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Abstract

This dissertation investigated how the Gikuyu people of central Kenya understood justice, forgiveness and trauma healing or their absence during a decade of intra-group reciprocal violence. This qualitative research study employed the narrative research method utilizing the “Williams Model” (Riessman, 2008). Field interviews were guided by a primary research question: What do the narratives of perpetrators and victims in reciprocal violence reveal about their understanding of justice, forgiveness and trauma healing or their absence? Fourteen research participants aged 78 to 92 years shared their full narratives. Current conflict analysis literature overwhelmingly centers on the victims and less on perpetrators. The research sample allowed perpetrator voices to be heard.

The findings of this study suggest that the absence of justice as defined by the stakeholders is a primary perceived barrier towards forgiveness and trauma healing in post-conflict environments. While restorative justice literature offers hope in repairing harm, it’s applicability in this study bears some complications when faced with the unreadiness of perpetrators to face their victims in a voluntary process. An extended discussion on restorative justice is offered under implications. Fair land re-distribution was identified as the most preferred response to the question of justice but is yet to be addressed. This stalemate suggests the need for a new negotiated framing and definition of justice if progress is to be expected. The study found out that forgiveness and trauma healing are desired but perceived as impossible goals. Researchers and policy makers could benefit from the findings especially in promoting native and localized restorative justice processes in order to terminate cycles of reciprocal violence.
Chapter 1 – Introduction to the Study

The Gikuyu people claim to have originated from their ancestors; the father, Gikuyu, and mother, Muumbi. They hailed from Mukurwe-Wanyagathanga in present day Murang’a County in central Kenya. The couple had nine daughters from whom the nine clans (mihiriga) could be traced. Social and political organization were centered on age-groups (Mariika) specific groups of men and women who were circumcised and initiated to mark their transition from childhood to adulthood. Time and major historical events were tracked through these age-groups. For example, the advent of the first colonists was remembered as having happened during the age-group of the locusts. This simply meant that during the circumcision season, locusts had invaded Gikuyu-land and symbolically the colonist invasion was tied to that particular age-group. The elders (Kiama) in every village formed the lowest local political structure and their job included administering justice and resolving local disputes (Kariuki, 1963).

The suffering of the natives started upon the arrival of the colonists and intensified during the First and Second World Wars during which more than 45,000 Gikuyu men between the ages of 17 and 37 were forcibly enlisted to fight for the colonial regime overseas. Many died out of negligence, lack of food and medical assistance (Goldfinch, 1923; Sandgren, 1989). Those who survived and made it safely back to Kenya were totally neglected by the colonial regime. Their lives were altered forever by the war. One research participant interviewed later was a World War II veteran. Religion was indirectly used as a tool for structural violence and manipulation resulting into ruptured native practices deemed incompatible with a “europeanized” lifestyle. Native converts were relieved from paying taxes or serving in the military. This special
treatment widened the chasm between the converts (athomī) and those who refused to embrace colonial religion. The colonists occupied the best arable land and expanded political, psychological and social domination among the new converts.

The Berlin conference of 1884 officially started the process of occupying what later came to be known as the “Kenya colony”, making it formal in 1895. The definition of colonialism was contested (Horvath, 1972). To some, colonialism was the act of forcibly occupying a people group against their will and forcing them to become subjects of the occupier while dictating economic, social and political decisions (Kohn, 2012). Another definition could be derived from the Latin word colonus meaning a farmer and a foreigner who settled in non-native lands for the sole purpose of farming while maintaining ties with his native country (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2013). The colonists in Kenya occupied the best agricultural lands while they retained citizenship with Great Britain, protected by the King. European superiority complex expressed by occupying and terrorizing non-Europeans was incomprehensible to the innocent natives (Kohn, 2012).

The arrogance closely tied to the claim that Africans and other nationalities needed to be “civilized” by the Europeans and assumed that these communities were incomplete humans and hence needed to be “Europeanized” exposing the flawed claim of equating Europeanization with humanness with obvious disastrous results (Eliot, 1966). The goal of colonialism was obliteration of the native populations and their history (Fanon, 1963). The natives were after all labelled in less human categories, (Smith, 2011), deserving subjugation, abusive exploitation and used as tools for extracting natural resources to benefit the interests of the colonists’.
The hidden motivation to occupy others was not civilization or environmental protection but economic exploitation and projection of imperialistic power over helpless native communities (Ax, Brimes, Jensen, & Oslund, 2011). The birth of the Mau Mau resistance movement could have been a natural response by a people group that was seeking baseline human dignity and the right to self-determine. The act of being subjected to barbaric treatment unleashed by the colonial occupiers provoked a violent native response (Muthu, 2003). Hayward (2009) details how the colonist military airpower unleashed on the native poorly armed Mau Mau Land and Freedom Forces. Having learned new airpower tactics in their operations in Malaya, Kenya provided another playground to perfect their art of killing. Hayward (2009) summarizes the biased colonial approach to the Mau Mau thus:

A mysterious branch of the Kikuyu tribe, Mau Mau had its roots in the Kenyan land reform movement and in the early 1950s began to vent its frustrations at the colonial government. Its intentions, much like the movement as a whole, remained porous, ensuring that Mau Mau was concomitantly labelled reformist, nationalist, anti-colonial and Kikuyu supremacist. British propaganda managed to propound a common perception of Mau Mau as an atavistic and savage group with no regard for life. The early British response to increased Mau Mau violence at the outbreak of the emergency was the mass arrest of Mau Mau sympathisers as well as of leaders of the trade unions and the nationalist movement. This left Mau Mau with an inexperienced and semi-educated leadership with no contact with the established hierarchy. (Hayward, 2009, p.75)
The above summary demonstrated the narrow colonist view and ignorance of the native communities and structure of the Mau Mau. The abusive treatment by linguistically and culturally illiterate colonists unaware of the local traditional practices had been identified and documented rather early (Atkins, 1734; Mill, 1861). The faulty foundation established within colonialism created a potential path to negative attributions of the inferior “other” residing in the Dark Continent (Curtin, 1964; Jarosz, 1992; McCarthy, 1983; Nesse, 2005). The Mau Mau were generally denigrated and depicted as cannibal-like savages who were in need of civilization. However, the brilliance and intelligence demonstrated by their tactical, operational and strategic capabilities provided a different image of powerful thinkers, curriculum writers, music composers, theologians and native journalists advocating for self-determination, freedom and land (Odhiambo & Lonsdale, 2003).

The colonial occupation left long lasting and damaging effects on the natives that are still present today decades after the colonists’ departure (Mamdani, 1996). To wage the war from the skies, the colonists were aided by Harvard aircraft and Lincoln bombers (Hayward, 2009). The bombings over Mount Kenya and the Aberdare ranges in central Kenya using four Lincoln bomber aircraft and ten Harvard aircraft demonstrated the desperation among the colonists especially given the poor targeting methods of the day. Unleashing that kind of airpower raised the question of proportionality given that the Mau Mau were only armed with homemade weapons and the few guns they had managed to steal by raiding colonial police stations.

A claim is also made that it took one ton of bombs to kill one Mau Mau warrior (NAUK, WO 276). If this was designed to make the Mau Mau come out of the Aberdares
and Mount Kenya running, it was a sad miscalculation. One colonial officer described the use of aerial bombing as of no consequence and self-defeating (Waters, 1973). Even with their very limited targeting capabilities, the colonists encountered stiff resistance from the Mau Mau who were familiar with the terrain and the advantage of observing aircraft movement and possible ground forces presence enabled them to adjust their tactics and procedures. The Kenya Truth and Justice Commission report stated the following about the creation of Kenya:

The creation of modern day Kenya dates back to 1885 when European imperial powers assembled in Berlin, Germany, to partition Africa among themselves. At the Berlin conference where these powers met, it was resolved that those interested in Africa would declare their spheres of influence then follow such declaration with effective control of the new territories. What followed was the partition of Africa, with little knowledge of the continent, especially its hinterlands. In the end, some roughly 10,000 African polities were amalgamated into 40 European colonies and protectorates. These colonies and protectorates would later provide the basis for the modern nation-states of Africa including Kenya. Some African societies with a lot in common were rent apart while others with nothing or little networks were fused together. (Kenya Truth Justice and Reconciliation Commission, 2013, Part 2A, p.2).

A new country was birthed out of colonial structural and physical violence and followed by gradual occupation. By 1922 the English population had reached 9,651; occupying more land in central Kenya and causing alarm among the Gikuyu, Embu and Meru people (Furley & Watson, 1978). The Kikuyu Association (KA) made up of native
chiefs and land owners from Kiambu village expressed their rejection of continued English encroachment of Gikuyu land. However, colonial officials and the missionaries with a blatant disregard for the natives ignored the Gikuyu petitions (Clough, 1990). Besides land grievances, the education system, newly introduced by the colonial government was racialized and discriminative. Kenyans occupied the lowest tier with the goal to educate them as farm laborers denying them literature, math and science subjects reserved for Indians and English settler population only (Clough, 1990); another example of structural violence.

Two other sources of continuous irritation were the *kipande* system (mandatory identity card that was hang around the neck like a dog tag introduced in 1919). All Kenyans had to carry around or risk arrest. This was a colonial command and control mechanism as well as a humiliation tool. In time, the Kikuyu Association (KA) under the leadership of native loyalist colonial chiefs was challenged by the Young Kikuyu Association (YKA) under the leadership of Harry Thuku who was a generation younger than the KA leaders. He was also more progressive and direct at exposing the ills of colonial occupation. Thuku was eventually arrested and detained while those clamoring and protesting his arrest were gunned down in hundreds by the colonists (Furedi, 1973). The efforts of Thuku and others did not go to waste since they soon transformed the YKA to the Kikuyu Central Association (KCA) that drew membership from an educated cluster among the Gikuyu, Embu and Meru people. Having educated natives in the opposition ranks amplified their voices in pointing out the flaws and gross injustices being carried out by the colonists. KCA formed the basis for Mau Mau warfighters. It had nationalist
apsirations but its deep roots in an ethnic base around central Kenya hampered that capacity (Maina, 2009).

The colonists divide and rule policy created foundations for structural violence that followed for decades (Galtung, 1969a). For example, in 1958, the currency was devalued while doubling the taxes for the natives driving them further into poverty. The missionaries precondition for the Gikuyu children admittance to their schools and churches was the denouncement of female genital mutilation, drinking traditional beer and polygamy (Oliver, 1952). The Gikuyu people were forced to sign (gwikira kirore) on paper that they had denounced these practices before their children could be admitted to local primary schools. This tension led to the Gikuyu people establishing their own independent schools and churches. As the chasm continued to widen, the colonists embarked on shutting down the native African schools provoking a violent response.

The colonists abused the natives and placed extreme restrictions on their way of life (Kershaw, 1989). Forming a military resistant group later known as the the Kenya Land and Freedom Army (KLFA) was the most attractive option (Kershaw, 1989). A significant group of natives refused to join the KLFA and instead joined the colonial ranks setting the stage for a bloody intra-group violence for almost a decade. During Kenya’s war of independence (1950-1963), the British government created a gulag system where the Gikuyu ethnic group was forcibly removed from their homes and forced into labor camps and detention centers. The justification for the declaration of the state of emergency by the colonist was partially by blaming the Mau Mau warriors for instigating the violence as noted by Lyttelton, the then Secretary of State for the Colonies;
…a state of emergency was proclaimed in Kenya last night. This was done with my full knowledge and approval. Secrecy was essential if the ring-leaders were to be arrested quickly and outbreaks of violence avoided…the situation has become progressively worse. Once, crimes were committed by stealth, but now law and order are challenged in broad daylight. Chief Waruhiu was murdered on the highway by a hired gunman…Nairobi has remained quiet and there has been no disorder either there or elsewhere in the colony. (Johnson, 1952, pp.1-2)

Initial underestimation of the war and the determination to cling on to the colony would later prove to be disastrous as the war deteriorated and ruthless inhuman measures were employed against the natives. In what seemed to be class antagonism, some elite Gikuyu tribe members, driven by a desire for self-preservation, wealth and power, pledged loyalty to the occupying colonists and supported the war against their own people (Peters, 2011). The loyalists joined the white community who had already concluded that the future of Kenya was to be determined by the colonists and not the natives (Puttkammer, 1957). Details surrounding this period of war and tension are slowly emerging as more Mau Mau war veterans openly share their experiences following the official recognition of the Mau Mau Veterans Association, a group that had been previously banned until 2003. It was through the efforts of this organization that a lawsuit against the British government was filed in a London High Court in search for justice and compensation for personal torture, loss of property and livelihoods.

In order to advance the colonial agenda, the divide and rule policy was enacted forcing the Gikuyu people to choose between the resistance movement or align with the
colonists’ as loyalists who supported the occupiers mission. This division resulted into an intractable intra-group reciprocal violence among the Gikuyu people. The resistance movement gained momentum and growth to later become the Kenya Land and Freedom Army (KLFA). The Gikuyu people who joined the colonists as loyalists were immediately branded as betrayers and worse enemies than the whites because they knew the terrain of the land as well as the secrets of the Gikuyu and their acts of betrayal hurt the resistors the most. The intra-group reciprocal violence degraded the ability to fight the foreigners as a united entity and probably was a welcome turn of events for the colonial administration who watched the violence from the sidelines even as they supported their newly founded alliance with the loyalist Gikuyu people. The Gikuyu on Gikuyu violence was concentrated around the central province of Kenya and left remarkable destruction with unknown losses of human life, land, property and devastating trauma. Based on the intra-group violence described above, I now turn to the research primary focus in an effort to illuminate how the Gikuyu people experienced and understood the intractable reciprocal violence.

