smear it on my buttocks and whole
body, so that I have libido. I wouldn't have libido but would feel itchy and a fever. (RWA_09_F)

In contrast, those who experienced isolated incidents of rape are less descriptive, providing some context for the sexual assault, but little in the way of physical description. For instance, one woman explained:

*He said to me: "Whatever I force you to do, you have to do it otherwise I am going to shoot you and go to jail." From there I accepted whatever he asked me to do, I took off all my clothes and he raped me. When he finished raping me, he went back to his room to sleep and I remained in my room.* (RWA_08_F)

Finally, those who experienced comparatively minor forms of sexual violence (e.g. subjected to forced nudity) generally speak about the experience in more of a passing statement, rather than providing an in-depth description. For example, one Rwandan woman simply referenced “*the day I was forced to walk naked up on the hill*” (RWA_07_F) without further details. Another stated: “*That was when they gave me a hoe to dig my grave. I dug my grave even though I was naked and weak*” (RWA_53_F).

Again, personal experiences were rarely discussed in the Armenian interviews (7.5%), as most of the discussions of sexual violence in this case were of witnessed violence (65.4%). Perhaps as a result of this, the discussions of sexual violence in the Armenian interviews were much more general than in the Rwandan case. As previously noted, in almost half of the discussions of sexual violence in the Armenian interviews, survivors spoke of a group in general (i.e. “women” or “girls”), rather than describing the victimization of specific individuals. For example, statements such as “*The Turks [were] coming and taking the young girls*” (ARM_39_M) and “*They tried to kill all the young people out of there. They killed them, they raped all the women*” (ARM_41_M) are representative of most discussions of sexual violence in the Armenian interviews. Armenian women did go into more detail about sexual violence than
Armenian men, often describing methods used to prevent this type of victimization (this theme will be discussed in greater detail below). Although Armenian men generally made only passing statements about sexual violence, usually describing it in broad terms, these statements are still significant. Given the social norms at the time of the interviews, and the fact that more than 50 years had passed since the genocide began, that men discussed sexual violence at all indicates that it is still a salient part of their genocide experience as well.

**Additional Themes Associated with Sexual Violence**

Themes emerged through the coding process, in which tags or labels were used to assign units of meaning to the information present in survivor narratives. These themes, or labels, assisted in reducing the large amounts of data in the interviews and surfacing common ideas across survivors and genocides. Coding for themes focused on ideas related to sexual violence in some way. Some themes were identified through my list of start codes, which were based on my conceptual framework and research questions, while others emerged through continual interaction with the data. The themes identified through this analysis were 1) concurrent victimization, 2) beauty and physical attractiveness, and 3) inability to describe events.

**Concurrent Victimization**

Sexual violence and other forms of victimization

One theme that arose during the coding process is that of concurrent victimization. Coding specifically focused on forms of sexual violence, as coding all different forms of victimization was beyond the scope of the present study. However, it became clear during analysis that certain types of sexual violence frequently occurred in the context of other forms of victimization.
In the Armenian interviews, forced nudity was described as occurring the context of looting and theft. For example, one woman said, “They stole. We were stark naked. . . . We were naked. No panties or underclothes, nothing. Nothing, nothing, nothing” (ARM_33_F). Another woman described how girls and women would be molested and have their clothes removed as their bodies were being searched:

*The Turks were with us, the gendarmes. We stopped at night and if the gendarmes were not with us the villagers would come and sit around and then take the young girls into the woods. Someone, out of desperation, had hidden her gold in her vagina. After they found that gold, they started to violate all the other girls, to rob them, to remove all of their clothing. They were all walking about with no clothes, barefoot* (ARM_98_F).

These quotes illustrate that women on the deportations routes were vulnerable to various different forms of victimization.

It was also common for forced nudity to be discussed in the context of assault (and possibly murder) in narratives from both genocides. In the beginning stage of the Armenian genocide, the men were separated from the women, children, and elderly, and survivors commonly described the men being subjected to forced nudity at this time. For instance, one woman said, “Older boys who could not come with us, they were taken by the Turks somewhere else away and they were undressed and the Turks started beating them until they just – some of them couldn’t survive” (ARM_79_F). In describing his own experience, one Armenian man recalled, “The others who had been taken with me were craftsmen. They put us all, about 70 or 80 of us, naked in two small boats in the river. . . . their aim was to drown us” (ARM_49_M). In the Armenian interviews, it was also common for dead bodies to be described as being completely naked. For example, one man recalled,

*I remember distinctly like a child would, like a dream, I remember nude bodies. Women and children, they had killed a bunch of them and they had taken all their clothing out. Nude bodies, and it was in the summertime and all this, so the bodies were burned.* (ARM_29_M)
In the Rwandan interviews, one woman said,

_It was also another form of torture, they would come and say to me, We killed Aime, we stripped her naked and paraded her through the Round-About. To tell a child of eight years old they bragged about it. Today they deny it but in the past they were talking about it even when no one asked. They said they took the pastor’s wife naked from church and paraded her through the Round-About, your relative Masamaza, they said, has been crucified at the Round-About._ (RWA_22_F)

Another said, “Mum died of a machete, by cutting her neck, but they first undressed her” (RWA_41_F). Sometimes it was not clear whether the victim had been assaulted and may have ultimately survived, or whether the assault resulted in death. For example, one man explained, “The first thing I saw was the lady who had given her baby away. . .She was hacked with machetes and was agonizing. She was half naked” (RWA_03_M). Although we can imagine what this woman’s fate might have been, we do not know for sure.

Forced abortion and mutilation are two additional types of sexual victimization that often resulted in death for the victims. For example, one Rwandan woman said:

_They lay her down, took a spear, inserted it in her and stirred it in her. They first kneaded her body as if helping her to give birth. Because of fear the baby came out. We thought that they were helping her to give birth so as to separate her from the baby. When the baby was half way out, they sent a spear upwards and stirred until when the spear came out of the mother’s mouth_ (RWA_09_F).

Another Rwandan woman discussed the forced abortion and death of her sister:

_I had sister among [us] whose pregnancy was almost due. She had even shopped clothes for the baby. That time we had limited resources such as sonography to observe twin pregnancy. Her twins were seen after she had been hacked and opened up. They opened her up alive. She was hacked._ (RWA_64_M)
The Armenian interviews also included descriptions of abortions that resulted in the death of the mother. One man recalled, “The Turkish soldiers took 200 or 300 Armenian women to another city. They would slash open the bellies of pregnant women and remove the babies. They would throw them into the river. I saw so much!” (ARM_23_M) Another Armenian survivor lamented, “Couldn’t God teach those Turks something? They stuck a knife in a woman’s abdomen and took the baby out and were playing with it...like it was a toy.” (ARM_37_F)

Mutilation was discussed slightly more frequently than forced abortion (n=17) and similarly included quite vivid descriptions. In the Rwandan interviews, mutilation, like abortion, often implied death of the victim. One woman explained, “After raping her, they were like 100 taking turns, they took hooks that are used to tie goats. They sent the hook in her body through her sex organ and pulled her intestines out.” (RWA_09_F) Another stated, “All I know is that they killed her by inserting strings and pins into her sexual organs. They inserted several things that they came across in her...” (RWA_69_F) In the Armenian interviews, one survivor described a Turkish mullah making a chaplet out of Armenian girls’ nipples (ARM_33_F) and another described a dead, mutilated body of a young girl being carried through the streets (ARM_02_F). However, when Armenian men spoke of mutilation, it was more often about forced circumcision. Some of the survivors personally experienced forced circumcision, while others managed to escape before the circumcision took place. Although these men did not refer to circumcision specifically as a form of mutilation, they did note that it was a custom of the Turks, and not of the Armenians, expressing that it was clearly an unwanted modification of their bodies.
Forced marriage, sexual slavery, and being “taken”

As noted in the previous chapter, it was clear that some forms of victimization overlapped, and that there were simply differences in the ways the survivors chose to label them. This can be illustrated by examining experiences of forced marriage and sexual slavery. I coded circumstances in which the victim was held against his/her will and sexually victimized as sexual slavery, unless the survivor specifically described this situation as forced marriage (by using the terms marriage, husband, or wife).

In the Armenian interviews, it was much more common for survivors to speak of the forced marriage of women or girls than in the Rwandan interviews. Armenian survivors not only used the phrase “forcibly married,” but also used the term “taken.” This term was used variously to refer to women and girls being raped, kidnapped, or both. While the purpose of taking the girls was sometimes to use them sexually and return them, the survivors also indicate that girls were frequently kidnapped from their Armenian family and given to a Turkish one. For older girls and young Armenian women, this meant being taken by Turks as wives. Sometimes these marriages were literally forced on women, and sometimes, women chose to marry a Turkish man in order to save themselves from death or preserve their families. For example, one survivor described how her own mother married a Turkish shepherd in order to keep her two children. It is clear from the interviews, however, that intermarriage was not common practice before the genocide, and that in most cases, even “voluntary” marriages were a result of the coercive circumstances of the conflict. In addition, many of the survivors told stories of Armenian women running away from their Turkish husbands after the genocide, which may be an indication that these unions were not as “voluntary” as they appeared. For example, one survivor recalled:
News spread fast all over that there were some wonderful, kind American people had come to Kharpet and opened an orphanage and take care of the Armenian people. Then they ran away from their husbands. Then, naturally, the husbands would come to see if they could have a chance to snatch away their wives. Sure, they got forcibly married, but at the same time, they loved the Armenians because they picked out the beautiful, I mean, the prettiest girls. (ARM_67_F)

Most of the interviewees spent time in American orphanages towards the end of genocide, and almost all of them related stories of Turkish soldiers coming to find Armenian girls who had escaped or coming to take on additional wives.

Whether marriages between Armenian women and Turkish men were “voluntary” or forced, sexual relations are implicit in these marriages. Speaking of women who eventually escaped their Turkish husbands, one survivor said, “They had been used by Turks, most of them. They weren’t virgins.” Survivors also discussed women they knew who had children with their Turkish husbands, and raised their children as Turks. One survivor spoke of her cousin, who avoided having children by her Turkish husband:

Well, she was forcibly married, abducted almost, and went where there was this man and the mullah was there, the Turkish priest and that’s how she couldn’t get away from him. And then she sat and she just, oh, I’m sure that there was some relationship, I’m not saying anything, but she knew of ways of preventing any children, she bound that she was not going to have any children. . . Evidently she stayed with him, we don’t know whether he died or she left him. (ARM_03_F)

The words of this survivor indicate that there were, indeed, sexual relations in the forced marriage of her cousin. This narrative also provides evidence that (at the very least) the young Armenian wife did not wish to conceive a child, and it may likewise provide evidence that she did not wish to engage in sexual relations with her Turkish master.

For young children, being “taken” or kidnapped meant being taken in as a servant or “adopted” child. One woman recalls the last time she saw her baby sister:

All of a sudden, we noticed two persons, dressed all in black. Their heads were wrapped in turbans. They were staring at us and in particular, my younger sister. They asked if
she was German. My mother said in Turkish, “No, we are not German.” Our family was quite fair. They said that they wanted to take the little girl. My mother said, “No, they’ll die with me.” Then, I don’t know what happened, and my mother gave them my sister to save her. (the survivor breaks down) I can still hear my little sister crying, “Mommy, Mommy. . . .” That poor child, just about 3 years old. They say the Turkish race will be handsome, of course, they took all the beautiful Armenian girls. (ARM_42_F)

Not only were sexual relations implicit in forced marriages, but they also took place when young girls were taken in as servants or as children of Turkish families. The survivor above implies that, although some children were young enough to avoid sexual victimization on the deportation routes, their assimilation into Turkish culture ultimately meant reproducing with the enemy⁹.

Once these girls were old enough, they would be taken as additional wives by their Turkish masters. One woman recalls a time that she, her mother, and three sisters lived with a Turkish family, and her sister was at risk of becoming a bride:

> My sister, 14 or 15, would do handicrafts with the Khanouns. They passed the time with each other. That Khanoum would say, “When my (husband) comes, I’m going to take you as his second wife.” She was referring to my older sister. The Khanoum herself wanted her. . . Because she couldn’t bear children. And she liked my sister. (ARM_55_F)

For this very reason, another woman remembers being warned about becoming a servant to a Turkish family by a soldier who found her:

> The commander wants you, but tell him you don’t want to go with him. Yell and scream at him because he will probably put you in his harem when you get older. Tell him you don’t want to go with a Turk. (ARM_08_F)

These narratives illustrate that females of all ages were eventually at risk of being forced into sexual relations with Turkish men. Although the Armenian survivors never used the term “rape” in reference to sexual relations in these unions, these relations do represent a type of marital rape or sexual slavery. If the marriages themselves were forced, then the sexual relations that occurred within these marriages were also forced upon these women.