**Research Problem**

Intra-group violence continues to ravage vast communities across Africa and the search for a solution is an ongoing effort. This study documents intra-group conflict, detailing whole and complete narratives expressed by perpetrators and victims. Selecting one community, this study attempted to understand how the Gikuyu people experienced justice, forgiveness and trauma healing or their absence during the Mau Mau war of independence. Past studies have focused on historical colonial accounts and the Mau Mau
but generally omit the intra-group reciprocal violence and its impact on justice, forgiveness, and trauma healing (Odhiambo & Lonsdale, 2003).

The narratives unveiled the root causes of reciprocal revenge among the Gikuyu and their long term and short term impact (Branch, 2009). Expressed narratives by research participants addressed gaps existing in literature today specifically intra-group conflict drivers and possibilities for resolution (Branch, 2011; Sandgren, 2012). The awareness of the limited framing covered in this research assisted me to elicit what was most important to the research participants as they shared their narratives. I remained open to hearing the whole story while observing important non-verbal details that enriched the narratives and their meaning.

The Gikuyu people were forced to choose between supporting the colonists or fighting against them. For the resistors, also known as the Mau Mau, they built solidarity around shared goals of freedom and forcibly taking back land that was occupied by the colonists. Those who chose to support the colonists also known as the loyalists were fiercely despised by the KLFA, and hence the homogenous group that had existed together in peace for generations was internally trapped in a reciprocal violent conflict (Anderson, 2005b; Elkins, 2005). The socio-economic gap that emerged between these two groups tended to amplify differences (Maloba, 1998).

**Goals of the Research**

First, this study sought to expand current research on colonial based intergroup violence and how perpetrators and victims understood and narrated their understanding of justice, forgiveness and trauma healing or their absence. Fourteen research participants shared whole narratives detailing their experiences as perpetrators and victims.
the research attempted to demonstrate the central role justice as defined by the victims played in conflict transformation. Third, the study explored whether the absence of justice could become the catalyst for future conflicts since it was viewed as the primary roadblock towards forgiveness and trauma healing. Fourth, restorative justice could provide a pathway towards possible solution focused approach appropriate for indigineous settings. Learning directly from the survivors of the Mau Mau war of independence privileged their direct experience with this conflict providing rich data sources.

**Research Question**

The primary research question that guided the study was as follows:

What do the narratives of perpetrators and victims in “reciprocal revenge” revealed about their understanding of justice, forgiveness and trauma healing or their absence?

**Conclusion**

To gain a broad understanding of the topic, chapter two covered a detailed literature review situating the study within intra-group violence generated by colonialism while driven and shaped by dehumanization, hatred and structural violence theories. I also provided a detailed colonial background overview and how this contributed to the construction of otherness. The Mau Mau historical background and description highlighted three massacres (Lari, Chuka and Hola). The increased grievances for land and freedom motivated the Mau Mau warfighters to take various oaths binding them together towards a united war effort. The native loyalists also known as the “home guards” assumed the perpetrator role driven by their urge for self-preservation and other motivations.
In chapter three, I discussed the research method and its justification. Thematic narrative analysis provided a fresh appreciation on how the perpetrators and victims of intra-group reciprocal violence understood justice, forgiveness and trauma healing and most important their absence. Intractable ethnic based violence especially in Africa could be understood using the perpetrator-victim lenses given the nature of their long history. The research participants’ thick descriptions offered a possible roadmap seeking to fulfill the demands of justice defined by the victims and perpetrators first, before seeking forgiveness and trauma healing. Chapter four offered the results of my field research. In chapter five, I offered a discussion section followed by conclusions, recommendations and contributions to the field of conflict analysis and resolution.
Chapter 2 – Literature Review

The research study invited fourteen participants from Kiambu, Nyeri and Embu counties in the greater central Kenya region who experienced Kenya’s war of independence between 1952 and 1962. Their thick descriptions provided detailed accounts of their understanding of justice, forgiveness and trauma healing and their absence. The literature review detailed the role of dehumanization, hatred, structural violence, the oath ritual and how these four aided in setting the stage for intra-group reciprocal violence. Potential gaps in current research were highlighted towards the end of this section. Colonialism planted and nurtured the seeds of hatred, dehumanization and indirectly created artificial differences between the Gikuyu people creating perpetrators and victims out of one homogeneous people group. The link between colonialism and dehumanization where one group treated another as inferior, evil and inhuman deserving to be exterminated has been documented (Bar-Tal, 2000; Haslam, 2006; Zimbardo, 2008). Racial categories have also been used where people with light/white color pigmentation are deemed superior to those who are dark skinned despite the fact that skin color has more to do with environmental exposure than inferiority or superiority categories (Jablonski, 2006). In the next section I will discuss in greater detail the four probable causes for intra-group reciprocal violence while relating them to the primary research question.

Contributing factors to intra-group reciprocal violence

Dehumanization

Maiese (2003) defined dehumanization as: “…a psychological process whereby opponents view each other as less than human and thus not deserving of moral
consideration. Jews in the eyes of Nazis and Tutsis in the eyes of Hutus in the Rwandan genocide…” (Maiese, 2003, p.1). Dehumanization and racism are closely linked (Smith, 2011). Dehumanization amplifies the “us” and “them” constructs leading to exclusion and violence (Bandura, Underwood, & Fromson, 1975). While human life has agency and value, granting recognition to some while denying it to others could result in blaming, invalidation and moral exclusion (Brock, Laham, Wilson, Haslam, & Koval, 2011; Epley, Waytz, Cacioppo, 2007; Opotow, 1995). A diary entry by a British colonial soldier in Kenya demonstrated aspects of dehumanization: “two natives remaining parts…nine fingers, two ears, three eyes, no testicles” (Foulks, 2011, section 2, Moshman, 2007, p.10). Other claims suggested that colonial forces severed hands of the dead in order to take their finger prints. Dehumanization accelerates conflict and blocks creative moral imagination of getting to a better place during conflict. Dehumanization tends to increase the tendency to treat others as inhuman (Hanna and Maiese, 2009). Groups locked in an “us” and “them” construct cease to acknowledge their shared humanity, attributing hostility to the “other”. Anderson (2005a) provided one of the sad accounts of dehumanization by colonists in Kenya based on how they treated human remains of the war dead natives. He referred to the 475 human remains held at the National Museum of Kenya with indications of torturous deaths. An inscription appears on their container with the following description:

…The skeletons of this collection are the remains of Africans (mostly of the Gikuyu tribe) who were killed during the great emergency of 1952 – 1960. They were uncovered and exhumed by the police and were then used as evidence against the Mau Mau by Her Majesty’s police. This collection was
generously donated to Dr. Leakey by Dr. Morris Rogoff, then the Chief Police Pathologist. (Anderson, (2005a, p.3)

The brutally murdered victims continue to be dishonored even in death. For the colonial police pathologist to treat human remains as trophies to be donated to the anthropologist suggested the colonists’ disregard of the Gikuyu people even in death. The degree of racial and ethnic hatred documented here closely mirrors Nazi Germany where perpetrators created a mental and psychological distance with their victims (Browning, 1998; Dower, 1998; Semelin, 2007; Harris, 1954; Kelman & Hamilton, 1993). The intra-group conflict among the Gikuyu people had the same degree of dehumanization and hatred. Tajfel and Turner (1986) in discussing social identity theory suggested that in intra-group conflict, each group tended to have a positive self-image while maintaining a negative one for the other side. Reciprocal violence among the Gikuyu people was driven by revenge (Moshman, 2007).

In order to eliminate dehumanization the gap between the “moral us” and “immoral them” has to be filled with a sense of shared humanity (Tsang, 2002). Communities trapped in cyclical patterns of violence created an intractable conflict based on the dichotomized identities of the “other” who deserve “destruction and death” (Yehuda, R., Bierer, L.M., Schmeidler, J., Aferiat, D. H., & Dolan, S. (2001). In this study, the detailed narratives from both sides provided insights on how each side was determined to win regardless of the human costs they suffered. These narratives also suggested that deeply listening and humanizing the perpetrator and victim could have opened new avenues for preventing intra-group violence (Chayes & Minow, 2003; Lederach & Lederach, 2011). Having an understanding of a shared human belonging
could have minimized the dichotomization of “us” and “them” while affirming a shared human identity and destiny (Crocker, Hampson, & All, 2004, 2008; Lederach, 2013). The dehumanization process of one group of people by another should have been an instant red flag that seeds of a potential genocide-like phenomena were being sown (Montville, 1990; Staub, 1992). Dehumanization of the other could then be a precursor for worse things to come as the conflict escalated. The group with more power tends to carry out dehumanizing acts increasing distance while decreasing empathy (Lammers & Stapel, 2011). Examples of dehumanization include descriptions such as “cockroaches”, “parasites”, “uncivilized”, and “immoral” (Guterres, 2006; Haslam, 2006; Henry & Tator, 2002).

Dehumanization is widely documented in other studies (Ozcelik, 2006; Anderson, 2005b). Narratives collected from the Mau Mau war veterans and loyalists revealed a similar degree of dehumanization in central Kenya and the various forms this took. Frunza (2010) affirmed that dehumanization strips off all human dignity for victims, a claim that my field research confirmed. One research participant described a rape incident of a mother and daughter as the helpless father who had been brutally beaten watched. Dehumanization isolates, humiliates, denigrates and attempts to erase the existence of others (Johnson, 2011). Attribution theory explains revenge and how dehumanization unfolds as a process especially where a self-proclaimed position of superiority by a people group leads to alleging inferior attributions of another people group with different characteristics or cultural identity (Nasby, Hayden, DePaulo, 1980).

Unless the perpetrator was able to generate human empathy towards the “dehumanized other”, the cycle of hatred was bound to continue. Deconstruction of
dehumanization through self-determination and sustained empowerment could create space for a different narrative of hope, emancipation and re-humanization of the other (Walzer, 2009; Schirch, 2005). The perpetrator and victim in reciprocal violence experienced the place of the “dehumanized other”. Since justice needs were not met, the cycle of violence continued and the possibilities for re-humanization were lost (Jackson, 2006; Ricoeur, 1986; Boudreau and Polkinghorn, 2008).

**Hatred**

Group based hatred could be defined as a deeply rooted negativity towards another group based on unfair perceptions and a desire to hurt and destroy “the other” (Halperin, 2008). Categorizing the “other” as evil, sub-human, who ought to be excluded from society. Making such claims of elimination against another people group through as a collective measure is unjustifiable (Eccleston & Major, 2006; Semelin, 2007). The destructive abilities of hate and its consequences have been widely documented (Berkowitz, 1993; Opotow & McClelland, 2007; Staub, 2011; Sternberg & Staub, 2005). Abusive treatment of one group by another, while denying them access to resources, accelerates deep feelings of hatred and intense desire to revenge (Huddy, Feldman, & Cassese, 2007; Levin & Rabrenovic, 2004; Skitka, Bauman, Aramovich, & Morgan, 2006). Negative emotions expressed through hatred play a significant role within intra-group conflict. Past studies suggest that hatred is a powerful force that drives and gives life to the cycle of violent conflict between individuals and groups (Petersen, 2002; Volkan, 1998). Hatred, anger and fear are a known explosive trio that fuels negativity and drives further apart parties embroiled in conflict (Bar-Tal, Eran, & De Rivera, 2007). An
example of the process of negative emotions and cycles of reciprocal revenge has been documented by Steele (2008), see Appendix A.

The motivation to hate partially originates from the assumption that “others” are inhuman and evil. As noted in dehumanization discussed earlier, hatred exaggerates negativity leading to humiliation and in some cases harm or death (Bar-Tal et al., 2007, White, 1996). Nazi ideology dehumanized the Jewish people and expressed the need to kill and eliminate root and branch. In Rwanda’s genocide, the Hutu ideology dehumanized the Tutsi referring to them as cockroaches, rats and snakes. The propaganda to exterminate them and their children aimed at preventing future generations from revenge (Dressler-Hawke, 2005; Semelin, 2007; Straus, 2006). A similar pattern could be tracked in the Balkans in the late 1990s when the Serbian civic and religious authorities labelled Muslims as undesirable and defective (Cigar, 1995). In all the three examples above (Nazis, Rwanda, and the Balkans), negative ideological subscriptions preceded dehumanization followed by hatred resulting into brutal acts of violence. For the intra-group reciprocal violence in Kenya, the native loyalists aligned with the colonists in dehumanizing and spreading hatred against the Mau Mau warfighters. A British colonial officer in Kenya summarized the hateful attitude towards the Gikuyu:

If the Kikuyu are the Germans of tribal Kenya, Kimathi was their Hitler. Like Hitler, he had to wait until the fabric of society broke around his head, but then he was able to exploit the convulsion with throbbing, burning oratory... .