⁹ Both the kidnapping of children and forced marriages also imply another type of consequence (and victimization): loss of Armenian culture. This will be discussed further in the next chapter.
It was less common for Rwandan survivors to speak of forced marriage, but in these interviews, survivors explicitly stated that forced marriage meant being held in sexual slavery. One man said, “For example, there were some Interahamwe who could come following the girls they had abducted during the genocide and taken in as their ‘wives’ (they would force them to live with them and rape them for days).” (RWA_40_M) There were also a few Rwandan survivors who were personally held in sexual slavery and described their experiences in great detail. These survivors sometimes described their experiences of being held in captivity and sexually abused as forced marriage. For example, in addition to describing multiple experiences of rape, one woman (RWA_09_F) states that the Hutu man who was holding her hostage made her his “second wife.” The Rwandan sample also included a young man who had been in sexual slavery and raped by several women. These women referred to him and another man as their husbands and said the men were there to “fulfill their needs” (RWA_01_M). These situations differ from forced marriage in the Armenian genocide, in which women became part of a harem for longer periods of time or even indefinitely.

In some cases, it is possible that the terms forced marriage, sexual slavery, and “taken” are synonymous, rather than representative of concurrent victimization experiences. In the Armenian genocide, forced marriage and being “taken” (and not returned to the group after being raped) often implied sexual slavery for the victim. However, survivors did sometimes speak of the kindness of their Turkish “families,” and so sexual slavery cannot be assumed in every case. In the Rwandan genocide, however, the term forced marriage was always associated with sexual slavery. I distinguished between forced marriage and sexual slavery while coding Rwandan interviews by focusing on the language of the survivor (and the language used by the perpetrator, if the survivor provided that information).
Sexual slavery and witnessed sexual violence (Rwandan narratives)

The Rwandan sample included a small number (n=7) of individuals who had been held in sexual slavery. In these cases, these individuals were forced not only to endure their own physical forms of sexual victimization, but also to witness the sexual victimization of others. One survivor in particular accounts for a large proportion of the discussions of sexual violence in the Rwandan case. Her narrative was especially long, rich, and in-depth, with her discussions of sexual violence accounting for 33 discussions (42%) from Rwandan survivors overall. She explains multiple times that her captors forced her to look on as they victimized other women. Once they told her that they wanted to her to watch so that she could “tell God” (RWA_09_F).

Beauty and Physical Attractiveness

Another theme that was salient throughout both the Armenian and Rwandan interviews is beauty and physical attractiveness. This was one of my start codes, as I had previous experience with the Armenian interviews and I knew that this idea was commonly discussed. Armenian survivors mentioned beauty when describing the Armenian “race”, stating, for example, that they had “beautiful young people” (ARM_07_F). In addition, I believed the theme would be present across both cases, as work on the Rwandan genocide has referred to the mythic beauty and sexual superiority of Tutsi women as a reason for the widespread rape during the conflict (Jones, 2002; Taylor, 1999). This was not specifically mentioned in my Rwandan sample, but across both cases, physical attractiveness was discussed in terms of its relationship to the sexual victimization of women.

Armenian survivors frequently discussed beauty as a risk factor for sexual victimization in general, saying that “they picked out the beautiful... the prettiest girls.” (ARM_67_F) In addition, while examining the Armenian interviews, I became aware that girls on the deportation
routes viewed sexual violence as an ever-present threat. Female discussions of sexual violence in the Armenian genocide are often accompanied by some reference to methods for avoiding this type of gender-specific victimization, many of which related directly to physical appearance. One woman explains that being physically attractive put women and girls at risk, and to avoid rape, they would try to make themselves less attractive to their attackers:

_They didn’t shoot the women, no, they would rather rape the women. Or, if a Kurd would come and see a young, beautiful girl, many [girls] rubbed garlic on their faces so that they would look ugly, that would make wounds on their faces. Many young girls did that._ (ARM_52_F)

In reference to forced marriages, another survivor stated “_They say that the Turkish race will be handsome, of course, they took all the beautiful Armenian girls._” (ARM_42_F)

While another Armenian woman did not alter her physical appearance, she tried to make herself look like a married woman:

_I picked up the child of my aunt so the Kurds would think it was mine, so they wouldn’t bother a married woman, so they wouldn’t touch me. The Kurds started to chase me. The women are calling, “Leave the child.” He was a two year old little boy. I wouldn’t let go_ (ARM_07_F).

Other women, who were still children at the time of the deportations, described how their mothers would try to protect them. One survivor recalls how her mother hid her under skirt because she was an attractive child:

_One time they come and pick the big girls, my mother sit down [on me] and make me [into] a chair. Everybody said you were good-looking, I don’t know, I can’t remember. They come and grab them, they look them, and she make me a chair, and she got skirt, full skirt, like she’s sitting on a bench or something_ (ARM_19_F).

Unlike Armenian women, Armenian male survivors simply reported that sexual violence was something that would happen to women and girls. One man said, “_I have seen how the Turks used to rape the young girls, then throw them in the rivers. I have seen all that. It would have
been better not to see those things.” (ARM_27_M) The female focus on the threat of sexual violence in the Armenian interviews illustrates that this type of violence truly is gendered.

Interestingly, Rwandan survivors spoke only very generally about avoiding victimization by fleeing their homes or hiding. Specific measures to avoid sexual violence were not discussed. This may reflect broader differences in the nature of these two genocides. Armenian women were concerned with sexual violence, including forced marriage, on the deportation routes. In contrast, Rwandan survivors, both male and female, were worried about detection. They often spoke of going through “check points” and some admitted to altering their identity cards to hide their Tutsi heritage. This does not mean that sexual violence was not a concern of Rwandan women (and possibly Rwandan men, as well), but that their methods for avoiding detection would provide them with protection from all forms of violence. Armenian women, on the other hand, could not avoid being deported (unless they possibly married a Turk at the outset), and therefore, were more concerned with a specific form of victimization (sexual violence) as the genocide went on.

Like their Armenian counterparts, Rwandan survivors also made general statements about beauty and sexual victimization. For example, one Rwandan woman said, “They first selected the pretty girls and killed them as they desired, but first they raped them.” (RWA_69_F) More often, however, when beauty was present in the Rwandan narratives, it was used to describe specific victims. One man recalled:

And there was a woman who was pregnant. She was a very fine woman and good shaped and I wonder if there is any other woman in Rwanda like that woman. They laid her body down and operated on her stomach and removed the baby with a spear. For God’s sake, I never forget the memory of that woman (RWA_01_M).

Armenian survivors also described individual victims in terms of their physical attractiveness.

One survivor never knew what happened to her mother, but feared for her because of her beauty,
saying “And my mother was a beautiful woman. God knows what they did to her. . . how much rape. . . God knows if she used that poison [hidden] in her hair [to commit suicide].”

It is apparent from the quotes above that Armenian survivors often discussed the intersection of youth and beauty as a risk factor for sexual violence. In contrast, Rwandan survivors did not discuss age nearly as often, and did not relate it to physical attractiveness. In fact, one survivor described the sexual victimization of an elderly woman:

_An old lady. . . they forced her to have sex when she was sixty something years old. . . when they were forcing her they could say that such old ladies are the ones who are good in bed._ (RWA_09_F)

Another important difference between the two cases is that the fate of physically attractive women differed. In the Armenian genocide, beautiful women were taken and forcibly married, presumably to bear children for the Turkish husbands. In Rwanda, the beautiful women were raped and killed.

_Inability to Describe Events_

This theme developed as an “in vivo” code from the Armenian interviews -- survivors described events as being “indescribable,” “unspeakable,” or even “unimaginable.” In addition, once I created this code, I became aware of instances in which the survivors were literally unable to speak about certain events (e.g. the interviewer noted that the survivor broke down) or in which the survivor stated that he or she did not have the words to describe something that had happened in the genocide. _Inability to describe events_ came to capture all of these things. Although the theme originated in the Armenian interviews, it is applicable to both cases, and is especially relevant to sexual violence.
An inability to describe sexual violence was more common among Armenian survivors than Rwandan survivors. For example, in the Armenian genocide, one survivor describes how a Turkish priest cut the nipples off of Armenian girls and made a prayer string out them, saying that “they have done horrible things, my dear, unimaginable.” (ARM_33_F) Although the survivor is not explicit in describing the sexual violence that occurred, another Armenian woman says, in reference to women being taken away, “Oh my, how terrible. How they annoyed us. I’m ashamed at the way they bothered us. I can’t describe the terrible things. It was awful. They were animals.” (ARM_75_F) Similarly, another survivor said:

*But all that night, I don’t want even to mention so people won’t feel bad, but the soldiers or the Turkish men did everything imaginable during the night. Snatched babies from their mother’s arms for adoption or snatched young girls for forced marriage and forced women down the basement. I don’t even want to mention . . . they did everything imaginable.* (ARM_67_F)

Sexual violence was described as indescribable only once in the Rwandan narratives. One survivor from this genocide recalled:

*I knew what was happening because from where I was you could tell what was being said and what was being done to them. I knew they were going to rape them. I cannot describe it to you, unless you had been there yourself. I felt the pain probably more than they did; it was if it were being done to me* (RWA_66_F).

In the Rwandan interviews, although it was not common for this code to apply specifically to descriptions of sexual violence, it was applied to descriptions of the genocide more broadly. Sometimes, survivors could not find the words to describe what had taken place. For example, one individual said, “*Anyway, what happened here in Murambi is terrible. There are no right words to express it. It was a horrible genocide and there is no way to explain how it happened or how one could do it.*” (RWA_07_F) Another survivor also had trouble expressing what had happened, “*I would describe what happened in 1994 as if Rwanda had gone down to hell or moved to a different planet. Rwanda was silent. I don’t know how to describe it.*”
The term “unimaginable” was also used to describe the Rwandan genocide. One survivor asked the interviewer, “Do you think it’s easy to talk about those killings? The slaughter was too grave and unimaginable. I sometimes think about what I saw and I say ‘It must be a nightmare.’” Although survivors are describing broader events as indescribable, these descriptions are still significant in terms of sexual violence. Although this theme was not more common among individuals who personally witnessed or experienced sexual violence, it was common among individuals who discussed sexual violence at some point in their narrative. In other words, individuals for whom sexual violence is a part of their genocide narrative had difficulty describing the event.

**Discussion**

The qualitative analysis for research question one examined not only to what extent sexual violence is a part of survivor narratives, but also how sexual violence is a part of survivor narratives. This was accomplished by assessing the salience of sexual violence as an overall theme in survivor interviews and by identifying additional themes in survivor descriptions of sexual violence.

The interviews used for this analysis were secondary sources in the sense that I did not personally conduct them and had no control over which topics and questions were included (i.e. sexual violence). Despite the fact that it was rarely brought up by interviewers, sexual violence was a salient theme in survivor narratives of both genocides, although the specificity of discussion varied across cases. Discussions of sexual violence in the Armenian interviews are much more general than those in the Rwandan interviews.

Three themes emerged in relation to sexual violence in these interviews: 1) concurrent victimization, 2) beauty and physical attractiveness, and 3) inability to describe events. The
The theme of beauty and physical attractiveness speaks to the gendered nature of sexual violence. Survivors indicate that physically attractive women and girls were the ones who were victimized. In the Armenian genocide, sexual violence was seen as a constant threat, and the idea of physical attractiveness as a risk factor led women and girls to alter their appearance in attempts to avoid sexual victimization. This example parallels sexual violence outside of genocide: according to dominance theories, sexual domination by men and sexual submission by women causes women to live in fear of rape and sexual assault every day. To take this parallel, even further, Rafter (2015) argues that the process of “doing gender” is accomplished not only in everyday interactions, but also through genocide. West & Zimmerman (1987) describe the process of “doing gender” as “a routine accomplishment embedded in everyday interactions. . . [involving] a complex of socially guided perceptual, interactional, and micropolitical activities that cast particular pursuits as expressions of masculine and feminine ‘natures.’” Although genocide is far from an everyday interaction, the women and girls in the Armenian genocide were “doing” or “accomplishing” gender by expressing their feminine nature – they felt a constant threat of sexual violence and responded to it by trying to make themselves appear unattractive.