(Henderson, 1958, p.8)

Field Marshall Dedan Kimathi was the commander in chief for the Mau Mau warfighters also known as the Kenya Land and Freedom Army (KLFA). His leadership
and ideology was not comparable to Hitler’s Nazi. The belief that access to freedom and land were the only options in stopping the violence motivated the Mau Mau warfighters who declared anyone opposed to the war as their sworn “enemy” deserving elimination. As a result, both sides fueled the intra-group reciprocal violence. How could genocide in Europe a decade earlier be viewed as inhuman but acceptable in Africa? Perpetrators and victims in reciprocal violence are impacted with a deep sense of shame, anger and a desire to revenge (Yeager, Tirri, Dweck, Nokelainen, & Trzesniewski, 2011). My research participants narrated their experiences with reciprocal violence, but created and told the story that presented them in a positive light while the other side’s descriptions were negative (Sternberg & Sternberg, 2008). Eran Halperin explained retaliation and reciprocal revenge rooted in anger as follows:

The research literature on emotions occurring in the context of conflict shows that anger evoked by an antagonist’s behavior is highly associated with support for retaliatory aggression (Huddy et al., 2007; Skitka et al., 2006). …

This dynamic can easily escalate into a vicious cycle of reciprocal violence that causes a tragic loss of life on both sides of the conflict. (Shaver, 2011, p. 326)

The Mau Mau warfighters and the loyalists reciprocal violence was deeply rooted in dehumanization and hatred. One research participant used the term “hyena” to describe a fellow Gikuyu who was on the other side. For some participants, experiencing the transition from being a perpetrator to victim seemed to increase the aggravation and the desire to get even. The chasm of difference was expanded by the colonial dichotomization and characterization of the Mau Mau warfighters as inhuman savages to
whom the “morally upright” Britons had an obligation to civilize or exterminate. Hatred and amplification of difference is noted in the following Gikuyu proverb commonly used by the Mau Mau against the loyalists: “Mwana wa hiti no hiti”, “a hyena’s offspring is a hyena”. This presented a major contrast between “ciana cia hiti” and “ciana cia Muumbi” literally, the difference between the “children of the hyena” (loyalists/home gaurds) and the “children of Muumbi”. The Gikuyu creation story as narrated by research participants privileged them as God’s children because Mwenenyaga, (God) created the first parents, Gikuyu and Muumbi and ordered them to occupy Gikuyu land (Wanjohi, 2001). Those who chose to betray this pledge, ceased to be the “children of the creator”. The commitment to protect this precious gift of land motivated the Mau Mau warriors to protect the soil at all costs.

Researchers have wrestled with the question of attributing reciprocal violence to “ancient hatreds” theory (Schwartz, 2005). When past conflicts are allowed to fester, they could become the source for future violence. For example, the battle of Kosovo in 1389, six hundred years ago could be linked to the 1999 Balkan war (Volkan, 1988, 1998, 2004, & 2006; Trop, 2012). Positive attributions of self, while apportioning blame to the “other” side have been documented (Baumeister and Hastings, 1997; Doosje and Branscombe, 2003; Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). The rewards of loyalism seemed an easier option than violent conflict, “…through preferential treatment during land and political reform and the post-conflict reconstruction of the local economy, loyalism had become a path towards land, self-mastery and, inadvertently, freedom.”

(Branch, 2007, p.313).
The colonist administrators and missionaries continually misinterpreted the Mau Mau resistance as a Gikuyu refusal to transition from tribal native tendencies into the so-called modernity through colonial education and British religious instruction (Cleary, 1990; Leakey, 1954b). This narrow assessment amplified the crisis as colonial powers attempted to capture and rehabilitate the Mau Mau warfighters.

The colonial propaganda against the Mau Mau described the fighters as suffering from a psychological disorder treatable through colonial rehabilitation programs aimed at reconstructing character (Bludwell, 1955; Elkins, 2000; Owen, 1956; Rosberg & Nottingham, 1966; Shannon, 1957). The morality and proportionality of the colonial military response using aerial bombers and explosives that killed thousands of unarmed Gikuyu demonstrated the extreme nature of dehumanization and hatred (Bartoli & Coleman, 2003). Having established the link between hatred and dehumanization, I now turn to show how these two advanced structural violence.

**Structural Violence**

According to the Norwegian peace scholar, Johan Galtung, structural violence is “…any constraint on human potential caused by economic and political structures…unequal access to resources, to political power, to education, to health care, or to legal standing, are forms of structural violence” (Winter & Leighton, 2001, p.99). Galtung’s use of the term “impairment” effectively described the impact of colonialism in central Kenya. Slavery and impoverishment were prominent (Farmer, Nizeye, Stulac, & Keshavjee, 2006, p. 1606). Indirect violence was as damaging as direct violence. The insidious and hidden nature of structural violence and its devastating results were highlighted in the field narratives. For example, one research participant explained how
his education was terminated when native schools were closed by the colonists.

Admission to the colonial mission school was only possible through conversion to Christianity first. The indirect attempt to obliterate a people group’s culture and traditions resulted into untold suffering and loss of life. The impact of structural violence resulted into total subjugation of the natives and denial of basic human needs for “…security, identity, well-being, and self-determination…” (Christie, 1997, p.315).

Structural violence led to a moral erosion of their traditional lifestyle in the name of civilization while locked down in a gulag system. The Gikuyu people turned against each other; another mark of structural violence (Galtung, 1971; Christie, Wagner & Winter, 2001). The colonial effort to “normalize” structural violence sometimes rendered it invisible to the victims and the perpetrators. The Mau Mau warfighters and the loyalists experienced “insidious assaults in dignity” during the various cycles of reciprocal violence (Farmer, 2004, p.282; Northrup, 1989; Baggallay, 2011; Wa Wanjau, 1991). The colonist created moral ambivalence by favoring and privileging one group over the other. Research participants’ narratives elaborated how structural violence was experienced destroying families and neighborhoods and turning them against each other. Construction of otherness was magnified by structural violence as the Mau Mau warfighters saw themselves as the “in-group” while the native collaborators and the colonialists were the “out-group”. The gulf between “us” and “them” concept has been widely documented and its ability to create psychological distance (Brewer, 1991; Reicher & Hopkins, 2001; Reicher, Hopkins, Levin, & Rath, 2005; Dower, 1998; Bartoli & Coleman, 2003; Stets & Burke, 1996; Hicks, 2013). Escalation followed a “reciprocal
causation” (Funk, 2007). The colonial instigated intra-group violence embedded in the divide and rule policy was an unsustainable miscalculation (Anderson (2005b).

This section weaves together dehumanization, hatred and structural violence and their role in designing and sustaining intra-group reciprocal violence. In order for the less powerful to build solidarity and unity of effort in the war against colonial occupation, the oathing ritual to willing and unwilling Gikuyu people transformed the intra-group reciprocal violence to an intractable war within a war. In order to wage this war successfully, administering the oath of allegiance to the Mau Mau also known as the Kenya Land and Freedom Army (KLFA) commenced. I now discuss the power of the oath ritual and how this impacted intra-group reciprocal violence.

The Oath

The oath was more than a ritual. It was a tool for doctrinal grounding with sophisticated ideology and psychological warfare frameworks (Green, 1990); Itote, 1967; Kariuki, 1963; Kinyatti, 1990, 2000; Leakey, 1954b; Wachanga, 1975; Phillips, 1958). There were several different oaths but serving the same purpose. The oathing function closely aligned with Horowitz (2001) “calculus of passion” descriptor. Taking the oath required that one crunch the soil; a symbolic act that aroused deepest emotional connections to the fight for land and freedom. The oath became the vehicle and agency for self-empowerment, organized resistance and the glue that held the entire Gikuyu people together in their quest for justice. The Mau Mau warfighters and their supporters saw the oath as a secret weapon against dehumanization, hatred and structural violence. The oath was also a blood contract (Elkins, 2005; Smith, 2005). Shedding blood for the sake of future generation’s freedom was worth the sacrifices (Kaggia, 1975). Oathing
reinforced trust and was the ultimate test for fidelity to the cause for land and freedom. The practice of oaths seemed effective in other parts of Africa like among Ethiopians (Gluckman, 1969). The role of *muuma* (oath) among the Gikuyu reinforced truth telling and consequences for lies: “...*ingihenania, muuma uyu unjurage*. *Ingiiigiriira mundu ungi kigenyo, muuma uyu unjurage, angikorwo mugunda uyu ti wakwa, reke muuma uyu unjurage*....”; “...if I tell falsehoods, may this oath kill me; if I make false accusations against another, may this oath kill me; if this land is not mine, let this oath kill me...”.

The oathing ritual was administered with goat intestines, various other parts of a goat, blood and water. The second tier oath was known as “*muuma wa kuringa thenge*”; “the oath of hitting the goat”. It was required for high level crimes. Disputants were forced to dismantle the ribcage of a young goat while calling upon curses on themselves, their clan and future generations. A deeply held belief existed that the oath had destructive powers on the perpetrator’s life and future generations. The third oath – “*githathi*” involved a stone symbolically tied on one’s neck. It was used to deter falsehood. The weights around the neck simulated a punishment by drowning of the perpetrator in the river. Research participants who freely talked about their oathing experiences verified the three oathing practices. The three levels have also been documented (Kariuki, 1963).

The mystery and secrecy surrounding the oath made it even more potent. For those bound by the oath, their solidarity with KLFA and supporters was unbreakable. The tension between KLFA, the loyalists and those who surrendered after taking the oath created an irreconcilable gulf, further fueling intra-group violence (Wachanga, 1975; Namunane & Siringi, 2011). The following full oath text illustrates the width and depth of the ritual:
(1) I speak the truth and swear before Ngai (God) and before everyone present here

And by this Batuni (platoon) oath of muingi (masses)

Which is called the movement of killing,

That if called upon to fight for our land,

To shed blood for it,

I shall obey and never surrender

And if I fail to do so

May this oath kill me

May this thenge (goat) kill me

May this meat kill me

(2) I speak the truth and swear before Ngai (God) and before everyone present here

And before the children of Gikuyu and Mumbi

That I shall never betray our country

That I shall never betray a member of muingi to our enemies

Whether they be European, Asian or African

And that if I do this:

May this oath kill me

May this thenge kill me

May this meat kill me

(3) I speak the truth and swear before Ngai and before everyone present here

That if I am called upon at night or during a storm
To destroy the house or store of a European or other enemy
I shall do so without fear and never surrender
And if I fail to do this:
   May this oath kill me
   May this thenge kill me
   May this meat kill me
(4) I speak the truth and swear before Ngai and before everyone present here
That if I am called upon to fight
Or to kill the enemy, I shall go
Even if that enemy be my father or mother, my brother or sister
And if I refuse:
   May this oath kill me
   May this thenge kill me
   May this meat kill me
(5) I speak the truth and swear before Ngai and before everyone present here
That if the people of muingi come by day or by night
And ask me to hide them
I shall do so and I shall help them
And if I fail to do this:
   May this oath kill me
   May this thenge kill me
   May this meat kill me
(6) I speak the truth and swear before Ngai and before everyone present here
That I shall never seduce the woman of another man

That I shall never take up with prostitutes

That I shall never steal anything belonging to a member of muingi

Nor shall I ever hate or speak badly of another member

And if I fail to do these things:

May this oath kill me

May this thenge kill me

May this meat kill me

(7) I speak the truth and swear before Ngai and before everyone present here

And by this Batuni Oath of muingi

That I shall never sell my country for money or any other thing

That I shall abide until death by all the vows I have made this day

That I shall never disclose our secrets to the enemy

Nor shall I disclose them to anyone not a member of muingi

And if I break any of the vows I have today consciously made

I will agree to any punishment that this society decides to give me

And if I fail to do these things:

May this oath kill me

May this thenge kill me

May this seven kill me

May this meat kill me

(Barnett, 1963, pp.63-64)
Prior to the KLFA war, the oath was utilized as one of the many rituals among communities in Kenya as a means of sorting out inter-personal conflicts and social ills like theft, land boundaries, and property disputes (Furedi, 1989; Kershaw, 1989). In order to obtain the truth from suspects, traditional elders would administer the oath to the parties (Mann & Roberts, 1991). The power of the oath was and is still daunting to this very day. Some research participants could not disclose all the oath details since they believe that the oath they took is still binding today. The key points for the oath included, fighting and shedding blood for the soil, never betray the cause, never surrender, sexual purity, and acceptance of the death penalty if one broke faith with the oath. Some studies attempted to mischaracterize the power of the oath dismissing oathing activities as “exaggerated rituals” (Christenson, Wood, & Barrett, 2003). However, for the KLFA, the fierce resistance by the natives was partially credited to the oath. The colonist underestimation of how much the KLFA believed in the power of the oath led them to attempt to break the KLFA resistance by discrediting the oath without success (Lynn, 2005; Markel, 2006). For example, KLFA warfighters from Irungu’s age group (riika ria Irungu) lost thousands of fighters but still pressed forward with the fight for the land and freedom (Newsinger, 1985) as a testament to their fidelity to the oath.