The themes of concurrent victimization experiences and survivors’ inability to describe events are important when considering definitions of sexual violence in genocide. Although it is not explicitly stated, Armenian survivors suggested that forced marriage implies a second form of victimization: rape. This has implications for the definition of sexual violence in international law, namely, that it is important to consider ongoing forms of victimization and long-term consequences of genocide that may be unique to sexual violence as a form of victimization. Forced marriage was a form of victimization that did not end in 1918 when the Ottoman Empire first surrendered to the Allied Powers or in 1923 when a peace treaty was signed between the
Allies and the new state of Turkey. Although survivors indicate that women did some times escape their Turkish husbands, they also discuss the long-term consequences of assimilation. The consequences of sexual violence in genocide will be discussed in the following chapter.

As discussed in the previous chapter, the definition of sexual violence outlined in the ICTR does not require physical contact for sexual victimization. Such a broad definition of sexual violence would include secondary exposure to sexual violence as a form of victimization. In these situations, sexual violence is inflicted upon two separate parties: the primary victim experiencing an act of sexual violence and a second victim being forced to observe or hear of this act of sexual violence under the coercive circumstances of the conflict. The qualitative analysis in this chapter illustrates how secondary exposure to sexual violence impacted the secondary victims. In the Armenian interviews, individuals who witnessed sexual violence and included it as part of their genocide narrative were often at a loss for words to describe their experience, stating that what they witnessed was “unspeakable” or “unimaginable.” In the Rwandan interviews, although the theme of an inability to describe events was not more common among individuals who witnessed sexual violence, it was common among those who spoke about sexual violence (in other words, those who included sexual violence as part of their genocide narrative). These individuals were often at a loss for words when describing their genocide experience more broadly. In addition, Rwandan individuals who were held in sexual slavery often said that they had to endure not only their own sexual victimization, but also to repeatedly witness the sexual victimization of others.
CHAPTER 6: RESULTS: IMPACT AND DESTRUCTIVE NATURE OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE

This chapter presents results for the study’s second and third research questions. The second research question asks: What was the impact of sexual violence on individuals within and across these two cases of genocide? The third research question asks: What was the impact of sexual violence on the targeted groups within and across these two cases of genocide? Results indicate that while sexual violence is an act of “serious bodily and mental harm”, as noted in the footnote to the International Criminal Court’s (ICC) Elements of Crimes (United Nations, 2011), it also has social and cultural consequences that are not fully captured by subsuming it under this description. In this chapter, I will discuss all types of consequences of sexual violence in genocide discussed in my data: physical, psychological, and social/cultural. First, I will begin by providing a brief overview of consequences of the Armenian and Rwandan genocides overall (i.e. consequences that may not be specifically related to sexual violence, but were commonly discussed among survivors). This will assist in contextualizing the next sections, in which I will present 1) consequences of the genocides for survivors of sexual violence and 2) consequences of witnessing sexual violence during genocide. To conclude, I will return to the importance of social and cultural consequences of sexual violence by discussing individual- versus group-level consequences, as well as short- and long-term consequences.

Consequences of the Armenian and Rwandan Genocides Generally

A very general observation is that although both sets of interviews have somewhat different structures, and to some extent, each has its own focus, all of these narratives are narratives of survival. Of course, this is not a ground-breaking observation; however, to some extent, it does limit the information that is available in these interviews, as the focus of the
narratives is not on victimization (my focus for analysis). For both cases, the narrative story of the interviews generally follows a sequence of events that allowed a given individual to survive the genocide, whether it be through hiding, fleeing, being saved/helped along the way, etc. While the interviews also include various other information -- including victimizations that a person experienced throughout the genocide, discussions of how they rebuilt/are rebuilding their life, consequences/adversities that they have suffered, or their views for the future -- the bulk of these stories remain focused on survival.

In my samples of interviews, it was relatively rare for individuals to speak of consequences of specific forms of victimization. More often, survivors spoke about consequences of the genocide more generally, and therefore, I wanted to begin with how consequences of the genocides are discussed in these narratives overall, before focusing on sexual violence specifically. This discussion will assist in contextualizing the discussion of consequences specifically related to sexual violence.

In terms of physical consequences of genocide, Rwandan survivors were much more likely to discuss physical consequences than Armenian survivors. This is likely due, at least in part, to my operationalization of “consequence” and choices in the creation of my coding scheme. Given my focus on sexual violence, most of the physical consequences I included in my coding scheme focus on outcomes specific to sexual violence (e.g. pregnancy, sexually transmitted infections, etc.). Perhaps due to the time periods in which the interviews were conducted, these consequences were much more likely to be discussed in the Rwandan than the Armenian interviews. In addition, the fact that the Armenian interviews were conducted so far after the genocide could mean that many of the physical consequences of the genocide had subsided by the time of the interviews. For example, even my broadest code for physical
consequences, wound/injury, was only coded for once in the entire Armenian sample, whereas it was coded 54 times in the Rwandan interviews.

When looking at psychological consequences, both Armenian and Rwandan survivors discuss symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder, including the symptoms of re-experiencing, avoidance, and arousal (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Survivors describe having nightmares of the genocide, avoiding places and people that remind them of the genocide, and experiencing episodes of extreme anger, anxiety, or other emotions. Otherwise, most of the psychological consequences are discussed by Rwandan survivors. These include hopelessness, depression, loneliness, and alcohol or drug addiction.

The category of social/cultural consequences is particularly interesting, partially because the social/cultural aspect of genocide is something that some argue is lost in the current legal definition of genocide. Again, the acts of genocide described in international law focus on physical consequences: killing members of the group, causing serious bodily or mental harm, inflicting conditions to bring about the physical destruction of the group, and preventing births within the group. In survivor narratives, however, social and cultural consequences of genocide are discussed more frequently than any other type of consequences across both cases. In particular, the codes “challenges” and “broken families” are discussed most often.

The code challenges refers to a wide variety of challenges that survivors experienced after the genocide. I defined challenges as “life being difficult or hard as a result of genocide.” Specific examples of challenges that I coded for include rebuilding one's life, new responsibilities as an outcome of the genocide (e.g. taking care of orphans), difficulty earning a living, surviving, and interruption/cessation of education. I should note that, while I do not have this code broken down into subcodes, I am aware of the fact that the challenges faced by
survivors differ across my cases of genocide. A salient difference between these two samples of survivors is that the Rwandan survivors have remained in Rwanda (although they may have sought refuge elsewhere for a period of time), whereas the Armenian survivors all migrated to the United States at some point in time. I did code for challenges that related to this migration; however, the stories the Armenians share about coming to America are largely positive. Once again, the passage of time may be an important factor here: this difference in outlook may be a result of the fact that much more time had elapsed between the Armenian genocide and survivor interviews than the Rwandan genocide and its narratives. One final coding decision whose effects I should note is that Armenian survivors also spoke frequently of issues they faced during the Great Depression (e.g. difficulties finding working, supporting a family, etc.), and I did not code these as “challenges.” Although they were a salient part of many of the Armenian narratives, I felt that the survivors were not clearly relating them to the genocide experience.

*Broken families* was also a very common theme across both cases of genocide. I defined my code for broken families as “losing family members or being separated in some way.” This included not only the death of a loved one but also being an orphan, being left on the deportations, not knowing relatives/family due to separation, and being "alone." The death of a loved one touched nearly every survivor in my sample, and it is the most-discussed consequence of genocide overall. Sometimes death was a result of the conditions of the genocide (e.g. starvation), but survivors also described the murder of their loved ones. In some interviews, survivors were asked to describe how much of their family was lost. One Armenian survivor responded, “Forty or forty-five people” (ARM_22_M). A Rwandan survivor stated, “We tried looking for a family after the genocide; many of the people we were living with had died. My

---

10 *Being alone* as it pertains to my code for broken families does not include feelings of loneliness, but rather refers to the physical state of being by oneself (e.g. not having family). Loneliness was coded as a psychological consequence of genocide.
mother’s family was completely decimated. Only 5 out of more than 60 people survived!”

(RWA_13_F)

One salient social/cultural consequence in the Armenian interviews is loss of culture. The fact that loss of culture was only discussed in the Armenian case is likely due to a number of factors relating to the genocides and samples more broadly, including the fact that the Armenian survivors had been forced to leave their homeland, while the Rwandan survivors in my sample remained in their country of origin. Culture was also a prominent part of the Armenian interview protocol (see Appendix B), with discussions about retaining Armenianism and questions relating to whether the survivors believed Armenians would exist in the distant future. In particular, the interviews focused on Armenian schools and churches in America and whether subsequent generations speak Armenian.

Culture also came up in the Armenian interviews without being prompted. Survivors spoke about individuals who became Turks to save their lives. For example, one individual explained:

All those who changed their religion, they remained. But others, they were deported . . . those who refused to change their religion. By changing their religion, some of them could save themselves and some of them we know [escaped] to Aleppo, Beirut, so forth.

(ARM_20_M)

11 I also had a code for assimilation that was used in the Armenian interviews, and while these two codes are clearly related, I used them to represent distinct concepts. I conceptualized loss of culture as spanning the period of time from the genocide to the present and even into the future. This code included things like forgetting the Armenian language, not using the language after the genocide, loss of land, and loss of “Armenianism.” Assimilation, on the other hand, took place during the genocide, through the act of individuals becoming Turks or changing their religion.
Although the Armenian survivors acknowledge that the “choice”\textsuperscript{12} they faced was often between converting and facing deportation and certain death, some still described the decision to convert as a source of shame. One man explained:

> Then when the incidents took way, and there were the deportations, we embraced Islam in a cowardly way to save our skins. . . . The reason why we had never returned to the city before that was that we had converted to Islam, and by going to the city my mother dreaded the disrespect and humiliation that would be brought to us by our relatives there, as it was great shame for us to have converted to Islam. (ARM\_62\_M)

Even though this family converted to Islam to save their lives, the shame they carried with them clearly impacted them for a very long time.

> It was common for survivors to admit that they forgot Armenian during the time they spent living among the Turks. For instance, one woman said, “Anyway, it was very hard for me. Lost my language, learned another one. I had to learn my Armenian all over again, then I came [to the United States and], I had to learn this language.” (ARM\_31\_F) Survivors also frequently discussed loss of land, as the current Armenian state is but a tiny fraction of the size of the area Armenians once occupied in the Ottoman Empire. One man stated, “These people owe us our land, they stole everything, they took everything from us . . . it’s ours.” (ARM\_13\_M) Another woman explicitly states that the genocide meant the destruction of the Armenians: “My opinion is that, my dear, this is a loss, a huge loss, and it has to be remembered. That huge loss, very big loss, a whole nation has been destroyed, lost, isn’t it?” (ARM\_33\_F) In addition to being discussed as a consequence of the genocide more generally, loss of culture was also specifically linked to sexual violence (i.e. forced marriage) in the Armenian interviews.

\textsuperscript{12}I use the quotes here to indicate the fact that others have termed these types of choices “choiceless choices.” Lawrence Langer (1988) coined the term, defining it as a choice “where critical decisions did not reflect options between life and death, but between one form of “abnormal” response and another, both imposed by a situation that was entirely out of the victim’s own choosing.”
As mentioned above, loss of culture was not described in the Rwandan interviews. While this could partially be due to the fact that this theme was not a salient part of the Rwandan interview protocol, I think it is more likely due to differences in the actual genocides. While the Armenians practiced a distinct religion and culture within the Ottoman Empire, and could be clearly defined as a religious and an ethnic group separate from the Turks, the distinction between Hutus and Tutsis in the Rwandan genocide was not as clear-cut. In fact, there was some debate at the ICTR in terms of how/whether to define the Hutu and Tutsi as groups. This debate centered around the fact that the two groups shared a common culture, customs, and language, and therefore, it was difficult to define them as different ethnic groups. This problem was resolved by saying that the perpetrators defined the two as distinct groups, and it was this subjective definition that was important (Szpak, 2012).