Colonists alleged that the ritual of oathing was deeply rooted in witchcraft since they did not understand the practice itself (Branch, 2009). For example, participants in the oathing ritual faced the directon of Mt. Kenya while crunching a handful of soil in their hands. They would recite the oath described above while stepping on fresh banana leaves. In some cases, a traditional songs accompanied the rituals. To demonstrate the colonial misunderstanding of the oath, a British anthropologist was hired by the colonists
to offer a counter-oath using newly trained native religious leaders nicknamed by the colonists as “Her Majesty’s Witchdoctors” (Branch, 2009, p.43). The counter-oathing efforts provoked a harsh response from the KLFA that specifically targeted for elimination those who had betrayed their oath and participated in the counter-oathing activities. Colonial psychological warfare was in full force as an attempt to persuade the Mau Mau to surrender. Leaflets were dropped from the air containing the following message: (see also appendix D and E).

12 facts that are true

(1) It is known that most of you are willing to surrender, but the agreement to surrender dating 18 January will expire 10 July 1955.

(2) You have only 7 days left to act upon the agreement that will save your souls and your land.

(3) You will be hunted and killed wherever you are if you do not surrender yourselves.

(4) The government is acting in good faith. Those people who surrender themselves before 10 July 1955 will be awarded in addition to securing their land and their property.

(5) If you do not surrender your people will starve and your children will face unending suffering.

(6) 877 smart people surrendered since 18 January 1955.

(7) 1281 Mau Mau insurgents have already been killed, and 625 have been arrested. In addition hundreds of thousands more in the reserves and
homesteads have concluded that after 16 January there will be no hope to survive for those who do not surrender.

(8) Your leaders have lied and misled you. They are the reason why the previous oaths for surrender failed.

(9) Be warned that your leaders who disagree among themselves may sacrifice you in their bid to save themselves.

(10) Those sympathizers that were assisting you in the reserves and the homesteads have lost hope and given up, and have decided to save themselves.

(11) You have no future in remaining in the forest, only suffering and death and your descendants will forget you.

(12) When you are bee misled by those that assist you, lied to by your leaders, cursed by your tribal family, and lied to god.

(Friedman, 2006, p.16)

While a small number of the KLFA fighters surrendered, the majority did not heed such these manipulative tactics. Intra-group reciprocal violence became intractable as the intensity involving those who took the oath and those who didn’t increased. The extent of the intra-group violence is slowly coming to light with the recent release of the Hanslope Park declassified documents. Hanslope Park was the secret location housing colonial files from former colonies including 1,500 Mau Mau classified files (Macintyre, 2011). The declassification and release of these files could reveal new details about the dirty colonial occupation tactics and their longterm impact. Having linked intra-group reciprocal violence to the oathing rituals, I now turn to a full discussion about the KLFA
also known as the Mau Mau followed by a brief description of the loyalists also known as the “Home Guards”.

**The Mau Mau**

The official opposition to the colonial occupation among the Gikuyu, Embu and Meru was led by the Kenya Land and Freedom Army “*Kiama gia ithaka na wiyathi*” (KLFA) also known as the Mau Mau. The name Mau Mau had multiple definitions and several contested meanings (Mwangi, 2009). For the purpose of this study, the term Mau Mau warfighters and the Kenya Land and Freedom Army (KLFA) are used interchangeably. The contested meaning of the term Mau Mau was based on legends and guesswork (Maughan-Brown, 1985). Kinyatti (1990) suggested that the origin of the name was the 1949 trial of Magroui ole Kedogoya, a Mau Mau warrior who told the court, “*Ndingikwira maundu mau mau nderirwo ni kiama*”. “I cannot disclose those those things the elders told me about the organization”. The words “those those” loosely translates as “Mau Mau” (Kinyatti, 2009).

Another source offers that the term “Mau Mau” was an abbreviated etymological of a Swahili battle cry, “*Mzungu Aende Ulaya; Mwafrika Apate Uhuru*”, translated as “the white man must return overseas for the African to gain his freedom” (Mcintyre, 2013). This definition was supported by Wa-Wamwere (2003). Their name may be contested but their struggle for self-determination, resistance and empowerment against the foreign invasion was not (Baxter, 2012). Another claim was that the word Mau Mau had no meaning in the Gikuyu language that it was used to demonize the Gikuyu people (Friedman, 2006).
The term could also have been rephrased as “Uma Uma” which literally meant “Out Out”, a battle cry urging the colonists to get out of their land (Corfield, 1960). Another claim was that the colonists coined the phrase based on rumors about the oath ceremony and since they could not understand the Gikuyu language inside the oath hut, all they heard was a sound “mumumumu” from which they coined the phrase Mau Mau (Barnett, 1963). The Mau Mau were also known as the Kenya Land Liberation Army (KLLA) (Padmore, 1953). Colonial and racial hatred of the Mau Mau was very apparent; “…bribe-takers, lazy, have blank minds as the blue sky above, no abstract thought, (endorsed) public hanging of Kikuyu in batches of 25, niggers, atavistic (primordial) (psychotic) savages” (Worsley, 1957, pp.14-15). These demeaning and insulting categories aligned with patterns of dehumanization, hatred and structural violence. The oathing ritual then became an organizing principle reinforcing solidarity and their unity of purpose (Turner & Reynolds, 2001). The colonists’ disgust with the Mau Mau resulted to a form of moral exclusion reducing them to non-human categories (Benson, 1967; Carothers, 1955; Corfield, 1960).

It’s instructive to note that foreign researchers used the term “Mau Mau rebellion” identifying with the colonists narrative (Eatman, 2007; Martin, 2006; Shamsul Alam, 2007; Slaughter, 1999; Spencer, 1995). I contend that this was a war of independence and not a rebellion. Mischaracterization of the freedom fighters and labelling them as terrorists fitted well with colonial ideology (Murra, 1956; Osborne, 2010). This labelling promoted hatred and dehumanization discussed earlier. The conjured image of sub-human savages falsely justified the ruthlessness of the colonists against the natives. For
example, the colonial chief commissioner, Charles Eliot expressed his dehumanizing beliefs as follows:

The African is greedy and covetous…too disconnected in his ideas to make any attempt to better himself. His mind is nearer the animal world than is that of the European or Asiatic, and exhibits something of the animal’s placidity and want of desire to rise beyond the stage he has reached. (Eliot, 1966, p.92)

Despite the clear KLFA determination to take back the land, the colonists failed to conceive how untenable their colonial agenda was (Kuhn, 1970). The Gikuyu people’s self determination and the Mau Mau warfighters tenacity was unstoppable (Barnett & Njama, 1966; Rosberg & Nottingham, 1966). Franklin’s dehumanizing belief provides another example of hatred describing the Mau Mau as: “…an eruption of foul savagery, deliberately aroused and enforced by witchcraft…” (Franklin, 1954, p.23). On October 20, 1952 the declaration of emergency ushered in a period of untold suffering. The murder of the loyalist colonial senior chief Nderi in Nyeri and the attack at Kirwara police station in Gatanga simultaneously provoked an extreme violent response. In Kirwara, 17 people protesting the construction of a police station were shot dead (Franklin, 1954). Kirwara police station is still standing over 50 years later. To the colonist, the struggle for land and freedom had a completely different meaning:

The Mau Mau rebellion meant very different things to different participants: to Africans it was various a fight for political self-government, an intergenerational feud, a battle for land and a Kikuyu tribal rebellion; in the eyes of Kenya’s white settlers it was a barbaric assault on civilized values, carried out by bloodthirsty savages; viewed from London it was an illegal
terrorist campaign and a threat to legitimate British Colonial authority.

(Macintyre, 2013, p.2)

The hanging of 1,090 KLFA men between 1952 and 1958 was consistent with dehumanization, hatred and structural violence but did not deter the KLFA objectives. The hypocrisy of the British government came into focus since around the same period, England was working on banning capital punishment at home (Anderson, 2005b). The total deaths during the Mau Mau war were estimated to be over 13,000 (Dagne, 2008).

The extent of the internment of the entire Gikuyu population has been documented (Elkins, 2005). The British divide and rule policy intentionally created a civil war among the Gikuyu people. Those who chose to be loyal and subscribed to the colonial agenda were privileged and protected. Aligning with the colonist came at a high price of death when caught by the Mau Mau. The degree of intra-group violence from both sides of the conflict was summarized by the 2013 Kenya Justice and Truth and Reconciliation Commission (KJRTC) report:

Elkins has indeed demonstrated the injustices meted on the Mau Mau by the colonial police and the loyalist. For example she argues that electric shock was widely used, as well as cigarettes and fire. Bottles (often broken), gun barrels, knives, snakes, vermin, and hot eggs were thrust up men's rectums and women's vaginas. The screening teams whipped, shot, burned and mutilated Mau Mau suspects, ostensibly to gather intelligence for military operations and as court evidence. Between 150,000 and 320,000 Africans were detained for varying lengths of time in more than 50 detention and work camps. The treatment in the camps, staffed by little trained non-Kikuyu,
loyalists and European settlers, was often brutal. The information about what was happening there was carefully controlled and the colonial office and the governor systematically denied reports of mistreatment. Elkins’ extended descriptions of the regime of torture, one is struck by its predominantly sexual nature. Male detainees were often sexually abused ‘through sodomy with foreign objects, animals, and insects, cavity searches, the imposition of a filthy toilet bucket-system, or forced penetrative sex’. Women had ‘various foreign objects thrust into their vaginas, and their breasts squeezed and mutilated with pliers.’ …A common practice during interrogation was to squeeze testicles with pliers.

The Mau Mau fighters were also responsible for unspeakable atrocities. Contrary to African customs and values, they assaulted old people, women and children. The horrors they practiced included decapitation and general mutilation of civilians, torture before murder, bodies bound up in sacks and dropped in wells, burning victims alive, gouging out of eyes and splitting open the stomachs of pregnant women… Mau Mau officially ended with the capture and execution of Dedan Kimathi, the uprising’s most senior leader in October 1956. While the figures are debatable, the Mau Mau are said to have caused the deaths of at least 14,000 Africans, 29 Asians and 95 Europeans.”

(KJTRC, 2013 pp.13-14).

Research participants confirmed Elkins claims above since some of them experienced first hand the extent of this violence. Having described the Mau Mau or (KLFA), I will now turn to a brief description of the loyalists also known as the “Home
Guards”. The intra-group reciprocal violence centered between the Mau Mau and the loyalists.

**The Loyalists “Home Guard”**

An estimated 25,000 native loyalists joined the colonists (Branch, 2009; McBeth, 2013). Conversion to Christianity became the free ticket to join loyalist ranks guaranteeing protection and privilege (Anderson, 2005b; Elkins, 2005). Native loyalists were also known as “home guards”. This group willingly and voluntarily crossed over to the other side against their own people. Branch (2009) claimed that 90% of the Mau Mau warfighters were murdered by the homeguards through a network of informants and foreign fighters who were well trained and equipped by the colonists. However, from a structural violence perspective a degree of manipulated victimhood could be assumed. Some were promoted to become colonial chiefs, police officers and intelligence gatherers (Lonsdale, 1990). Another probable motivation for joining the loyalists was the opportunity to revenge against the murder of their families by the KLFA (Branch, 2007).

Choice theory suggests that humans make choices in their best interest (Glasser, 1999). Erroneous attribution to the actions of the colonist as humanitarian and sympathetic to the uncivilized natives led to flawed ideology (Ocobok, 2010; Lonsdale, 1992). The majority of the loyalists were rewarded with education opportunities as they fully embraced the colonial “civilized” ways. As prime targets for murder by the KLFA, some lived in between two worlds and secretly took the oath for their own survival. The ambivalence they had to contend with demonstrated another degree of structural violence (White, 1990).
Research participants confirmed that the core of the loyalists was comprised of Gikuyu converts who had joined Anglican, Presbyterian and Catholic churches (Berman, 1990; Franklin, 1954). Jeremiah Nyaga, a native of Embu who later became a cabinet minister in the first post-colonial government was a staunch Christian and loyalist who said, “I would rather die than take the oath” (Branch, 2007, p.293). The recruitment of native loyalists into colonial ranks was the brainchild of Stuart McWalter Henderson, born in 1927 and died at the age of 86 in 2013. He was raised in Kenya and had learned the Gikuyu language. This skill propelled him to become the primary lead senior police officer in charge of training a native special force to hunt down KLFA leaders.

Henderson was credited for the capturing of a leading KLFA commander, General China, also known as Waruhiu Itoote. He presented him with two choices, to be hanged or join the colonist fight against the KLFA. Henderson also masterminded the pseudo-Mau Mau gang that infiltrated the genuine Mau Mau warriors. On October 21, 1956, the highest ranking KLFA Commander, Field Marshall Dedan Kimathi was captured (McBeth, 2013). There were times when members from the same family found themselves in two opposing sides; KLFA and the loyalists. Such was the life of Wambui Otieno who was among the leading women Mau Mau warriors but had loyalist family members (Otieno, 1998).

Motivation to join the loyalist might have included self preservation and modernity (Glasser, 1999; Kagan, 2006; Chatterjee, 1993). Some loyalists who made claims of nationalism did so out of selfish ambition and not in support for KLFA warfighters, a phenomena that has been studied (Fanon, 1963). Gikuyu nationalists like Jomo Kenyatta, Harry Thuku and other colonial chiefs were caught between choosing
KLFA or denouncing armed violence and using non-violence to fight colonial occupation (Delf, 1961; Kenyatta, 1966; Thuku, 1970; Otieno, 1998; Leakey, 1954b).