In the interviews in my sample, most of the Rwandan survivors say that they did not know to which ethnic group they belonged until the genocide, or until they began experiencing persecution leading up to the genocide. For example, one man said, “I knew it when I was in Primary Four, they used to make us stand according to our ethnic group, I used to go where there was a large number of students, I couldn't see any difference between us!” (RWA_04_F) Another man describes a similar experience:

“I remember they used to tell us to stand up, when they told Tutsi to stand up, I did it and when they told Hutu to stand up, I stood up also. My teacher in Senior Two Primary, was called Jacques Bazarama. He gave me a small letter that I had to take to my parents. There was written that they had to explain me clearly about my ethnic group.” (RWA_37_M)

Discussions of this type of differentiation among Hutu and Tutsi in school settings were very common in Rwandan interviews.
To conclude, Rwandan survivors seem much more likely to speak about many consequences of the genocide than Armenian survivors, especially physical and psychological consequences. Armenian survivors were more likely to discuss cultural consequences of the genocide than Rwandan survivors. As with many differences in these sets of interviews, this is likely due to the passage of time. The Rwandan survivors are living in much closer temporal proximity to the events, and therefore are still dealing with many of the consequences of the genocide – in a way, they are still trying to “survive.” The Rwandan interviews also include a wider age-range of survivors. The Armenian survivors, on the other hand, were all speaking over fifty years after the genocide, and were looking back on their lives as their story comes to an end.

Consequences for Survivors of Sexual Violence

In this section, I will discuss consequences of genocide specifically for survivors of sexual violence. I not only present consequences discussed by survivors who personally experienced sexual violence in the genocides, but also analyze how other individuals spoke about genocide consequences for victims of sexual violence. This was particularly important in the Armenian case, given that my sample does not include many Armenians who personally experienced physical sexual violence.

As with the more general discussion of genocide consequences, discussions of physical and psychological consequences of sexual violence were much more common in Rwandan interviews than in Armenian interviews. Due to age and the passage of time (most of the

13 In this chapter, I utilize quotes from survivors of physical sexual violence. This is primarily because, as mentioned above, survivors rarely linked their discussion of genocide consequences to a specific victimization experience, and therefore, it is not possible to determine a cause-effect relationship between sexual violence and specific consequences. Although a cause-effect analysis is not possible, the Effects Matrix in Appendix E illustrates which forms of sexual violence individuals who discussed certain consequences had experienced.
interviewees were quite young at the time of the genocide), only one individual in my Armenian sample had been forcibly married, and she got pregnant and gave birth to a child as a result. However, her experience, as with other mentions of pregnancy in these interviews, was discussed in a cultural, rather than physical context.

Survivors who experienced physical sexual violence in the Rwandan genocide, on the other hand, frequently discussed pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections, including HIV/AIDS, as consequences they experienced as a result of the genocide. One woman could not come to terms with her rape until she realized she was pregnant. She said, “I was looking pregnant. My breasts and stomach became big and I had no periods. Then they asked if I was raped, but until then I was not able to say that I had been raped!” (RWA_73_F). In addition, survivors who had experienced sexual violence, but did not experience pregnancy or infection as a result, discussed consequences for victims of sexual violence in broader terms, rather than speaking strictly from personal experience. For example, one uninfected victim of rape said she “always think[s] about people who were infected with HIV/AIDS during the genocide. . .” (RWA_13_F). Individuals who did not personally experience sexual violence also spoke of the contraction of HIV/AIDS and pregnancy as prominent consequences of the events of 1994.

Rwandan survivors who were infected with HIV/AIDS when they were raped also describe additional psychological consequences as a result of their disease, including isolation and fear. For instance, one woman described her reaction when she found out she was HIV positive:

*I went there, they tested my blood, and then at two o’clock in the afternoon, they gave me the results. They were positive. I am HIV/AIDS positive. I was shocked and confused and I fell down. I didn’t believe it at first. I went home, but got on the wrong bus. . . . I felt like I had gone mad and my life was over. I started feeling traumatized and sometimes I felt like I was worthless and deserved to die. I looked for something that could kill me, but got none. What made me more hopeless was my poverty and*
In addition, social consequences of the genocide (poverty and loneliness) contributed to her suicidality.

In the Armenian interviews, consequences of sexual violence were most often described in terms of social or cultural implications. Armenian men who were forcibly circumcised indicated that the physical alteration of their bodies served as cultural ritual for the Turks, and therefore served as more than a “physical” alteration of their bodies. For example, one man said, “We were made ‘Turks’. They circumcised us! It was a great celebration for them. . . like a wedding. There were many people, music, and even horses – like a parade.” (ARM_23_M) Another described the ritual in a similar way: “So that these. . . under-10-year-olds, under that tent with the music, they had to circumcise all these Armenian kids to officially become Turk(s). That was their culture. . . . If you are circumcised, you are a Turk. That’s when they were satisfied [that] we became [a] Turk.” (ARM_41_M) For these men, circumcision meant the loss of their own culture as they were assimilated into another.

Armenian survivors frequently describe forced marriage of women and girls, but as I mentioned above, there was only one survivor in my sample who personally experienced this type of victimization. This particular woman had been forcibly married to a Turk and describes a courageous escape from her captor. She became pregnant as a result of her forced marriage, and ultimately chose to leave the child behind after giving birth, rather than give up her culture and live as a Turk. She related a conversation with the Chief of Turkish police before she escaped to Italy:

“I heard that you have been looking for me. I did not know this, but I heard that you have been torturing my sister. You have taken her to jail, but you have no right to do this because I am of age. I am 20 years old and I have my rights. I can defend myself. . . . I ran away from the Arab, because I was afraid he was going to kill me,” I continued, "if
he found me. I want the government to take me. If they kill me, let them kill me. If they save me, let them save me. I will not become a Turk. I am a Christian." He said to me, "Young woman, you have a child. Feel some pity for your child." I then said to him; "My father's children died crying 'Water, water, bread, bread'. If it wasn't a pity for them, why is it a pity for this child who has a father who can give him a comfortable life?" "But you should know," he continued, "we would treat you like a queen. We would give you a palace. We would do everything for you." "I want nothing from you," I answered. "I just want my religion. I want my Armenianism." (ARM_72_F)

This woman’s story portrays the difficult choices that women had to make during the Armenian genocide, such as abandoning children born of rape. Her story also highlights the overlapping physical and social/cultural consequences of the genocide on survivors. It is clear that for Armenian survivors of forced marriage, like other survivors of the genocide, loss of culture was a prominent consequence even of physical victimization.

In the Rwandan interviews, bearing a child as a result of the genocide was associated with other consequences, including struggling to survive. For example, one woman described the many challenges she faced as a new mother in post-genocide Rwanda:

I started to struggle with my child. I could stay in the house desperate; I could spend the whole day and night without eating. The next day, if I meet a good person and he or she gives me food. Perhaps the following day I don’t find someone. My child could get ill . . . Later I suffered headache[s], I started bleeding in the nose but it was somehow different from before, though I was bleeding so much. I started to lose weight every single day; day and night I was losing weight. I said to myself what if I am HIV positive and my tests came negative. (RWA_08_F)

This same woman described consequences of the genocide that were ongoing at the time of her interview, saying,

Up to now, I live alone and I feel lonely. Whenever a day passes, I thank God the way I live [now] with friends and good people who understand me and my life. I wonder how I am going to return to school. This is a problem I face [at] this moment. (RWA_08_F)

As described in the previous section, challenges are a common consequence discussed by all survivors (whether or not they experienced physical sexual violence). The challenges faced by survivors of physical sexual violence are similar to those of other survivors, including poverty,
not being able to return to school/finish their education, and having to care for orphans of the genocide. However, it is clear from several of the interviews that consequences of the genocide are compounded for survivors of sexual violence, as victims of physical sexual violence make up a large proportion of the individuals talking about certain consequences that are not necessarily specific to their sexual victimization experiences. These include social consequences (e.g. social isolation and stigma), and also psychological consequences (e.g. PTSD, feeling badly about oneself, alcoholism/drug addiction, fear, depression, suicidality, and hopelessness). In examining the segments of text coded for these consequences, although victims often speak about them more generally, they sometimes relate these outcomes to their sexual violence experiences. For instance, a male victim made the connection between his experience of rape, social isolation, and feeling suicidal:

They discussed about how women were raped and they could keep this to themselves for long, which afterwards would have effect to their lives. That’s when I understood my problem. This showed me that because of keeping what happened to me to myself, it led to the consequences I was facing, like [considering] committing suicide. (RWA_01_M)

A woman who was infected with HIV/AIDS said,

To be raped so violently by a person when one is innocent is an agony I can never get rid of. So one day, I told my story to a woman who was my friend, about my rape because I was so lonely and had no one to talk to. (RWA_53_F)

She, and most other survivors of rape, attributed her loneliness and isolation her sexual victimization.

**Consequences of Witnessing Sexual Violence**

Sexual violence had consequences not only for those who experienced it, but also for those who witnessed it during the genocide. In particular, in the Armenian genocide, individuals who had witnessed sexual violence described the genocide as *unforgettable.*\(^{14}\) Violence against

---

\(^{14}\) I coded this as a consequence because the survivors described certain images, sounds, or memories of the genocide that still haunt them to this day – the fact that this “re-experiencing”
women was commonly described in this way. For example, one woman said, “I cannot forget a 
woman when she said, a Turkish Mullah had cut the nipples of Armenian girls and beaded them 
on a string as a chaplet.” (ARM_33_F) Although she did not personally experience or even 
personally witness this sexual violence, it remains a part of her genocide narrative decades later 
and is something she says she cannot forget. Another survivor described violence that he 
witnessed in these terms:

One sight I’ll never forget was mother holding a baby on her lap, some Kurd throw rusty 
knife at her, hit [her] right on the chest, baby was sucking blood coming off of her. I will 
ever forget that sight. (ARM_45_M)

In addition to sexual violence, other experiences that survivors described as unforgettable 
include the death of large numbers of people and the loss of family members and/or close 
friends.

Discussion

This chapter examined the impact of sexual violence on individuals and groups on the 
Armenian and Rwandan genocides by analyzing genocide consequences discussed in survivor 
interviews. Survivors of both genocides often spoke of consequences broadly, without linking 
them to a specific victimization experience or type. However, in the Rwandan genocide, 
individuals who experienced physical sexual violence were more likely to discuss certain 
consequences than other survivors, namely, transmission of HIV/AIDS and pregnancy. In 
addition, across both cases, individuals who did not personally experience sexual violence 
sometimes described consequences for survivors of sexual violence. Armenians largely 
identified these consequences as cultural, whereas Rwandans identified them as physical (e.g. 
pregnancy, disease). Individuals who witnessed sexual violence in the Armenian genocide also 
described the genocide or certain events during the genocide as “unforgettable,” indicating that 
occurs after the genocide makes it a consequence.
individuals who experienced sexual violence are not the only ones impacted by it. Once again, these results have implications for international law.

Survivors rarely speak in terms of “individual” or “group” consequences. At the beginning of my analysis, I had coded for these categories by extrapolating the individual- and group-level implications of various consequences, but I quickly determined that there was substantial overlap between the two. Since sexual violence is often considered a crime against an individual, it is perhaps easier to see the individual-level consequences of this form of victimization (e.g. trauma, pregnancy, etc.). Sexual violence, especially when it is as pervasive and widespread as it was in the Armenian and Rwandan genocides, also has the potential to impact individuals who did not personally experience it, as well as present consequences for a group as a whole. Thus, in what follows, I discuss some of these individual- and group-level implications for the most commonly discussed consequences of sexual violence during genocide.

As noted above, Armenian survivors spoke most commonly about loss of culture (i.e. Armenianism) as a result of the genocide. This was true not only for consequences of the genocide more broadly, but also for consequences of sexual violence. For example, women and girls were frequently “taken” by Turkish and Kurdish men and assimilated into a new culture as children, wives, or servants. On the individual-level, these women were separated from their own families, and may have experienced any number of consequences as a result of forced marriage or sexual slavery (e.g. pregnancy). At the group-level, many Armenian survivors state that their entire culture or entire nation was or will be lost as a result of such widespread assimilation. The size of the Armenian state today is quite small compared to the area that the Armenians once occupied, and there are Armenian diaspora spread all over the world as a result of their loss of land. Loss of culture was a primary concern of Lemkin when he coined the term
genocide to describe such atrocities, and this example from the Armenian case provides evidence of how sexual violence can destroy a group through cultural harm.

In the Rwandan interviews, physical consequences of sexual violence were most salient, and were usually discussed at the individual-level. It is likely that this difference is due to the fact that Rwandans were dealing with very present/instrumental harms such as disease and pregnancy. Both those individuals who had personally experienced sexual violence and those who had not discussed the transmission of HIV/AIDS and pregnancy as widespread consequences of sexual violence. Individuals dealing with a devastating disease and/or unwanted pregnancy face many additional challenges when attempting to rebuild a life in post-genocide Rwanda. For instance, finances and obtaining medical care and treatment are primary concerns. Although not explicitly discussed by survivors, these consequences also have implications for the group and society as a whole. Demography studies (La Mattina, 2012; United Nations Population Fund Rwanda, 2007) have shown that women represent a disproportionate number of survivors in Rwandan society, and the prevalence of HIV/AIDS has implications for reproduction and achieving a more balanced ratio of men to women in this post-genocide society. Studies have estimated that between 2,000 and 5,000 children were born of rape as a result of the Rwandan genocide (Mukangendo, 2007). Many of these children face rejection by their mothers and stigmatization by society (Mukangendo, 2007). We have yet to see the results of a generation of children growing up in the conditions of Rwandan society, especially those labeled as “rape babies” or “children of hate.” Although many of the consequences discussed by Rwandan survivors were primarily at the individual-level, it does not mean that the perpetrators did not use sexual violence as an act of genocide. First of all, we cannot know the intent of the perpetrators from victim testimony. Secondly, many of these
individual-level consequences may add up to long-term consequences for the groups. As Lemkin conceptualized the crime “genocide does not necessarily mean the immediate destruction of a nation.”

As evidenced above, another important consideration when assessing the impact of a genocide (and specific forms of victimization, such as sexual violence) is the possibility of long-term consequences. Although I did not code for “short-term” and “long-term” consequences because these two terms would necessarily have different meanings across my cases, it is apparent from the analysis that certain consequences of sexual violence in genocide may be ongoing over long periods of time. Many of these consequences are social or cultural in nature, rather than physical or psychological (although, to be sure, long-term physical and psychological consequences also exist). For example, forced marriages in the Armenian genocide and children born of rape in Rwanda are two outcomes that have implications that reach far beyond the time of the genocides.

The importance of the overlap between individual- and group-level consequences, as well as the consideration of long-term social and cultural consequences, cannot be overstated when we are considering sexual violence and genocide in international law. The tension between the individual and the group has been an ongoing theme in the evolution of sexual violence in international law, with the ICTY and the ICTR maintaining differing definitions of the crime. Moreover, the social and cultural impact of genocide has been a concern since Lemkin coined the term “genocide” in 1943. Both of these issues will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

COMPARING SURVIVOR DISCOURSE WITH THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE AS GENOCIDE

This chapter addresses the final research question of this study: How does survivor discourse of sexual violence as genocide in my interviews compare to the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide? Before answering this question, I will review the results from my first three research questions, which describe survivor discourse of sexual violence in the Armenian and Rwandan genocides. My analysis indicates that 1) a broad definition of sexual violence (such as the one used in the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR)) is necessary to capture the true nature and extent of sexual crimes in this context and 2) while sexual violence is an act of “serious bodily and mental harm,” it also has social and group consequences that are not fully captured by subsuming it under this description. Next, in the context of comparing these results to the existing legal framework of sexual violence as genocide, I will discuss the resulting implications for international law; namely that 1) the definition of sexual violence from the ICTR should be more widely adopted in international law -- specifically, under the crime of genocide in the International Criminal Court’s (ICC) Elements of Crimes, and 2) although it may not be necessary to explicitly include sexual violence as an act of genocide in the UN legal definition of the crime, that definition should be revised to include the social and cultural harms that result from sexual violence in genocide. To conclude this chapter, I point to directions for future research.

Review of Results

Research question one asks: How and to what extent is sexual violence a part of the narratives of survivors? This analysis is important because the results illustrate that sexual
violence is a salient part of narratives of both genocides. Quantitative analyses indicated that approximately 54.0% of survivors discussed sexual violence, with a higher proportion of females (57.4%) discussing sexual violence than males (49.4%). A total of 119 individual victims of sexual violence were identified in the data, with most of these victims being female (89.1%). In terms of experiences with sexual violence, analyses examining the frequency of discussions of sexual violence indicate that secondary exposure to violence is the most common experience with sexual violence discussed (either through witnessing sexual violence or hearing about it from others). Forms of sexual violence that did not necessarily require physical contact, including harassment, forced nudity, and threatened sexual violence, were also common in discussions, comprising almost one-quarter (24.3%) of all discussions of sexual violence.

The qualitative portion of this analysis examined the salience of sexual violence as an overall theme in survivor narratives and also identified additional themes in survivor descriptions of sexual violence. Three themes emerged in relation to sexual violence in my samples of interviews. Concurrent victimization was commonly discussed by survivors. Given the very nature of genocide, sexual violence often occurs in the context of various other forms of victimization. In both genocides, some forms of sexual violence, namely mutilation and forced abortion, often resulted in the death of their victims, making these types of violence comorbid with murder. In particular, survivors spoke of forced nudity during assault and/or murder. There were also three types of sexual violence that frequently overlapped with each other: sexual slavery, forced marriage, and being “taken.” The second theme was beauty and physical attractiveness of victims. In both sets of interviews, survivors explained that the attractive women were the ones selected first for sexual victimization. In the Armenian case, female survivors described methods for avoiding victimization that often had to do with altering their
physical appearance. The final theme that emerged from my interviews in relation to sexual violence is an inability to describe events. This theme encompasses instances in which survivors were literally unable to speak about certain events (e.g. the interviewer noted that the survivor broke down) or in which the survivor stated that he or she did not have the words to describe something that had happened in the genocide (i.e. referring to it as “unspeakable” or “unimaginable”).

The second and third research questions for this study ask: what was the impact of sexual violence on individuals (research question 2) and groups (research question 3) within and across these two cases of genocide? In both sets of interviews, it was rare for survivors to link specific consequences of the genocide to a particular victimization experience; rather, they spoke in general terms. In the Armenian interviews, survivors much more frequently spoke about cultural consequences of the genocide than in the Rwandan interviews. In terms of sexual violence, in the Armenian genocide, young boys (most of the men were killed prior to the deportations) experienced forced circumcision, an act that was meant to erase their Armenianism and “make them Turks.” Women and girls were forcibly married to Turks and Kurds, which often meant converting their nationality and religion, as well as becoming sexual slaves to their new “husbands.” It is impossible to know the number of women who did not escape their Turkish masters at the end of the genocide in 1923, and many survivors speak about the destruction of the Armenian culture as a result of mass assimilation.

In the Rwandan interviews, survivors also spoke about social consequences of the genocide, but were more likely to speak in terms of physical and psychological consequences in relation to sexual violence than Armenian survivors. These physical consequences include contracting sexually transmitted diseases (HIV/AIDS), pregnancy, PTSD, suicidality, and many
additional challenges in rebuilding their lives in a post-genocide society. One reason for the high frequency in discussion of physical consequences could be temporal proximity of the interviews to the events -- the Rwandan interviews were conducted within 10 years of the genocide, whereas the Armenian interviews were conducted decades after the event. Another reason for this difference could be the fact that group delineation was much less clear in the Rwandan case, with most survivors indicating that prior to the genocide, they did not know to which ethnic group they belonged or what the difference was between the Hutu and the Tutsi. Although physical and psychological consequences of the genocide were frequently discussed by Rwandan survivors, these consequences were often compounded by social factors such as a lack of social support or poverty.

Comparing Survivor Discourse to the Legal Framework of Sexual Violence as Genocide and Resulting Implications for International Law

The goal of the present study was to examine the phenomenon of sexual violence as genocide “outside of the law” by performing a comparative historical analysis of narratives of survivors of the Armenian and Rwandan genocides and comparing these results to the existing legal framework. The results of this study uncover survivors’ understanding of the nature and extent of sexual violence in the Armenian and Rwandan genocides. There are two main components of the current legal framework of sexual violence as genocide to which these results will be compared: the definition of sexual violence in international law and the definition of genocide in international law.

Definition of Sexual Violence in International Law

The definition of sexual violence used throughout this study is that from the ICTR. The ICTR considered sexual violence:
as any act of a sexual nature which is committed on a person under circumstances which are coercive. Sexual violence is not limited to physical invasion of the human body and may include acts which do not involve penetration or even physical contact ("Prosecuter v. Jean Paul Akayesu," 1998, Paragraphs 598, 688).

Compared to many other definitions of sexual violence that describe specific actions and body parts, and which often call for evidence of lack of a victim’s consent, this definition of sexual violence is quite broad. The fact that it does not require physical contact allows it to include acts of forced nudity and harassment, which were discussed in both the Armenian and Rwandan interviews.

Even more relevant, however, is that a broad definition of sexual violence without a requirement for physical contact could also encompass indirect exposure to -- witnessing or hearing of -- sexual violence as a form of violence in and of itself. This is important because the criminological and psychological literature has indicated that witnessing (i.e. being an eyewitness) and indirect (i.e. through other knowledge or information) exposure to violence have lasting consequences for those who experience it (see for example, Finkelhor, Turner, Ormrod, Hamby, & Kracke, 2009). In the present study, 21.6% of discussions of sexual violence were about violence that was heard of, which is the same as the proportion of discussions of violence experienced firsthand (see Table 4.7). Witnessed sexual violence was the most common type of sexual violence discussed across both genocides, with it making up 49.0% of all discussions of sexual violence across both cases.

With indirect exposure to sexual violence, violence is inflicted upon the victim experiencing an act of sexual violence and also upon the party witnessing or hearing about the violence. Not only does my examination of sexual violence in survivor interviews indicate that it is discussed frequently by survivors, but the qualitative results also illustrate how indirect exposure to sexual violence impacted the exposed parties through an inability to describe events.
In interviews with Armenian survivors, individuals who witnessed sexual violence and included it as part of their genocide narrative were often unable to find the words to describe their experience, referring to it as “unimaginable” or “indescribable”. In the Rwandan interviews, individuals who included sexual violence in their genocide narrative in some way were often at a loss for words when describing their genocide experience more broadly. In addition, Rwandans who were held in sexual slavery often said that they had to endure not only their own sexual victimization, but also to repeatedly witness the sexual victimization of others.

Currently, the ICC defines sexual violence under both war crimes and crimes against humanity in its Elements of Crimes (United Nations, 2011) as:

> The perpetrator committed an act of a sexual nature against one or more persons or caused such person or persons to engage in an act of a sexual nature by force, or by threat of force or coercion, such as that caused by fear of violence, duress, detention, psychological oppression or abuse of power, against such person or persons or another person, or by taking advantage of a coercive environment or such person’s or persons’ incapacity to give genuine consent (Articles 7(1)(g)-6, 8(2)(b)(xxii)-6, and 8(2)(e)(vi)-6).

While this definition of sexual violence overcomes the consent obstacle by focusing on the coercive context of conflict, unlike the ICTR, the ICC does not specifically state that acts of a sexual nature do not necessarily involve physical contact. In addition, no such definition of sexual violence exists under the crime of genocide in the Elements of Crimes (it is only stated under war crimes and crimes against humanity).

The comparison of survivor discourse with the legal definition of sexual violence above illustrates that 1) forms of sexual violence that may be considered more “minor” represent a large part of survivor narratives and 2) sexual violence reached beyond those who experienced it personally, with many survivors who witnessed or who otherwise experienced secondary exposure to sexual violence including it in their genocide narrative. Given that sexual violence has only been successfully prosecuted as genocide once in international law (the *Akayesu*
conviction), and that secondary exposure to sexual violence is so pervasive and its effects so long-lasting, I suggest the ICC adopt the definition of sexual violence from the ICTR and incorporate it into the crime of genocide. Although minor forms of sexual violence and secondary exposure to sexual violence may not lead to the immediate physical destruction of a group, this is not a requirement for genocide.