The choices they finally made are contested but Kenyatta’s decision to neglect KLFA veterans and the obvious favoritism he offered the loyalists shocked many KLFA survivors who had sacrificed their own blood to free Kenya from the shackles of colonialism. Karimi (2013) explains that Senior Chief Waruhiu was probably one of the few most loyal among the natives. His arrogance and projection of political power generated terror and violence for the natives (Mutunga, 2014). Following his murder, it took almost eight years of a perpetual state of emergency. This result alone suggested his symbolic importance to the colonists. The attempts by the missionary Louis Leakey to create a counter-oath for cleansing those who had taken the Mau Mau oath “Mau Mau iringirwo thenge” provoked harsh reactions from the KLFA veterans and led to more intra-group violence. Barnett and Njama (1968) quote a section of a letter that described how the KLFA felt about the loyalists and the surrender group:

When we regain our lands and freedom, the thata cia bururi (impotent of the land) will be forgiven. We know they are either stupid or have been driven to fight against us by Europeans in order to save their lives. Thus, in one of our battle cries we shout: “choose the whites, save the blacks, for they are only fools”. We realize that these loyalists are in fact our brothers, sisters, parents, or in-laws. Blood is thicker than water and we cannot forever remain the enemies of our relatives. “Rurira rutithambagio rui”. (the umbilical cord is never to be washed in the river.). No situation can remove the ties of blood.

(Barnett and Njama, 1968, p.291)
The potential seed for forgiveness was there, however, it never got a chance to germinate as a result of the severe drought of injustice. Retaliation in reciprocal violence has been documented (Stillwell, Baumeister, & Priore, 2008). The colonial administration rewarded the loyalists with coffee growing licenses, forestry, livestock trade, and transport businesses. Movement restrictions were lifted for the loyalists. Governor Baring once told them, “you have earned the right to lead your people and you will be given privileges before those who failed to take an active part in the fight” (“Kenya News Agency,” 1954). Loyalism was rewarded and opposition was severely punished driving further apart the homogeneous unity that once existed.

Tiras Waiyaki Munyua provides an example of loyalist denouncement of the Mau Mau and pledging allegiance to Queen of England. Whether this was obtained by coercion or was voluntary remains unclear. Betraying the oath brought harm upon the individual. The denunciation transferred loyalty to the Queen of England:

DENOUNCIATION OF MAU MAU AND DECLARATION OF LOYALTY

I, TIRAS WAIYAKI MUNYUA do solemnly declare that I utterly denounce the Mau Mau movement and all its works and that I will never have any part in it. And I do also solemnly declare that I will always be loyal to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth and her Government in Kenya, whose servant I am, and will do my utmost to further the true progress of the peoples of this Colony in accordance with the policies laid down by the government to that end.

Signature of Deponent / Witness / Date

(KNA: AP/1/1822, 163)
Brainwashing was a dominant theme in the denouncement. It seems likely that in the face of brutal violence, the easy route of joining the enemy was easier. The loyalists did pay a high price for the choice to support the colonists; for example, in June 1953, a brutal colonial chief by the name of Njiiri from Kinyona in central Kenya was shocked when the Mau Mau captured his son, beheaded him and delivered his head to Chief Njiiri’s home entrance. For this brutal murder, the chief attacked the village where the suspects supposedly resided and in one day murdered 400 people (Branch, 2009). The claim that home guards also fought for independence is highly contested by the KLFA veterans. As the violence escalated, there was a general sense that even the colonial machine was slowly losing the capacity to control the intra-group violence. The ever increasing cyclical nature of the violence impacted the level of grievances discussed next.

**Escalation of Grievances**

By 1934, over six million acres of land had been appropriated by the colonists (Barnett & Njama, 1966). The natives had been relegated into communal village systems lockdown aimed at breaking their will and open resistance. What was dismissed as the “Mau Mau peasant revolt” turned out to be an enduring unbreakable will that eventually led to Kenya’s independence (Maloba, 1998). On October 20, 1952 the British colonists declared a state of emergency in Kenya with one objective; clearing the Mau Mau warfighters from the face of central Kenya. The colonial attorney general in Kenya at the height of the violence, Eric Griffith Jones noted the following about the Mau Mau detention camps in a letter to the colonial governor, “distressingly [Mau Mau Camps are] reminiscent of conditions in Nazi Germany or Communist Russia…if we are going to sin,
we must sin quietly” (Dyer, 2013, p.3) The extent of the excessive violence and the efforts to conceal it was known to the colonial powers.

The colonialists did not only occupy the land but also dictated what food crops the natives could grow. Each household had a limited number of livestock they could keep stoking further discontent and resistance (Bates, 1987; Kanogo, 1987). There were even claims that the natives assumed colonists were leasing the land. The colonist claimed to have purchased to keep (Whittlesey, 1953). As the colonial powers tightened their grip on the Gikuyu people, the KLFA increased their oathing activities. The colonists’ self-interests to protect the land they occupied motivated their drive to stop the KLFA fearing their capacity to muster nationalism from across other Kenyan communities could have been to the detriment of the foreigners. A violent conflict response became the only option. Land among the Gikuyu was viewed as a divine gift from God that could not be sold but passed on to succeeding generations (Baker, 1955).

The Gikuyu people usually refer to land as “soil”; a term of endearment that stoked powerful emotional connections with land ownership. The soil feeds, nurtures all life and comforts the spirits of those who eternally rest in it upon death (Kenyatta, 1966). Clutching a handful of soil when taking the oath or even at death was viewed as a sacred act of reverence to the soil, the source of life. Shedding blood for the soil was viewed as a sacred duty among the Gikuyu people and was a cardinal doctrine for the Mau Mau ideology. Land ownership was viewed as the ultimate price for self-determination and sacred duty worthy of violent resistance regardless of the cost (Clough, 1998). Research participants confirmed this sentiment during the field interviews.
At least 1.5 million Gikuyu people felt threatened by the Europeans who had occupied all their original native lands (Erskine, 1956). The suggestion to permanently move 1.5 million Gikuyu people to the dry uninhabitable plains of Eastern Kenya demonstrated the colonial determination to wipe out the Gikuyu people from central Kenya (Bennett, 2013; Itote, 1967; Kinyatti, 2008). Close to 2,500 Gikuyu families were forcibly removed from the Rift Valley weekly and sent back to central province in Murang’a. Around the same period, the colonial chiefs in Murang’a had already annexed land that initially belonged to the returning families. As a result the returning families had nothing but hopelessness (Elkins, 2003). The rising bitterness was unstoppable and it was a question of when the Gikuyu would fight back in an effort to stop the colonists.

In 1951 the Mau Mau “Kiama kia Mbaara”, “the Mau Mau War Council” was formed (Furedi, 1973). KLFA met the threshold of a revolution defined as follows: “…a revolution is a rapid, fundamental, and violent domestic change in the dominant values and myths of a society…” (Huntington, 1968, p.264). The highest ranking KLFA leader to be captured was the Field Marshall Dedan Kimathi Wachiuri on October 21, 1956. He was later hanged and buried in an unmarked grave on February 18, 1957 (Kareithi, 2011). Others Generals who continued who contued with the struggle included Mathenge, Kariba and Tanganyika (Gikonyo, 1979; Maina, 1977). Women played a special role in the ranks of KLFA as fighters, intelligence officers, logistics and supply nodes (Davison, 1996; Otieno, 1988; Presley, 1992).

The ideological grounding of the KLFA was strongly anti-imperial and anti-colonial in orientation; however, as Mazrui (1987) notes, the lack of clearly defined nationalist parameters limited the KLFA to a tribal movement. As the colonial forces
gained ground and total control of the villages, the supply routes for the KLFA from the villages became untenable. As discussed earlier, the tactical, operational and strategic capabilities of the KLFA was built around the administering the oath to maximize mobilization, solidarity, morale, and the unbreakable blood bond (Otieno, 1998; Rosberg & Nottingham, 1966). The climax of these escalations resulted into three notable massacres that I discuss next showing how the violence spilled beyond the boundaries of an intra-group reciprocal violence.

**Massacres: Lari, Chuka and Hola**

In the village of Lari, a native colonial Chief Luka Wa-kahangara had been rewarded with land and privileges for aiding the colonial occupation. The escalating land and freedom grievances led to the brutal attack on the Chief’s household by the KLFA. They destroyed his property and murdered most of his family (Anderson, 2005b). Chief Luka had also insensed the locals by pushing them out to make room for a colonial forestry program. Preservation of forests was more important to the colonists than people’s livelihoods. Across the neighboring village, Chief Makimei led revenge attacks against KLFA and their supporters to avenge Chief Luka’s death. With the help of the colonial forces the attacks resulted into the deaths of hundreds of Gikuyu people in Lari village (Slaughter, 1999). Five Lari massacre survivors kindly shared their story and their interviews will be discussed later in the analysis section.

In the village of Chuka in Meru, Eastern Kenya, 20 locals were shot by the colonial forces in June 1953. This little known event the “Chuka massacre” targeted loyal home guard units and a few KLFA members. The incident was concealed for over five decades and was only made public in 2006 (Anderson, Bennett, & Branch, 2006, p.20).
The file detailing the incident had been marked secret and not for public release until 2038. The 5th KAR, B Company under Major Griffiths was responsible for the brutal Chuka massacre and when put on trial, he was acquitted of all wrongdoing. We may never know all the details of the savage acts by the colonial forces due to the level of secrecy, “protecting alleged criminals of war from justice” (Anderson et al., 2006, p.22). Over a thousand other colonial records were destroyed and their contents may never be known (Cobain, Bowcott, & Norton-Taylor, 2012; Taylor & Kiberenge, 2012).

On March 3, 1959, eleven Gikuyu men were beaten to death while over 60 were brutally injured during a brutal beating that went on for over two hours. This incident later came to be known as the “Hola Massacre” (Ombuor, 2012). This massacre bears similarities with the Chuka massacre of June 1953 discussed above. Hola was a remote camp in Kenya’s coast province. Hardened Mau Mau detainees were transferred there and any form of protest at the camp was met with brutal treatment. Eleven KLFA fighters were literally clobbered to death in Hola (Kabukuru, 2003)

John Maina Kahiihu, a survivor of this massacre narrated his experience:

We refused to do this work. We were fighting for our freedom. We were not slaves. There were two hundred guards. One hundred stood around us with machine guns. Thirty guards were inside the trench with us. The white man in charge blew his whistle and the guards started beating us. They beat us from 8 am to 11.30 am. They were beating us like dogs. I was covered by other bodies – just my arms and legs were exposed. I was very lucky to survive. But the others were still being beaten. There was no escape for them. (Slaughter, 1999, p.5)
This extremely inhuman violence got the attention of the colonial office in London and within a few months following this incident, the colonial administration closed the detention camps. In 1960 the state of emergency was discontinued. Descriptions of reciprocal violence presume that the powerful side tends to wrongfully underestimate the less powerful (Burgess, & Maiese, 2004). The oppressed group deeply resented the conquerors and slowly and systematically initiated an underground movement to enlist fighters and resources to sustain the resistance. Negative attributes of the “enemy other” were solidified through the oathing ritual. Destroying the “enemy” was interpreted as administering justice and in obedience to the oath requirement. The oath ritual increased the sense of entrapment into the reciprocal violence (Brockner, 1985; Kriesberg, 2003). Mistrust and fear of the other side widened the chasm of “us” and “them’. In response to the emboldened KLFA, the colonial war machine supported by native sympathizers moved into action and in the name of seeking “justice” rounded up and hanged hundreds of KLFA warfighters in public to deter others (Anderson, 2005b).

The public hanging of more than 1,200 KLFA members at Githunguri village was meant to send a message to the rest KLFA engaged in resistance mission especially following the Lari massacre. Hundreds of thousands more had been detained. The rising colonial violence solidified the Mau Mau warfighters resolve to fight on for land and freedom (Anderson, 2005b). Having reflected on the escalation of grievances and the three catastrophic massacres, I now turn to the discussion about the absence of justice, forgiveness and trauma healing and their influence on intra-group reciprocal violence.
The cycle of reciprocal violence (Steele, 2009) offers a general description in appendix A, page 294.

**Absence of Justice, Forgiveness and Trauma Healing**

**Justice**

Past studies seem to concentrate on the victims and their immediate needs for justice while neglecting the role of perpetrators and their needs (Turyahabwa, et al, 2011). In reciprocal atrocities, resources for psychological care for victims are readily available but not the perpetrators. Understanding how perpetrators were impacted by their acts is yet to be fully explored in order to address their needs (Bayer, Klasen, & Adam, 2007). In most case studies, victims and not perpetrators in psychological distress are the focus of mental health research (Magoba, Nabwire, Kuhumura, & Mawoko, 2010). The perpetrator voice is an important one in reciprocal violence research in order to hear and understand (Favilla & Fellow, 2009).