Definition of Genocide in International Law

In addition to having implications for the definition of sexual violence, this analysis also has implications for the definition of genocide. As mentioned above, some of the main critiques of the current legal understanding of sexual violence as genocide include the fact that it produces dominant narratives of these crimes that do not reflect their full complexity, focuses exclusively on interethnic conflict without accounting for social and cultural factors, and does not take into consideration the interpretation or needs of the victims of such crimes. The results of the present study support this feminist critique of the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide in several ways. In this section, I will discuss two categories of findings from my analysis that have specific implications for the definition of genocide: 1) the gendered nature of sexual violence and variations from the dominant narratives of sexual violence as genocide; and 2) social and cultural consequences of sexual violence, both for victims of sexual violence and victims who experienced secondary exposure to it.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the current legal framework of sexual violence as genocide was developed largely out of the Rwandan Tribunal and the Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. Genocide is listed in the ICC’s Elements of Crimes, where it appears exactly as it is stated in the 1948 Genocide Convention (United Nations, 1948):

Any of the following acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, any national, ethnical, racial, or religious group, as such: a) killing members of the group; b)
causing **serious bodily or mental harm**\(^{15}\) to members of the group; c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within a group; and e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Sexual violence is not explicitly listed in this definition as an act of genocide; however, following the *Akayesu* trial, France proposed that rape and sexual violence be linked to the act of “serious bodily and mental harm.” The outcome was a footnote to the ICC’s Elements of Crimes, clarifying that the phrase “serious bodily or mental harm” “may include, but is not necessarily restricted to, acts of torture, rape, sexual violence or inhumane or degrading treatment” (United Nations, 2011, Article 6(b)-1, Footnote 3). While this development shows recognition of sexual violence as a tool to commit genocide, the UN Genocide Convention, repeated in the ICC statute, remains unchanged – that is, sexual violence remains unrecognized (de Brouwer, 2005).

**The Gendered nature of sexual violence and variations from dominant narratives**

One of the themes identified in the analysis for research question one, beauty and physical attractiveness, speaks to the gendered nature of sexual violence, not only in general, but also in genocide specifically. Survivors of both genocides indicated that physical beauty was a risk factor for sexual victimization by making statements that “beautiful,” “pretty,” or “attractive” girls were the ones victimized first. Methods for avoiding sexual victimization were almost exclusively described by female Armenian survivors, and these women indicated that the threat of sexual violence was constantly present throughout the deportations, to girls as well as adult women. Although men sometimes experienced sexual violence through forced nudity or forced circumcision, they did not describe these forms of violence as an ever-present threat in the same way as women did.

\(^{15}\) emphasis added
The gendered nature of sexual violence has been a prime topic of discussion among scholars regarding the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide. One of the debates in forming the ICTY centered around the very use of the term “genocidal rape.” One side of this disagreement argued that the rape of Bosnian Muslim women by Serbian men was genocidal, and that this type of rape was fundamentally different than rape in war or rape in general. The other side argued that this position would deny the extent to which women were always harmed in war (i.e. that both Bosnian and Serbian women were raped in the conflict) and the extent to which rape is a gendered phenomenon that may be considered genocidal against all women, in times of peace as well as war (Copelon, 1995).

While my results do support the idea that sexual violence in genocide is a gendered phenomenon, they also brought to light another argument against our current legal understanding of rape as genocide. As noted earlier in this chapter, scholars have observed that international trials create dominant narratives of sexual violence in genocide that often obscure or completely ignore factors beyond ethnicity. In both my Armenian and Rwandan samples, I found evidence of sexual violence against men. In both cases, men, as well as women, experienced forced nudity in the context of other forms of victimization (theft/looting and physical assault). In the Armenian case, sexual violence against men most often took the form of forced circumcision. Young boys who went on the deportations with their mothers rather than being slaughtered with the rest of the men were kidnapped by Turkish soldiers (or, sometimes “given” to Turks as a way to save their lives) and underwent circumcision as part of their assimilation into Turkish culture. In my Rwandan sample, there was one man who had been held in sexual slavery, experienced repeated rape, and suffered from sexually transmitted infections as a result. Dominant narratives
of sexual violence in both of these cases, produced both within (Rwanda) and outside (Armenia) of the legal arena do not include sexual violence against men.

The ad hoc tribunals of the United Nations have also been criticized for producing dominant narratives of sexual violence that ignore certain types of sexual crimes (Buss, 2010). While rape and other gruesome acts of physical sexual violence were part of survivor narratives of sexual violence in the Armenian and Rwandan genocides, other acts of sexual violence that did not necessarily require physical contact were also quite common. Sexual harassment, forced nudity, and secondary forms of victimization (through witnessing or otherwise being exposed to sexual violence), also had a lasting impact on survivors.

These departures from the dominant narratives of sexual violence in genocide that have been created by international law have implications for the legal definition of genocide, as these experiences often have lasting social and cultural consequences that are not currently recognized.

Social and cultural consequences of sexual violence for primary and secondary victims

Among the results for my previous research questions, one area is particularly important when comparing the legal framework of sexual violence as genocide to survivor narratives of this phenomenon: social and cultural consequences. When Raphael Lemkin coined the term “genocide” in 1943, he focused not on physical destruction, but on social and cultural destruction, stating,

> Generally speaking, genocide does not necessarily mean the immediate destruction of a nation, except when accomplished by mass killings of all members of a nation. It is intended rather to signify a coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves. The objectives of such a plan would be the disintegration of the political and social institutions, of culture, language, national feelings, religion, and the economic existence of national groups, and the destruction of the personal security, liberty, health, dignity, and even the lives of the individuals belonging to such groups.\(^{16}\) (Lemkin, 1944, pg. 670) (Lemkin, 1944)

\(^{16}\)emphasis added
While some feminist scholars have argued that sexual violence should be explicitly listed as an act of genocide in the UN definition of the crime, this is not necessary. However, I believe that the definition of genocide should be revised to include social and cultural harms as acts of genocide, and that these modifications would make the UN definition better able to subsume sexual violence as genocide and reflect the true realities of the crime. I am recommending a formal change to the United Nations’ definition of genocide (particularly in the ICC’s Elements of Crimes), that would include a sixth act of genocide: *causing social and/or cultural harm to (members of) the group.*

In the Armenian interviews, cultural consequences of the genocide are the most common type of consequences discussed. In addition to the consequences of the genocide in general, including loss of land, sexual violence in particular also resulted in the destruction of the Armenian culture. Armenian survivors frequently discussed forced marriages and women and girls being “taken.” Girls who were too young to be taken as wives were often taken as the kidnapper’s “child” until they become old enough to become wives. In their discussions of forced marriage, survivors implied that forced marriage was comorbid with a second form of victimization: rape. Taken together, these two forms of victimization illustrate that it is important to consider ongoing forms of victimization and long-term consequences of genocide that may be unique to sexual violence as a form of victimization. While survivors indicate that women did some times escape their Turkish husbands, there must also be numerable women who were not lucky enough to escape their captors (and therefore share their genocide narrative years later).

In the Rwandan interviews, culture was not discussed, as there were few cultural distinctions between the Hutu and the Tutsi. Many social consequences of sexual violence
discussed in the Rwandan case fell under the broad category of “challenges.” All survivors of the genocide faced challenges in putting their lives back together; however, some of the challenges, such as being able to afford medication for HIV/AIDS or raise a child born of rape, were unique to survivors of sexual violence. These individuals also experienced social isolation and stigma, which made overcoming the challenges they were facing that much more difficult. Although pregnancy is a physical consequence of sexual violence, there are social consequences for individuals who were conceived and born of rape, and they are just becoming young adults in a post-genocide society. Another physical consequence of sexual violence, HIV/AIDS, certainly had the potential to impact reproduction of a society that lost over one million people in the genocide and was left with a demographic largely composed of women (La Mattina, 2012; United Nations Population Fund Rwanda, 2007).

The social and cultural consequences of sexual violence can also be observed in the extent to which sexual violence is a part of survivor narratives, even for those who did not personally experience sexual crimes. As noted above, secondary exposures to violence make up the greatest proportion of discussions of sexual violence across my two samples of interviews, indicating that observing or hearing of sexual violence was an important part of the genocide experience for a broader group of people than those who experienced these crimes firsthand. In addition, as indicated by the theme “unspeakable,” sexual violence left even those who did not experience it firsthand at a loss for words.

Many scholars have argued that the UN definition of genocide deviated from Lemkin’s original intention of social and cultural destruction over physical decimation (see for example Card, 2003; Shaw, 2007) and sexual violence in genocide is a prime example of this departure. Card (2003) asserts that the difference between genocide and other crimes is not the fact that the
victim is a group as opposed to an individual; she argues that the kind of harm suffered by individual victims of genocide, by virtue of their group membership, is not captured by other crimes. Card’s (2003) focus is primarily on culture—she argues that the annihilation of groups that do not contribute significantly to their members cultural identity do not qualify as genocide. However, as evidenced by the Rwandan case, the group-level destruction caused by sexual violence (and other acts of genocide as well), is not limited to the destruction of culture. While culture is a factor, MacKinnon (2006) makes the argument that sex is relational, and sexuality is socially central to gender identity, so when this particular form of humanity, central to our identities and relationships, is violated, sexual atrocities result in both individual and group destruction. For example, individuals who experienced rape in my Rwandan sample described an inability to have intimate relationships and sexual encounters following the genocide. Considering the massive scale of sexual violence in this atrocity, such consequences could have widespread group effects for a country trying to recover from genocide.

The results of my analyses indicate that 1) social and cultural consequences of sexual violence are widespread and long-lasting, both for those who personally experience it and those experience secondary exposures to sexual violence; 2) the distinction between various types of consequences (social/cultural, psychological, and physical) is not always clear cut.; 3) there are unique consequences for victims of sexual violence and consequences that are directly attributable to sexual crimes. In terms of international law, I believe that these findings support the argument that social and cultural harms should be made explicit in the legal definition of genocide, as sexual violence results in much more than “serious bodily or mental harm” for those who experience it, witness it, or are otherwise exposed to it.

17 As is the focus of other scholars who advocate for the addition of social and cultural harms to our definition of genocide (for example, Shaw, 2007).
Directions for Future Research

In terms of future research, an important next step in understanding sexual violence as genocide is making broader comparisons across cases. The Armenian and Rwandan genocides differed in many respects, including temporally, geographically, and their social and cultural contexts, but it was their differing legal contexts that made them ideal cases for the research questions at hand. Other cases of genocide have also been noted for widespread sexual violence; however, including that of the former Yugoslavia. Given that history is socially constructed, and dominant narratives of genocide are produced, it is also important to utilize cases that may not be known for widespread sexual violence, as this does not necessarily mean that it did not occur. One such case is the genocide in Indonesia, the details of which are only coming to light after decades of silence (Pohlman, 2014).

A crucial next step for understanding how well international law represents the true phenomenon of sexual violence as genocide would be to compare legal testimony of survivors with testimonies such as those used in the present study. Although this is not possible in the Armenian genocide, which was never prosecuted by the United Nations, data from sexual violence prosecutions in the ICTR may be compared to oral history interviews. This type of comparison may also be made for the former Yugoslavia and for cases moving forward in the ICC, such as violence in Sudan and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Such analyses would build upon the findings of the present study to improve implications for international law.

The results of this dissertation can assist us not only in understanding sexual violence in genocide, but also in understanding sexual violence more broadly. In Chapter 1, I quoted MacKinnon, who drew parallels between the nature of rape in genocide and the nature of rape in general. She stated that:
Rape in genocide – gender combined with ethnicity, nationality, or religion in genocidal rape – does to women and men on a combined sex and racial, ethnic, national or religious basis, what rape does to women outside genocides on a sex and gender basis everyday. (MacKinnon, 2006)

MacKinnon argues that just as genocide destroys racial, ethnic, national, and religious groups through sexual violence, sexual violence is used as a destructive force against women every day.

As discussed in the previous sections, the results of my analysis have implications for both the definition of sexual violence and the definition of genocide in international law. I believe that these results can also enhance our understanding of sexual violence outside of genocide. A broad definition of sexual violence inclusive of acts that are not necessarily physical in nature (e.g. harassment) would likely be more reflective not only of experiences of sexual violence in genocide, but also of experiences with sexual violence in an every day context. For example, a “continuum” theory of sexual violence views sexual violence as comprising various stages, including verbal threats and other forms of action and harassment leading up to rape (Mardorossian, 2002). In addition, just as sexual violence in genocide is not limited to serious bodily or mental harm for its victims, sexual violence outside of genocide also results in social consequences that should not be ignored. For instance, on an individual-level, stigmatization and secondary victimization are common consequences for victims of sexual violence, and on a group-level, fear of sexual violence impacts women’s behavior every day. Future research in the broader area of sexual violence could include analysis of “every day” survivors’ narratives to see whether these conclusions hold. Comparison of themes identified in narratives across samples of survivors of sexual violence in genocide and survivors of sexual violence outside of genocide could also lead to potentially meaningful results.
This analysis is the first comparison of sexual violence in the Armenian and Rwandan genocides, and it is one of the first empirical comparisons of sexual violence across genocides. By utilizing data from oral history interviews with survivors, this victimological study allows us to understand the phenomenon of sexual violence in genocide from the perspective of survivors. In this dissertation, victims’ voices provide us with insights into their perceptions and interpretations of events, a better understanding of the relationship between the group and the individual, and the adequacy of current international law in addressing sexual violence as genocide.

In these narratives, individuals did not understand genocide in terms of the law, but in terms of the consequences they experienced. Survivors were often unable to match the consequences they spoke of to specific forms of victimization (e.g. sexual violence) -- instead they discussed the experience and aftermath of genocide as a whole. Armenian survivors mentioned international law a handful of times, likely due to the lack of recognition of this atrocity as genocide. Although Rwandan survivors did sometimes mention Gacaca, a local form of justice and truth-telling, they did not discuss international law at all. The lack of discussion of international law in both cases indicates that international law did not have an impact on survivors’ understandings of genocide.

Although survivors understand genocide in terms of their personal experience, this does not mean that the individual nature of their narratives has no implications for the legal understanding of genocide as a harm against a collectivity. The very nature of these oral history interviews was to obtain individuals’ stories of the genocides; aggregated together these narratives tell us something about genocide beyond the individual experience. Because survivors
understand their experiences of genocide, and of sexual violence in genocide, primarily in terms of their own individual experience, does not mean that the Armenian and Rwandan atrocities were not genocidal or that sexual violence was not used towards genocidal ends. It does mean that although genocide is a crime against a collectivity, consequences for the individual contribute to the collective well being of the group.

In particular, utilizing victims’ voices in this dissertation, I have illustrated the need for a broad definition of sexual violence in international law, given that even those who experienced non-physical forms of sexual violence or those who witnessed sexual violence include these events in their genocide narratives years after the atrocities. In addition, although survivors understood these genocides primarily in terms of their individual experiences, social and cultural harms were also present in narratives for both cases. A definition of genocide that more explicitly encompasses social and cultural harms would be more accurate and more reflective of victims’ interpretations.
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APPENDIX A

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework
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APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Reconstructed Armenian Interview Protocol

**Background questions and Armenian culture**

- Tell me what you remember about your city and your village.
- Was there a church in the village?
- When would you go to church?
- Do you know the type of government system in the village?
- What was your home like?
- How many people lived in your house?
- Name all the people you can remember in your family.
- What was your family life like?
- What did you do during the day?
- What did you do during the summertime or after school for enjoyment?
- Do you remember the games that you played?
- What would you eat for meals?
- What would happen if people got sick?
- How were the elderly taken care of?
- When somebody died in the village what happened?
- What about when somebody was born?
- How was a wedding celebrated?
- How old were people when they got married?
- Were the marriages arranged?
- When did a boy become a man?
- Do you remember your parents telling stories about other relatives?

**Leading up to the genocide**

- Do you remember any things from your childhood as happy times other than what you have mentioned now or particularly sad times other than the massacres before that time?
- Do you remember any Turks living in the village?
- Were there any problems with religion?
- Did Turks and Armenians ever get married before the war?

**The genocide**

- What things happened during 1915 or a little bit before that gave you an indication that the massacres were about to happen?
- Anything else on the road you saw? Any other stories that you remember? Any incidents that you remember? Did you see anything else on the deportation routes?
- Are there any people that helped you?
- What was life like in the orphanage?
- Were there only Armenians in the orphanage?
After the genocide:
- How did you come to America?
- Did you have impressions of America before you came here?
- What was most difficult for you when you came to America?
- During this time did you try to stay Armenian or did you want to become American?

The Future and Remembering the Genocide:
- Who are the Armenians that you admire most in history?
- In order to be a good Armenian, what must one do? How does one be a good Armenian?
- Should the Armenians remember April 24th?
- If Turkey gave back our land, would you go live there?
- Do you think there will be any Armenians in the United States 50 years from now?
- Do you think there will ever be a unity of Armenian people?
- Have you ever told this story to your children or grandchildren? Your life story?
Reconstructed Rwandan Interview Protocol

Background/Before the Genocide

- We would like you to begin by telling us about yourself – your names, when and where were you born?
- How big was your family? How many children were you?
- Tell us what you remember about [your family member(s)].
- Who from your family survived the genocide?
- Tell us about life before the genocide.
- Had you ever had any problems before the genocide (because you are a Tutsi)?
- What can you say about the period when the genocide was about to start?

The Genocide

- Can you tell us how the genocide started here?
- Do you remember the day of April 6, 1994? What happened on that day?
- What happened to you?
- How did [your family member(s)] die? How do you know this?

After the Genocide

- Now, how is your life?
- Did you return to where you used to live?
- What is the thing that hurt you the most that you remember and will never forget?
- Do you think you can forgive the people who killed your family?
- Do you feel that justice has been done for you and your family?

The Future

- Given the life you experienced, where do you think Rwanda is heading?
- Do you believe that consequences of the genocide will affect your offspring?
- Do you have hope for the future?
- Do you think unity and reconciliation are possible?
- Is there any particular message you would like to pass to the world at large especially to those who will came across this testimony?
- Is there any message you want to pass on to other survivors?
## APPENDIX C: CODING SCHEMES

### List of Start Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Categories</th>
<th>Specific Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Individual/Group</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survivor Attributes</td>
<td>Gender-Male</td>
<td>A-M</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender-Female</td>
<td>A-F</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>A-A</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>A-S</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personally experienced sexual violence?</td>
<td>A-SV</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Definition of Genocide</td>
<td>Killing members of the group</td>
<td>UN-K</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bodily/mental harm</td>
<td>UN-H</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group conditions for physical destruction</td>
<td>UN-GC</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measures to prevent births within the group</td>
<td>UN-PB</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transferring children to another group</td>
<td>UN-TC</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Sexual Violence</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>SV-R</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molestation</td>
<td>SV-M</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forced marriage</td>
<td>SV-FM</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual slavery</td>
<td>SV-SS</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enforced sterilization</td>
<td>SV-ES</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forced prostitution</td>
<td>SV-FP</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forced abortion</td>
<td>SV-FA</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forced nudity</td>
<td>SV-FN</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>SV-H</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context of Genocide</td>
<td>Social factors</td>
<td>CG-S</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political factors</td>
<td>CG-P</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic factors</td>
<td>CG-E</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural factors</td>
<td>CG-C</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gendered factors</td>
<td>CG-G</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences of Sexual Violence</td>
<td>Shame/stigma in society</td>
<td>CS-SS</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shame/stigma in</td>
<td>CS-SF</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Characteristics</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>CS-F</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>CS-PTSD</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>CS-D</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopelessness</td>
<td>CS-H</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to bear children</td>
<td>CS-U</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>CS-HIV</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>CS-P</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context of Sexual Violence</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>CTS-Pub</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>CTS-Prv</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivor's Home</td>
<td>CTS-SH</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator’s Home</td>
<td>CTS-PH</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deportation</td>
<td>CTS-D</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothel</td>
<td>CTS-B</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim/Offender Relationship</td>
<td>Offender unknown to victim</td>
<td>VO-U</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offender known to victim</td>
<td>VO-K</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offender was part of military</td>
<td>VO-M</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offender was part of paramilitary group</td>
<td>VO-PM</td>
<td>I/G</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Coding Scheme

I. Sexual Victimization Experience
   a. Victim
      a.i. Survivor
      a.ii. Parent
      a.iii. Sibling
      a.iv. Other relative
      a.v. Friend/neighbor
      a.vi. Unknown individual
   b. Victim Attributes
      b.i. Male
      b.ii. Female
      b.iii. Baby
      b.iv. Child
      b.v. Teen-Young Adult
      b.vi. Adult
      b.vii. Elderly
   c. Experience
      c.i. Firsthand
      c.ii. Secondhand
      c.iii. Witnessed
      c.iv. Presumed
      c.v. Anticipated
   d. Type of Sexual Victimization
      d.i. Rape
      d.ii. Gang rape
      d.iii. Oral sex
      d.iv. Molestation
      d.v. Mutilation
      d.vi. Forced marriage
      d.vii. Sexual slavery
      d.viii. Sterilization (forced)
      d.ix. Prostitution (forced)
      d.x. Abortion
      d.xi. Harassment
      d.xii. Threatened
      d.xiii. Nudity (forced)
   e. Context of Victimization
      e.i. Public
      e.ii. Private
      e.iii. Survivor’s home
      e.iv. Perpetrator’s home
      e.v. Deportation
      e.vi. While running away or in hiding
e.vii. Daytime

e.viii. Nighttime

f. Perpetrator
  f.i. Unknown to victim
  f.ii. Known to victim
  f.iii. Part of military
  f.iv. Part of paramilitary group
  f.v. Ethnicity
    f.v.1. Hutu
    f.v.2. Turk
    f.v.3. Kurd

II. Victim Identification

III. Consequences
  a. Physical
    a.i. Pregnancy
    a.ii. HIV/AIDS
    a.iii. Other STD
    a.iv. Sickness/disease
    a.v. Wounds/injuries
    a.vi. Weakness

b. Social/cultural
  b.i. Challenges
  b.ii. Broken families
  b.iii. Sexual dysfunction
  b.iv. Isolation (reluctant to share exp)
  b.v. Stigma
  b.vi. Loss of culture

c. Psychological
  c.i. PTSD
    c.i.1. Re-experiencing
    c.i.2. Avoidance
    c.i.3. Arousal
  c.ii. Hopelessness
  c.iii. Feeling badly about oneself
  c.iv. Loneliness
  c.v. Alcoholism/drug addiction
  c.vi. Fear of disease
  c.vii. Depression
  c.viii. Suicidality

d. Memory
  d.i. Unforgettable
  d.ii. Lack of Personal History

e. Group consequence

f. Ongoing victimization/suffering

g. “Lost everything”

h. Perceived Consequences for Others
h.i. Physical
   h.i.1. Pregnancy
   h.i.2. HIV/AIDS
   h.i.3. Other STD
   h.i.4. Sickness/disease
   h.i.5. Wounds/injuries
   h.i.6. Weakness

h.ii. Social/cultural
   h.ii.1. Challenges
   h.ii.2. Broken families
   h.ii.3. Sexual dysfunction
   h.ii.4. Isolation (reluctant to share exp)
   h.ii.5. Stigma
   h.ii.6. Loss of culture

h.iii. Psychological
   h.iii.1. PTSD
      h.iii.1.a. Re-experiencing
      h.iii.1.b. Avoidance
      h.iii.1.c. Arousal
   h.iii.2. Hopelessness
   h.iii.3. Feeling badly about oneself
   h.iii.4. Loneliness
   h.iii.5. Alcoholism/drug addiction
   h.iii.6. Fear of disease
   h.iii.7. Depression
   h.iii.8. Suicidality

h.iv. Memory
   h.iv.1. Unforgettable
   h.iv.2. Lack of Personal History

h.v. Group consequence

h.vi. Ongoing victimization/suffering

h.vii. “Lost everything”

IV. Emotions experienced during genocide
   a. Suicidality
   b. Fear
   c. Depression
   d. Hopelessness
   e. Not understanding
   f. Perceived emotions of others
      f.i. Suicidality
      f.ii. Fear
      f.iii. Depression
      f.iv. Hopelessness
      f.v. Not understanding

V. Methods for Avoiding Victimization
   a. Deception
b. Self-defense
c. Suicide
d. Hiding
e. Running away
f. Cross-dressing
g. Make oneself unattractive
h. Marriage to member of perp group
i. Asking for help
j. Paying

VI. Descriptions of Perpetrators
   a. Climate Prior to Armenian Genocide
   b. Violence
c. Geographic Separation
d. A/T Peace
e. Turkish power
f. A/K relations
g. Sentiments toward Turks
h. Politics
   i. Gender customs
   j. Turkish language
   k. Intermarriage
   l. Mixed populations

VII. Climate Prior to Rwandan Genocide (Background)
   a. Tension/ideology/incitement
   b. Violence
c. Ethnic ID/Divisions
d. Imprisonment
e. Discrimination
f. Politics
g. Peace
   h. Not knowing the difference
      i. Exile
      j. 1950s-1960s
      k. 1970s
   l. Gender dynamics