The narratives shared by research participants confirmed that justice was more important to them than forgiveness. This position has been well documented in the past (Helmick & Petersen, 2002). The one who caused harm could seek to reach a “mutually tolerable” place recognizing that justice promotes the wellbeing of the other (Hicks, 2013; Suchoki, 1995). Justice opens the possibilities for adequately dealing with negative descriptions of the other (Volf, 1996). Restorative justice has proved to yield better outcomes than retributive justice (Umbreit, 2002). A proper description of the victim, offender, concerned community is a necessary first step in restorative justice (Zehr, 1990). The warring sides must realize that there are no winners in violent conflict.
To end violence, it may require justice built around mutual ownership of the conflict (Zartman & de Soto, 2010; Malan, 1997). The first president of independent Kenya’s policy to “forgive and forget” could have been premature (Odhiambo and Lonsdale, 2003). His post-colonial administration looked the other way as massive corruption and land ownership policies benefited the loyalists and failed to recognize the KLFA veterans (Khamis, 2007). By minimizing the KLFA war effort and those who paid the ultimate sacrifice, this policy promoted injustice and advanced the narrative of betrayal. Indigenous justice methods drawn from African traditional society seem to be rare in the field of conflict analysis (Musisi & Sudarmono, 2004). Customary laws and traditions dictated penalties, restitutions, and forgiveness parameters. Among the Gikuyu, penalties were paid by a set number of goats depending on the crime. Prison and detention facilities were not part of the Gikuyu justice system but a rather a colonial imposition. Death sentences existed but in rare circumstances and were reserved for sorcerers or one who had committed murder or great harm to the community (Wa-Wanjau, 1991).

Another native justice process was the cleansing ceremony that provided restitution and redemptive elements to the offender. For example, in order to restore an offending party back to harmony with the community a cleansing ceremony was required. In some cases, a second type of purification oath was administered. A traditional healer presided over the ceremony and a sacrificial lamb was slaughtered and offered as a libation to appease the spirits of the ancestors. While details are scarce about this process, KLFA warriors who had killed in the course of the war were required to go through a cleansing oath ceremony internal to the Gikuyu people, (Wa-Wanjau, 1991).
Nabudere (2013) gives the example of the Acholi practice in Uganda known as *Mato Oput* reconciliation process. Utilizing long straws, parties from both sides of the conflict simultaneously drank a bitter root extract from a shared calabash (a traditional African bowl) to symbolize shared bitterness. This was equivalent to what Pranis (2005) would refer to having a place at the table for all sides. More discussion will follow under recommendations.

Fair treatment of others, collective responsibility and the equal distribution of resources were central pillars of justice in the pre-colonial African traditional societies (Olaoba, 2008). For example, following the Rwandan genocide, victims were open to forgiving perpetrators where acceptance of responsibility for the harm caused and a willingness to repair the harm was expressed (Hagengimana, 2001; Tutu, 1999). This position was consistent with the justice parameters expressed by the KLFA veterans during my field research. The urge to seek revenge could only be halted by the delivery of justice followed by the repair of damaged and fractured relationships (Griswold, 2007; Cesaire & Pinkham, 2001; Fanon, 2005, 2008; Memmi, 1991).

The role of the *kiama* (council of elders) in administering justice was based on their moral authority, trust, and traditional wisdom. The desired outcome was interpersonal and communal harmony that promoted the fullness of life and wellness (Ikenga-Metuh, 1987). Recently, a landmark court case in London demonstrated the KLFA veterans’ understanding of justice that stretches beyond monetary gains. The out of court settlement awarded 5,228 Mau Mau veterans, $5,700 each. The legal bill was $9 million. The English lawyers leading this case were the real winners. British Foreign Secretary Hague stated that, “the British government sincerely regrets that these abuses took place”,


(Dyer, 2013; Pflanz, 2013). There was no admission of liability or responsibility. Justice for many remained unreachable, the suffering continues in what is equivalent to second order of betrayal. Two research participants expressed deep disappointment with the High Court in London and the decision to settle the case out of court that included a small segment of the KLFA veterans. The quest for justice goes beyond monetary gains.

Nottingham was a former District Officer serving in Kenya during the emergency. He came forward to testify against the British government supporting the Mau Mau survivors’ compensation claims (Macdiarmid, 2012). He concurred that a gulag was in place and that the British government had an obligation to apologize. “…what went on in the Kenyan camps and villages was brutal, savage torture by people who have to be condemned as war criminals. I feel ashamed to have come from a Britain that did what it did…” (Kabukuru, 2003, p.37). The KLFA veterans today live with a deep sense of betrayal by the succeeding governments of independent Kenya and continue to demand land and monetary compensation (Ngunjiri, 2013). In 1963, responding to a compensation question from the media, Kenya’s first president responded “…we shall not allow hooligans to rule Kenya…” (Anderson, 2005b, p.34). This was a clear departure from all his initial proclamations about justice that opened the door to further marginalization of the KLFA veterans.

Field Marshall Muthoni Kirima was identified as probably the only surviving highest ranking KLFA female officer (The Economist, 2013). Today she wears the famous Mau Mau dreadlocks and at the age of 81 stated that her struggle for land and freedom is still ongoing. She alluded to the sense of betrayal and injustice by post-colonial governments. The Field Marshall lives in abject poverty and she lamented:
I emerged from the forest after 11 years but was never given an inch of land. I have nothing to show for those 11 years, not even a needle. It was only the sons of the supporters of the white men who benefited from the blood and sweat for our battered bodies. You cannot shave your nape…there are freedom fighters who, should you tell them there is independence in Kenya, will ask you to clearly and more elaborately define the meaning of that ‘independence’. This is the lot to which I belong, the lot that believes it’s not yet uhuru. The bones of my fellow freedom fighters are, like me, crying in the forests. We ventured the forests to free the country from the grip of the white settlers. We thought that those we left behind schooling would fight for us, but things turned differently.

(Mutanu, 2012, pp. 4-5)

Naomi Nzyula represents hundreds of similar victims. She was pregnant at the time of her arrest in December 1952. While in police custody, she was sexually assaulted and lost her baby. Today at the age of 80, she cries for justice. The disparity in suffering was significant. Few colonialists lost their lives compared to the natives (Stanley, 2011). Thousands of Gikuyu people were hanged, castrated, sexually abused and not to mention the loyalists who perished protecting their alliances with the white community. Elizabeth Waruguru was 107 years old in 2012. She was a Mau Mau war logistician who supplied the fighters with food, clothes, medicine and intelligence (Kiarie, 2012). She was falsely accused of hiding weapons and ammunition and almost died by a firing squad in 1955 near Dagoretti town. At the last minute the firing squad supervisor requested to see the grenade that Waruguru was accused of being in possession. It turned out that it was not a
The execution was called off. She narrated how men were castrated and women had bottles shoved into their private parts in an effort to gather Mau Mau secrets. Justice for many was and may be will never be realized.

The Kenya Justice Truth and Reconciliation Commission of 2013 report correctly linked truth with justice as follows:

“...justice thus looks to the past to facilitate a better future by holding individuals to account for the wrongs they committed; by providing reparations to those who suffered violations; and, through an acknowledgement of such violations and an understanding of their causes, providing guidance to the present generation to prevent the commission of such violations upon future generations. In essence, truth telling is necessary for justice...”.

(KJTRC, Volume , Chapter Two, page 49).

The field interviews discussed later confirmed the atrocities committed during the intercenerine violence and revenge once the colonist succeeded in creating a civil war between the Mau Mau warfighters and the native loyalists who aligned themselves with the colonists. On June 7, 2013, the British government through their High Commissioner in Nairobi, offered what came close to an apology 59 years later. In the House of Commons in London, the then British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Hague did not apologize but rather stated that his government will continue to defend itself against the accusations and that the monetary settlement did not offer a precedent for other former British colonies (Howden & Sengupta, 2013). The out of court settlement only covered 5,228 Mau Mau veterans and another case is pending representing 8,000 Mau Mau Veterans. The British government has however declared that no other additional payments will be
made. The lawsuit, Case No: HQ09X02666 had been filed before The Hon. Mr. Justice McCombe at the High Court of Justice in London by the Leigh Day and Company (attorneys) on behalf of five claimants: Ndiki Mutua, Paulo Nzili, Wambugu wa Nyingi, Jane Muthoni Mara and Susan Ngondi. The Foreign and Commonwealth Office was the listed defendant.

The collective violent acts against the five mirror closely to the field interviews discussed later in this work. Nzili was castrated by colonists in 1957; Nyingi was detained with hard labor at six different detention camps (Lodwar, Kodiaga, Mageta, Athi River, Manyani and Mwea. He survived the Hola Massacre discussed earlier. Mrs. Muthoni Mara was sexually assaulted in 1957 where a glass bottle was forcibly inserted inside her private parts during an interrogation session. Mrs. Ngondi suffered the same fate at Gatithi detention camp as Muthoni Mara highlighting that sexual assault was commonly used against female victims of whom she remembers 15 of them. Seven of them died shortly after the assaults.

Nottingham was a colonial District Officer who testified against the colonial government during this case. He confirmed the colonial and native loyalists atrocities stating that colonial leaders made up a theory that Mau Mau was a psychological disorder cemented in place by the oath rituals. Torture, violent assaults, detention without trial were daily practices. He also recalled that a colonial military officer by the name of Dunman castrated most detainees as well as rampant shooting of suspected Mau Mau fighters. Nottingham informed the court that the head office in Nairobi ordered the colonial administrators to burn any documents in their possession that could implicate the colonial administration in a post-colonial government in Kenya (Day, 2013). The
examples described above explain why two research participants stated that asking or even attempt to discuss “forgiveness” made it sound like a “dirty” word. There is no amount of monetary compensation that could make it right for those who suffered such dehumanizing sexual assaults and deeply inhuman atrocities leading to loss of life. However, a discussion about the possibilities of forgiveness where the meaning was local and not necessarily the same as offered in the English language follows next.

**Forgiveness**

To forgive is, “to give up vengeance, to keep quiet and do as if nothing happened which means: to walk away by principle...” (Maggiori, 2005, para. 2). It can also be argued that forgiveness is strictly a decision of the person who has been wronged. The terminology is problematic because it did not carry the same meaning offered here. In the case of the KLFA the delivery of justice remained the best promise for a hopeful future and forgiveness may have to wait (Rank & Rigby, 2002). The hurt based on my research participants was still present many decades later. Some of them have been unable to get rid of the emotional pain. Forgiveness may not be offered or where offered, it may not be accepted (Hamber, 2007). Justice could generate empathy and in return set the right conditions for forgiveness and reconciliation (Barbara, 2011; Fiske, Todorov, & Prentice, 2014). For the locals, co-existence even without a tangible just act was probably closer to their understanding of forgiveness. This even raises the question whether forgiveness was necessary given the fact that the two sides continued to live together in some relative degree of peace after the war.

Research participants dismissed the empty forgiveness talk that followed the end of the war. The meaning and timing of forgiveness is disputed (Bailey & Tilley, 2002).
The subject of forgiveness is over-saturated and at times creates confusion than clarity (Wade & Goldman, 2006). Whether forgiveness is strictly a religious concept or not is contested (Wade & Worthington, 2003). Dropping the urge to seek revenge could create understanding curtailing the flow of negative energy rooted in anger (Wicks, 2009). Perpetrator admission of wrong doing could promote forgiveness (Griswold, 2007). Since the process of restitution or reparations takes a long time, it may not be a prerequisite for forgiveness. However, based on the field interviews, the delivery of justice, returning the soil to KLFA veterans seemed to be the only key to open the door towards forgiveness or co-existence.

Forgiveness does not require forgetting but rather in memorializing the traumatic event(s) narratives of hope and strength are preserved (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000; Hein & Selden, 2000; Mellor & Bretherton, 2003; Novick, 1999). After the demands of justice have been fulfilled, remembering could aid the journey towards trauma healing (Tutu, 1999; Eyerman, 2004; Minow, 2002). Political regimes seem to recognize the power of remembrance and hence the possible reason why the Mau Mau Veterans Association remained a banned organization in Kenya for four decades until 2003. The psychological threat of memorializing a group like the Mau Mau whose claims of justice have not been met could easily stoke opposition against the ruling elite. Studies have shown willful and selective amnesia when it comes to justice and truthful accounting of a violent past (Baumeister & Hastings, 1997; Blight, 2001; Hein & Selden, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Graybill, 2004). The work of forgiveness is hard but seems to offer the best hope once justice has been delivered and the conflicted parties are willing to move past their hurt, anger and resentment (Kalayjian & Paloutzian, 2009; Meyer, 2000). Guarding
against the temptation for pseudo-forgiveness could prevent further hurt and the risks associated with premature and inauthentic forgiveness (Ballester, Chatri, Sastre, Riviere, & Mullet, 2011).

**Trauma Healing**

Trauma can be defined as the act of being afraid, vulnerable and wounding of the mind (Herman, 1997). If the traumatic event is re-experienced abruptly, when one is unprepared, the impact could be startling. If the traumatic event is not processed in context, when relived again, it could open old wounds. The “re-experiencing” is without its initial context and bears haunting power over the survivor (Caruth, 1996). The connection between the amygdala and the hippocampus in relationship to how information is processed without context has been documented (Rambo, 2010). For example, after surviving deadly attacks in reciprocal violence, a victim’s hippocampus could have been rendered ineffective. The visual images of blood, smoke, and weapons might fail to be cognitively processed in context. As a result these images could find their way into the limbic system where they were stored without context. These memories are referred to as “wounded attachments” (Brown, 1993). Once triggered in a post-traumatic event, without notice the re-experiences could reappear as unwelcome intrusions (Rambo, 2010). The stories research participants shared with me revealed their traumatic experiences in their own words. Non verbal expressions like sighs, tone, silence and emotional expressions signalled the mental revisiting of some dark places with some obvious degree of discomfort.

Trauma redefines and in some cases shatters one’s sense of self identity (Crossley, 2000). Effective response to trauma focuses on affect regulation where the
traumatized survivor is able to recollect and narrate the traumatizing event with its context on multiple occasions without the arresting power the same event could have if relived without context. By keeping the hippocampus actively engaged, the context is accommodated (Van der Kolk, 2014). Narrating one’s story of anguish and pain within its proper context could disarm the traumatizing power each time the story is recounted (Eng & Kazanjian, 2003; Joseph, 2013; Straub & Pearlman, 2000). Narrative research allowed participants to cover a wide range of experiences including long and detailed trauma themes within their context. One research participant discussed her grieving process while others employed metaphors of trauma (in a pit, tunnel, drained well, drowning, dark hole, hell on earth, dark cloud, hunter/hunted, tearing of the soul, animal world, eternal pain pouring down like rain), images that point to grief, sadness and sorrow. Grieving is part of trauma and loss recovery (Thiong’o, 2009).

The possibility for collective trauma to be passed on from one generation to another has been raised (Starman, 2006). Whether the Gikuyu people have been able to meaningfully mourn the Mau Mau war losses is yet to be addressed. The absence of justice has remained as the major roadblock towards meaningful grief and trauma recovery. Pain could become a bridge to healing and restoration if the demands of justice are satisfied (Steele, 2011; Robben & Suarez-Orozco, 2000). Forgiveness does not always lead to trauma healing and reconciliation as clearly articulated by my research participants. Moving on without justice has been their only option and some have no intentions of asking for forgiveness or accept it if offered. Their narratives reconstitute a new way of living their lives in the absence of justice (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Studies from the field of social work suggest that individuals as well as people
groups subjected to extreme suffering have the capacity to bounce back (Chapin, Nelson-Becker, & MacMillan, 2006; Saleebey, 1997; Braun & Browne, 1998; Browne, Mokuau, & Braun, 2009; Norval, 1999; Rothschild, 2010). How KLFA veterans and loyalist survivors could bounce back is another area of research worth pursuing (Wicks, 2009). Rituals re-order what has been thrown out of alignment; in this case by violent conflict (Rothenbuhler, 1998; DeCarvalho & Whealin, 2012). The traditional healer was viewed as the one with the power to restore internal brokenness within a person as well as repairing broken external relationships with others in the community. Embracing the power of ritual in trauma healing seems to have favorable results for participants (Wyrostok, 1995). However, in this case, justice needs rise above trauma healing.

Religion was not a primary focus in this study, however; indigenous traditional expressions of God seemed to have promoted the victim’s resiliency (Staudiger, Marsiske, & Baltes, 1993). This process could have impacted each individual’s trauma positively (Briere & Scott, 2013; Rothschild, 2000). I make the claim that the need for trauma healing applied to the perpetrator and the victim. This could be one of the missing keys to disrupting intra-group reciprocal violence (Levine, 2008). Collective trauma healing may never be complete without a clear understanding of perpetrator needs and motivations. Pre-Christian African traditional religion and the post-colonial Christianity could provide some resources for trauma healing and most of these options remain largely unexplored (Mugambi, 1989, 1995, & 1996; Malukeke, 2001a). The symbolism and healing power of sacred trees, mountains, caves, art, riddles, proverbs, dance rituals and other traditional rituals could offer unexplored indigenous trauma healing resources (Moodley & West, 2005). The link between justice, forgiveness, religion and trauma
healing is yet to be fully explored and could shed more understanding on how such a process could work (Roberts & Anderson, 2012).

KLFA used laments in song as a device to relieve deeply rooted sorrow and stress (Kamaru, 1987). Interpreting the meaning of death and suffering in poetry played a cathartic function and lightened their souls in order to gallantly face the darkness of death and violence. Trauma healing couldn’t be achieved without justice. It required individual, community and institutional endurance to do the work of seeking justice for all first. Repairing the harm and extending forgiveness could encourage the work of trauma healing (Kritz, 2002). As noted elsewhere, the language of trauma is problematic since it does not translate directly from English language to Gikuyu language and hence the need to pay close attention to the descriptions and definitions offered by the research participants.

Another under explored value for trauma healing is the concept of building consensus mediated by elders among the Gikuyu people (Mugambi, 1995). At the heart of consensus building is the potential for trauma healing models deeply rooted in the African traditional philosophy since consensus building requires the demands of justice be fulfilled first. The absence of justice could be the major hindrance to enduring peace within intra-group conflict. More discussion will be offered under restorative justice. Gender dynamics could offer possibilities given the powerful role played by women in traditional African societies as mediators, peace builders and restorers of broken relationships could be activated and passed on in order to promote the much needed trauma healing (Nwoye, 2011).
Intra/inter-group reciprocal violence could be addressed through trauma healing:

“...If individuals who have been traumatized by violence are given opportunities and support to express and heal their pain, then their fear, grief and desire for revenge will be reduced and not fuel future violence” (Babbit, Chigas, & Wilkinson, 2013, p.33). Unhealed trauma left unattended is not without consequences (Herman 1997; Staub, 2006). Intervention that heals happens when certain conditions are met; for example:

Interventions that create safe space as a way to support the trauma healing process often allow participants: to feel supported to share stories of victimization in order to process emotions, particularly anger; to reduce the negative emotional force of painful memories; and to reconnect with and gain trust in people. (Babbit et al., 2013, p.34)

The stain of trauma and its permanence led to permanent change in life (Brahm, 2004). Inter-generational tensions could become intractable (Brown et al., 2006). In my Past conversations with a family member who was a survivor of the Mau Mau war suggested that most of the violent experiences are still frozen in time and are rarely talked about today (Personal Communication, July 2014). Direct involvement with violence as a perpetrator or victim generated trauma that was stored in the body (Hamby and Grych, 2012 ; Gutlove & Thompson, 2003). Co-existence between the KLFA veterans and loyalist survivors in central Kenya assumed a muted non-involvement cold relationships. Victims of trauma remain hyper-vigilant and on the look-out hoping that the re-experiencing described earlier would not happen (Herman, 1997). Since the traumatic event was housed in the memory of the individual, it could become an ever-present phenomenon that comes and goes at will. The non-engagement posture between the
loyalists and KLFA veterans today could also be a self-protective move from reliving the atrocities committed to one another and by doing so triggering a traumatic response.

Traumatic experiences could cause the victims to put on a face in order to veil the recollections of humiliating helplessness and vulnerability (Herman, 1997; Straub & Pearlman, 2000 & 2002). The very act of remembrance and memorializing the Mau Mau war opens up the past with its unfinished work of justice and unless fully addressed, it could keep the historical wounds fresh from one generation to another. Telling the truth and narrating the dark painful past could establish new paths towards trauma healing (Herman, 1997). How the truth is narrated, who tells it and who gets to hear it and at what time is of critical importance to the healing process. The contextualized re-experiencing could open a path towards a new story of strength in the absence of justice (Gutlove & Thompson, 2003; Hamber, 1995; Werdel & Wicks, 2012).

The assumption that truth and time can heal requires further examination and should not be considered as an obvious step when working with traumatized perpetrators and victims (Foucault, 1997; Hayner, 2001). Within the parameters of storytelling, perpetrators might be able to safely explain their motivations and in safety take responsibility without the fear of revenge. The process of storytelling could become the starting point leading to the possibility for a shared peaceful future. The tension between forgetting negative themes and the honesty of remembering positive themes and their relationship with trauma healing are contested (Misztal, 2005). In the search for justice and truth, sifting through memory and working across layers of emotional pain is part of the process if relationship repair work will bear fruit (Brown et al., 2006). While remembrance and memorialization activities are emotionally draining, they offer relief to
participants (Minow, 2002). Efforts to account for the truth even when disputed is still a step in the right direction. Acknowledging that forgiveness may never be attained honors the convictions and the lives of survivors on both sides of the conflict (Winnicott, 1986; Booth, 1999).

Among the KLFA veterans and survivors, a deep sense of collective trauma potentially resides in their lives and the lives of their families as will be noted in the analysis section of this study (Alexander, 2004). Poverty and landlessness are daily reminders that their suffering was in vain. The reality that their quest for justice may never be fulfilled complicates the unfinished work of seeking personal and community closure. Time may be running out for the survivors who are advanced in age. The findings of the Kenya Truth Justice and Reconciliation Commission (KTJRC) highlighted the failure of transitional justice following independence. Denial of the past atrocities while trying to pass the blame to others limited the naming of the root causes for intra-group reciprocal violence (Norton, 1998). The link between transitional justice and trauma healing has been widely documented (Cohen, 2001; Elster, 2004; Green, 1994; LaCapra, 1999; Ricoeur, 1999; Spinner-Halev, 2007; Weyeneth, 2001; Bouta, Kadayifci-Orellana, & Abu Nimer, 2005; Steele, 2011; Hart, 2003). A transitional justice approach aligns with the position that forgiveness and trauma healing are impossible in the absence of justice (Bar-Tal et al., 2007; Kriesberg, 1998; Rubin, Pruitt, & Kim, 1994).

**Gaps in the literature**

First, there is no shortage of studies in the field of inter-group violence; however, there are few that specifically focus on indigenous intra-group reciprocal violence. Second, existing literature fails to offer any positive justification of colonially instigated
structural violence. The absence of a stronger link between racism and colonialism in Kenya is surprising and does tend to indirectly purge the overwhelming racial hatred unleashed by the English foreigners against the natives. Selective outrage and socially constructed lines of divisions could inform this absence (Perazzo, 2007). In the name of civilization, customs and traditions that had existed for centuries were adulterated, severely damaged and current scholarship is largely silent about it.

Third, the absence of indigenous restorative justice and consensus building studies leads to the absence of native understanding of justice processes that might include non-tangible elements with the potential for co-existence and forgiveness. Literature around African non religious understanding of forgiveness is extremely scarce. An indepth cultural understanding and non-western interpretation of trauma and its healing is urgently needed in order to address the needs of perpetrators and victims trapped in intractable intra-group reciprocal violence using indigenous definitions and understanding.

Fourth, the perpetrator does not have a voice in most of the literature reviewed. Until an indepth understanding of what motivated perpetrators and how they processed their sense of wellness after they had violated others is important. While it probably might be easier to demonize the “evil other”, looking for the cure could be a more worthwhile investment to repair human brokenness on both sides. Understanding perpetrators could assist in creating a preventive cure for intra-group reciprocal violence. How perpetrators tell their story and what they tell could shed more understanding on intervention strategies to prevent future conflict.
Finally the fusion between religion, colonialism, and structural violence demands academic scrutiny. The role that English missionaries played in promoting colonial sponsored hatred and violence is underexplored and probably hidden under selective outrage. Most literature seems to associate the missionaries with “the light” they brought rather than the darkness they manufactured and distributed across indigenous communities. Structural violence studies could widen the academic space to include examining how harmonious native communities were permanently ruptured in the name of civilization and religion. In closing, the hypocrisy displayed by religious leaders in Europe deliberating on the just war theory while their fellow missionaries were supporting an open unjust and inhuman war should not go unaddressed. Using bomber aircraft on a population that did not even own a single hand held gun was disproportional, unethical and peace scholars could explore these historic environments in order to encourage more scholarly investments in this field and right the wrongs of past centuries.

**Conclusion**

In this literature review section, I have identified, defined and discussed four factors that contributed to intra-group reciprocal violence namely; dehumanization, hatred, structural violence and the oath ritual. I have also described the two major antagonists, namely the Mau Mau also known as the Kenya Land and Freedom Army (KFLA) and the native loyalists who joined the colonialists also known as the “Home Guard”. The escalation of native grievances in the face of colonial occupation followed by brutal violence was illustrated in the three massacres (Lari, Chuka and Hola). Five potential gaps in the literature were highlighted and could provide opportunities for future research.
Chapter 3 – Research Methods

Narrative Inquiry

In this study I used qualitative research inquiry with narrative thematic analysis approach as the primary method of analysis. Clandinin and Connelly offered the following definition for narrative inquiry:

Narrative inquiry is a way of understanding experience. It is collaboration between researcher and participants, over time, in a place or series of places, and in social interaction with milieus. An inquirer enters this matrix in the midst and progresses in this same spirit, concluding the inquiry still in the midst of living and telling, reliving and retelling, the stories of the experience that make up people’s lives, both individual and social. Simply stated…narrative inquiry is stories lived and told. (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, p. 20)

Narrative inquiry has been widely documented (Clandinin, 2006, 2013; Clandinin & Connelly 2000; 2004; Riessman, 1991; 1993; 2002; 2003; 2005; 2007). Storytelling as a research method has been widely explored (Behar, 1993; Carr, 1986; Polkinghorne, 1988). The uniqueness of the narrative research method includes the participant’s ability to expose “individual and collective action and meanings, as well as the processes by which social life and human relationships are made and changed” (Laslett, 1999, p.392). Interpretation of the story and accurate meaning is owned by the research participant.