VIII. Mass Victimization
   a. Murder
   b. Dead bodies
   c. Property
d. Deported
e. Kidnapping
f. Assault
g. Imprisonment
   h. Sexual Violence
      i. Death lists

IX. Free Codes
a. Sexual violence
b. Group victimization
c. Rumor
d. Forgiveness
e. Assimilation
f. Beauty
g. Mistrust
h. Hope for the future
i. “Unspeakable”
j. Concurrent victimizations
k. Gender-specific victimization
l. Choiceless choice
m. Dehumanization
n. Role of religion after genocide
## APPENDIX D: RESEARCH LOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Research Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/27/13</td>
<td>- Open code ARM <em>44</em> F &amp; Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/13</td>
<td>- Set up node hierarchy in NVivo to nest interviews within genocide (create a node for each interview and classify as a person with attributes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29/13</td>
<td>- Meet with Dr. Amy Farrell about nesting described above and other preliminary issues (See Memo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Open code RWA <em>53</em> F &amp; Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/30/13</td>
<td>- Re-code all Armenian interviews as nodes. There was a problem with NVivo automatically coding PDF documents once for the entire document and then once for each page of the document, leaving them with numerous references when they should have each only been coded once. After contacting NVivo support, I have fixed this error without having to convert my 80 PDF interviews to a different document type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/13</td>
<td>- Create coding scheme from start codes and open codes from ARM <em>44</em> F and RWA <em>53</em> F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enter coding scheme in NVivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/13</td>
<td>- Begin recoding RWA <em>53</em> F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ran into questions about concurrent victimizations &amp; emailed Dr. Farrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/13</td>
<td>- Met with Dr. Farrell about coding scheme and concurrent victimizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Modified coding scheme &amp; memo about re-coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/6/13</td>
<td>- Created SPSS document for victim characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Re-coded RWA <em>53</em> F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Memo: Unspeakable in Armenian interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19/13</td>
<td>- All PDFs have been converted to continuous documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- All word docs have been converted to RTFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- All documents have been imported to MAXQDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Document groups (ARM/RWA) created in MAXQDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Variables (gender, age, exp sv) created in MAXQDA and gender assigned to all interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coding scheme (2-4-13) entered into MAXQDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ARM <em>44</em> F recoded with new coding scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20/13</td>
<td>- RWA <em>53</em> F coded in MaxQDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- RWA <em>01</em> M coded in MaxQDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/13</td>
<td>- ARM <em>01</em> M coded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ARM <em>02</em> F coded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/13</td>
<td>- RWA <em>02</em> F coded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23/13</td>
<td>- ARM <em>04</em> F coded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- RWA <em>04</em> F coded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/13</td>
<td>- Memo on completed coding of 8 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/13</td>
<td>- Revised coding scheme (slightly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Analyzed segments coded as “physical consequences”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Memo on “physical consequences” and subcodes identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Began analyzing segments coded as “social/cultural consequences”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/26/13</td>
<td>- Finished analyzing segments coded as “social/cultural consequences”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Memo on “Social/cultural consequences” and subcodes identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Analyzed segments coded as “psychological consequences”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Began memo on “psychological consequences” and subcodes identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27/13</td>
<td>- Met with Dr. Carlos Cuevas about psychological themes/PTSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Finished grouping psychological consequences and wrote memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5/13</td>
<td>- Met with Dr. Farrell to discuss some of the questions that arose from 2/25 memo after reviewing coded segments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6/13</td>
<td>- ARM_05_M coded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ARM_06_M coded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- RWA_03_M coded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/13</td>
<td>- RWA_05_M coded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/12/13</td>
<td>- RWA_06_M coded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13/13</td>
<td>- Met with Dr. Nicole Rafter and Dr. Farrell to confirm my approach to coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Recoded RWA_01_M, RWA_02_F, RWA_03_M, RWA_04_F, RWA_05_F, RWA_06_F, RWA_07_F, ARM_01_M, ARM_02_F, ARM_03_F, ARM_04_F, ARM_05_F (all interviews coded before I revised coding scheme on 3/6/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Memoed about these activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/13</td>
<td>- Added descriptive memos to codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Re-coded all sexual victimization experiences for legal framework (should do simultaneously in the future)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Re-coded “consequences” that really qualify as emotions during the genocide and also un-coded “physical consequences” (e.g. hunger) that were part of genocide experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/13</td>
<td>- Re-coded all interviews coded thus far with free codes that have been added to coding scheme -- this brings me entirely up to date on coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_03_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_07_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_09_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_08_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_09_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_10_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_07_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_08_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Began coding RWA_10_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20/13</td>
<td>- Finished coding RWA_10_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_11_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_12_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_11_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wrote 3/22/13 memo (after coding 25 interviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23/13</td>
<td>- Recoded all interviews according to 3/22/13 memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Revised coding scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_12_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_13_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_14_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_15_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/26/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_14_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/27/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_13_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_15_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/31/13</td>
<td>- Reviewed coded segments for mass victimization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reviewed coded segments for climate prior to Armenian genocide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reviewed coded segments for climate prior to Rwandan genocide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Memo on creating subcodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Revised coding scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_16_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_17_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_18_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/3/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_16_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_21_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/6/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_17_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_18_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_19_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/17/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_20_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_21_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_22_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/18/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_19_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Memo on this interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/19/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_22_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/20/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_23_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_24_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_25_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_26_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_27_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/23/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_28_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_24_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/24/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_25_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Began coding RWA_29_M (repeated interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/25/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_23_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/29/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_26_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/30/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_27_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_28_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_34_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/1/13</td>
<td>- Meeting with Dr. Farrell – notes/memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_30_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_31_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_32_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_33_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_30_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_31_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/3/13</td>
<td>- Wrote memo on beginning analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_29_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_32_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_34_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_33_F (no pers SV, spoke of it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5/13</td>
<td>- Began coding ARM_35_F, but not a survivor of the genocide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_36_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_37_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_38_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_39_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_35_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Memo on definition of SV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Created SPSS dataset for SV experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Entered all Rwandan coded segments in SV dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Simultaneously re-coded all SV experiences as type of SV and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>included victim/experience marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/13</td>
<td>- Began entering Armenian coded segments in SV dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Simultaneously re-coded all SV experiences as type of SV and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>included victim/experience marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/13</td>
<td>- Memo on creation and use of SV spreadsheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sent memo to Dr. Farrell due to several lingering questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_40_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_41_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_42_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_43_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_45_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_46_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_36_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_38_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/10/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_37_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_41_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_39_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_40_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Phone call with Dr. Farrell about analysis plan &amp; SV spreadsheet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|            | - Revised Coding scheme (added “Deception” and “Self-defense”)}
to ‘Methods for avoiding victimization”) and re-coded segments
coded generally under these new subcodes
- Memo on phone call with Dr. Farrell

5/11/13
- Finished re-coding all segments coded as SV
- Finished creating SV spreadsheet
- Wrote memo on finishing these two tasks

5/12/13
- Coded RWA_43_F
- Coded RWA_44_F
- Coded RWA_45_F
- Coded ARM_47_M
- Coded ARM_48_F
- Memo on beginning descriptive analysis

5/13/13
- Coded ARM_49_M
- Coded ARM_50_F
- Began coding ARM_51_F – did not experience the genocide (was in Russia)
- Coded ARM_52_F

5/14/13
- Coded ARM_54_F
- Coded ARM_55_F

5/15/13
- Preliminary analysis of descriptive data
- Memo on preliminary analysis of descriptive data (RQ1)
- Coded ARM_53_M
- Coded ARM_56_M
- Coded ARM_57_M
- Coded ARM_58_M

5/16/13
- Coded RWA_46_F
- Coded RWA_48_M

5/17/13
- Coded RWA_47_M
- Coded RWA_49_F
- Began coding RWA_51_M, but it is a perpetrator interview
- Sent 5/15/13 memo to entire committee

5/18/13
- Coded RWA_42_M
- Coded RWA_50_M
- Coded ARM_59_M
- Coded ARM_60_F

5/19/13
- Began analysis on RQ2 & RQ3
- Memo on preliminary analysis of RQ2 & RQ3
- Memo with notes from Dr. Rafter on preliminary analysis for RQ2 & RQ3

5/20/13
- Continued analysis on RQ2 & RQ3
- Finished memo on preliminary analysis of RQ2 & RQ3
- Coded ARM_62_M
- Coded ARM_63_F
- Coded ARM_65_M

5/21/13
- Coded ARM_61_M
- Coded ARM_64_M
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/22/13</td>
<td>- Checked all loss of culture codes and assimilation codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wrote memo on loss of culture/assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Memo with notes from Dr. Rafter on loss of culture/assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_55_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_56_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_70_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/23/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_71_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_67_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_72_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_73_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_74_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_75_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_76_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Responded to Dr. Rafter’s comment re: 5/15/13 memo &amp; saved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in memos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/17/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_77_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_78_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_79_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/18/13</td>
<td>- Began coding RWA_57_F – not about genocide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_58_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_59_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_62_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_60_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_61_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_63_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_66_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_67_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_80_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_81_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_82_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_83_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_84_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_68_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_69_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_72_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/23/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_65_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_70_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_71_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/24/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_73_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_74_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded RWA_75_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity Abbreviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/25/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_85_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_86_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_87_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/26/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_88_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_89_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_90_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_92_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Began coding ARM_94_M, but he came to the U.S. in 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_95_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_96_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_97_M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/13</td>
<td>- Coded ARM_95_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_98_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coded ARM_99_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/29/13</td>
<td>- Coded RWA_64 (all interviews now coded!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Memo on RWA_64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/13</td>
<td>- Began re-analyzing SV spreadsheet for RQ1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Began 7-1-13 memo on analysis for RQ1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/4/13</td>
<td>- Re-coding of threatened SV in MAXQDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Re-coding of segments coded only as “SV” in MAXQDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Re-ran frequencies and code relations browser and updated 7/1/13 memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/13</td>
<td>- Memo on Unspeakable/indescribable in Rwandan interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10/14</td>
<td>- Began re-writing methods chapter (Ch 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/14</td>
<td>- Began writing Ch 4 (RQ1 – quantitative results)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/14</td>
<td>- Received and began addressing Dr. Rafter’s preliminary comments on Ch 3 and Ch 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Began writing and analysis for Ch 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/28/14</td>
<td>- Memo on Unspeakable/indescribable in Armenian interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6/14</td>
<td>- Memo on beginning analysis for Research Questions 2 &amp; 3 (Ch 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1/14</td>
<td>- Began writing Ch 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9/14</td>
<td>- Received and began addressing Dr. Rafter’s comments on Ch 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/16/14</td>
<td>- Began writing Ch 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/22/14</td>
<td>- Worked on thesis of dissertation with Dr. Rafter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/28/14</td>
<td>- Received and began addressing Dr. Rafter’s comments on Ch 6 and effects matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/14</td>
<td>- Received and began addressing Dr. Rafter’s comments on Ch 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/28/14</td>
<td>- Worked on Statement of Reflexivity with Dr. Farrell and Dr. Rafter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2/14</td>
<td>- Received and began addressing Dr. Farrell’s comments on the full draft of the dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/14</td>
<td>Received and began addressing Dr. Rafter’s comments on the second full draft of the dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/14</td>
<td>Received and began addressing Dr. Farrell’s comments on the second full draft of dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22/14</td>
<td>Received and began addressing Dr. Poiger’s comments on the second full draft of dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/14</td>
<td>Final full draft of dissertation sent to committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E: EFFECTS MATRIX

Effects Matrix for Research Questions 2 & 3 Consequences of Genocide\(^{18}\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect Type</th>
<th>Specific Consequence of Sexual Violence</th>
<th>As a result of what type of sexual violence?(^{19})</th>
<th>Physical contact required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Inability to be sexually intimate</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIV/AIDS/STD</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hopelessness/meaninglessness</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling badly about oneself</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcoholism/drug addiction</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suicidality</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stigma</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of Culture</td>
<td>Forced marriage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Code</td>
<td>Unforgettable</td>
<td>Witnessing</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{18}\) Survivors of sexual violence may not be the only survivors to report these consequences; however, this matrix examines the associations among various types of sexual violence experienced and consequences discussed.

\(^{19}\) This column indicates what types of sexual violence the survivor(s) reporting a specific consequence of the genocide experienced. The survivors do not necessarily explicitly state that the consequence is a direct result of a particular type of sexual violence.