The human ability to make meaning of their environment through stories is well documented (Bruner, 1991; Clandinin & Connelly, 1994; Connelly & Clandinin, 1986,
Research participants resisted and even ignored my prepared questions that seemed to attempt to divide their stories or inquiring about themes they were not prepared to talk about. In this approach participants tell as much as they wish or rightfully withhold whatever they do not wish to disclose (Riessman, 2002). Firsthand accounts establish a degree of credibility in the narrated stories (Anderson, 2005a; Branch, 2011; Sandgren, 2012).

The study of perpetrator and victim understanding of intra-group reciprocal violence where stories express descriptive accounts align with narrative inquiry (Bold, 2011; Clandinin, 2006; Clandinin & Conley, 2004). Other closely related research methods in the field but not used in this study include participant action research and phenomenology (McIntyre, 2007, Moran, 2000). Storytelling as a research method goes back to the end of the Second World War era (Bertaux, 1981; Bruner, 1990; Polkinghorne, 1988; Sarbin, 1986). Early scholars credited for advancing narrative research theories included French and Russian scholars (Foucault, 1972; Todorov, 1990). Of importance to this study was the effort to detail individual stories where thick descriptions were offered by the participants (Holloway & Jefferson, 2000). Narrative inquiry privileges and empowers the narrators to share the stories they wish giving voice and empowering participants who would otherwise be marginalized into silence (Andrews, 2007; Sliep, Folesso & Hanssen, 2010; Weingarten, & Gilbert, 2004). The research participants as owners of their experiences shared as they wished since “…the goal of qualitative researchers is to provide ways of understanding experience from the perspective of those who live it” (Bailey & Tilley, 2002, p.2).
Despite having suggested interview questions, the participants provided the stories of their choice (Czarniawska, 2004). The collection of oral history involves the indepth sharing of narratives (Plummer, 1983). In narrative research, “the approach does not assume objectivity; rather, it privileges positionality and subjectivity” (Riessman, 2002, p.696). Narrative inquiry is not a quest for objective truth but a deep immersion into thick descriptions from the research participants’ understanding of their experiences. Meaning and truth merge in this construct: “…the hearers of the story believed that it was true because it was meaningful, rather than it was meaningful because it was true” (Doan & Parry, 1994, p.2). Oral history method of inquiry was considered but not used because its emphasis on participants’ role as linguists could potentially interfere with the natural flow of the story due to the emphasis on the mechanics of language and its impact on story (Perks & Thompson, 1998; Zirimu & Bukenya, 1987). Narrative research encourages a natural flow of storytelling without disruptions (Ritchie, 2003). Capturing the whole story gives voice and power to the narrator as she or he shares the narrative of choice.

Close attention was paid to the starting and exit points of narratives that allowed smooth transitions (Jefferson, 1979). Not all narratives had an ordered progression and hence the need to capture the whole account as delivered. Features of the narratives that remained undisclosed were noted as such. This honored the research participants’ wishes since “…the approach enables investigators to study the active, self-shaping quality of human thought, the power of stories to create and refashion personal identity” (Riessman, 2002, p.707). Situating the narratives within their rich natural habitat added value compared to engaging in the same interviews away from their environments.
Sitting inside a mud hut, next to a fireplace with smoke from the burning firewood all over our faces was part of the deep and rich experience. To be “in the moment” with the research participant was critical as Frank observed:

“…thinking with stories means joining with them, allowing one’s own thoughts to adopt the story’s immanent logic of causality, its temporality, and its narrative tensions. Narrative ethics seeks to remain with the story, even when it can no longer remain inside the story. The goal is empathy, not as internalizing the feelings of the other, but as what Halpern calls ‘resonance’ with the other. The other’s self-story does not become my own, but I develop sufficient resonance with that story so that I can feel its nuances and anticipate changes in the plot . . . the first lesson of thinking with stories is not to move on once the story has been heard, but to continue to live in the story, becoming in it, reflecting on who one is becoming, and gradually modifying the story. The problem is truly to listen to one’s own story, just as the problem is truly to listen to others’ stories”. (Frank, 1995, pp.158–159).

Creating a healthy emotional distance with the research participants assisted in maintaining objectivity while being aware of my own story and the strict boundaries between the two. The passage of time could take out the sharp emotional jabs from the narrative (Riessman, 2008). However; I was highly sensitive to the emotional meter during the interviews and adjusted accordingly in congruence with the research participant emotional highs and lows during the interviews. The power of narrative research is to be in the moment, “the trustworthiness” of narrative accounts privileges the owner of the story flowing from a relationship of trust between the research participant
and the researcher. There is no canonical approach to validation in interpretive work, or recipes and formulas” (Riessman, 2002, p.706). Spontaneity added to richness of the experience.

Validity and reliability are important because narrative interviews are interpretive experiences that privilege the owner of the experience as authoritative and trustworthy despite minor gaps caused by the transcribing and interpretive work by the researcher (Riessman, 2008). A word of caution here is in order since the gap between the research participant and the researcher could be significant depending on the subject, relationship of trust and language. Individual experiences while owned by the research participants, are not in total isolation but rather enmeshed within society with shared themes (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996). Expanding the circle to the community increases the reliability threshold.

Another data source in this study was archived documents. The data was analyzed in order to inform, confirm or further explore the field research findings. Available documents related to the subject under study included the June 2013 Mau Mau reparations High Court Case in London that won a landmark ruling. The British government agreed to pay compensation to the five claimants in Case No. HQ09X02666, (Leigh Day, 2013). Expert testimonies as well as summary biographies of the five claimants were subjected to thematic narrative analysis discussed above for relevant data. Selected letters written to the British government by the Kenya government, Archbishop Tutu and Nelson Mandela’s wife, Graca Machell were accessed for analysis. All these archival data sources provided a second tier validation and analysis on how victims and
perpetrators understood justice, forgiveness and trauma healing or their absence including other emerging themes as noted below:

“…a theme may emerge from reading a primary source, but it needs to be supported with other historical materials….in narrative analysis, we attempt to keep the “story” intact for interpretive purposes, although determining the boundaries of stories could be difficult and highly interpretive” (Riessman, 2008, pp.66, 74).

Interpretation of themes remains highly contested in thematic analysis and could be one of its weaknesses. While the contexts of the narrators will be different, even similar terminologies may not be understood to mean the same especially within indigenous communities with language differences. Several cautionary observations in narrative research are noted as follows: First, while narratives are gathered directly from their owners offering close and authentic environments, their validity and transparency ought not to be treated as free from potential exaggerations and errors (Atkinson, 1997). What is shared by the research participant is important and contains revelations that illuminate one’s life experiences. The discursive accounts are factual as expressed by the research participants and deserving full credit as such.

Second, narrative researchers, are advised to intentionally maintain a reasonable ethical distance from getting weaved into personal narratives in unhealthy ways through deep reflexivity (Atkinson, 1997). For example, while the research participants might experience the interview process as a therapeutic encounter, the role of the researcher is to deeply listen and not be trapped in the role of a therapist or counselor. The researcher though cannot afford to be cold and distant to the point of blocking authentic emotional
connection moments to build genuineness around the encounter. An epistemological balance that provides a grounded understanding between the researcher and the research participants is recommended (Bochner, 2001). The story as shared by the owner must be accurately documented in order for the analysis to be authentic.

Third, while I have selected hatred, dehumanization, and structural violence theories as process vehicles, stories must be allowed to flow uninterrupted while generating emerging themes. The thick descriptions offered by the research participants including critical emotional transitions during the narrative sharing assumed a natural flow. The power of a researcher being fully present and an engaged listener seemed to embolden the research participant to go deeper in her exposition of major themes, nuggets of wisdom and their meaning. The relational value built around mutual trust seemed to strengthen the relationship leading to a degree of comfort and ease during the interviews.

Fourth, power imbalance between the research participants and the researcher could have affected the narrative depth, breadth and quality. The practice of deferring and concentrating the power around the research participant yielded best results. Finally, narrative research is sometimes blamed for lack of quantifiable methodological thoroughness (Atkinson, 1997). A significant depth of documented narratives were subjected to a validation gauge where large segments were repeated to the research participants in order to verify the details as complete and without gaps and thus closing potential gaps during note taking. During the interpretation phase, principles of analysis that kept the data intact were thoroughly applied (Mishler, 1999; Thomas, et al., 2009). The role of research participants as teachers did emerge in the data collection phase as
will be noted during the analysis phase. This dynamic suggested research participant’s empowerment and strong ownership of their story occurred to the extent that they felt comfortable taking on the role of instructor.

**Sample Selection**

The sample selection was specific and intentional since all the participants had a direct experience with the Mau Mau war of independence as KLFA veterans or loyalists. I focused on participants from Kiambu, Embu and Nyeri counties; locations with the largest concentration of surviving KLFA veterans and loyalists. The process of finding 14 research participants was accomplished through gatekeepers in these communities. Medical doctors and clergy with direct contacts with the targeted research participants were instrumental in identifying gatekeepers (Riessman, 1993). All the participants met the criteria of being Mau Mau war veterans or loyalists who directly or indirectly supported the colonists.

**Data Collection**

I interviewed 14 research participants for this study. Prior to leaving each interview site, I shared my summary notes highlighting the major themes for the research participant and corrected any non-intended words or meaning for accuracy. I then transcribed each interview from the voice recorder and completed a first draft. Second, I listened to each interview for the second time, closely reviewing the transcripts while referring to my field notes and adding nonverbal elements I gathered during the live interviews into the transcripts. As a native Gikuyu speaker, language was not a barrier and the research participants felt a degree of comfort and ease that could not have been present with a translator. Interviewing the selected participants and their life stories was
at the heart of this research (Czarniawska, 2004). The Kenya Truth Justice and Reconciliation Commission report and the recent Mau Mau Court case in London archival data provided sufficient triangulation narratives for validity and confirmability. Key themes, words, phrases were noted as categories to be compared with the transcripts (Riessman, 2008).

As it will be apparent in the transcripts, I provided detailed narratives with thick descriptions where narrative thematic analysis could be replicated in a similar research regardless of context. These transcripts have the capacity to be subjected to a standardized analysis. For example, NVivo 10 software could enhance further analytical steps leading to evidence based outcomes with empirical and scientific value (Edhlund and Mcdougall, 2013). Riessman (2008) observes that, “…data are interpreted in light of thematic developed by the investigator influenced by prior and emergent theory, the concrete purpose of an investigation, the data themselves, political commitments, and other focus” (Riessman, 2008, p.54). While the themes of dehumanization, hatred and structural violence were featured in the literature review, during the narrative analysis, I remained open to allowing emerging themes from the interviews shape the flow of the narratives. Denzin and Lincoln (2008) are right in pointing out that, “…there is no single interpretive…there are multiple interpretative communities, each with its own criteria for evaluation interpretations” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2008, p.35).

Emotions such as crying and laughter were noted within the context of the story (Riessman, 1993). Starting and ending points in the story were noted as well (Jefferson, 1979). As the researcher, I followed along without disruptions, creating space for the narrative to unfold and expressing deep respect throughout the process
and especially when research participants’ arrived at unprepared moments of self-revelation and reflection (DeVault, 1999).

The interviews focused on their role as either perpetrators or victims and sometimes both. Participants were free to choose what role they wished to emphasize. I carefully observed the level of comfort or discomfort they were exhibiting while sharing their story. Only in one instance collaboration with the gatekeeper was necessary after the research participant expressed the desire to have the gatekeeper present during the interview. This made him more comfortable discussing various topics and put him at ease and seemed to encourage open and honest disclosure.

Smaller sample size in qualitative research promotes depth and breadth of a thick and detailed narrative (Huber & Whelan, 1999). The number of participants was also determined by the time required for in-depth interviews and the cost of travel to different locations where the research participants resided. The chronologically ordered “re-storying” process using recorded interviews containing specific stories was maintained while protecting the integrity of the participant’s voice as well as the meaning of the stories (Creswell, 2009). My set of selected questions were helpful in structuring the interviews but in most cases research participants narrated the story they wanted to regardless of my guiding questions. Collecting data from the research participants residing in their native environments proved to be deeply respectful and sensitive since it communicated humility and gratitude. Honor and respect for the elders is a strong virtue among the Gikuyu community. Situational awareness of participants needs especially when sharing personal sensitive narratives of a painful past was consistently maintained.
during the interactions. Voice recording guaranteed authenticity with the voices of the participants and the story they wanted to share.

As the primary data gatherer, interacting face to face with participants was deeply enriching. Flexibility with information flow was observed. The interview encounters created and maintained space for open-ended questions enabling research participants to go deeper. Several research participants hinted that they had never shared some of the information with anyone else. The rich narrative accounts orally expressed by their owners created a highly valuable experience in the narrative research process (Plummer, 1983). Detailed field notes and audio recording from the participants assisted in capturing major themes in their stories. Visual expressions seemed to be linked with deep experiences narrated and annotated in my field notes. The meaning of experiences as expressed by the research participant(s) and how they impacted their lives was documented and informed the analysis process. I now turn to narrative thematic analysis using the Williams Model, the selected method of analysis for this study.

**Narrative Thematic Analysis**

In 1984, Gareth Williams worked with arthritis patients who offered reconstructed narratives about their experiences and how they made meaning of their health condition. The themes in the participant’s stories seemed to support known theories about arthritis in what Riessman referred to as “…temporally ordered narrative form…” (Riessman, 2008, p.2). Within the milieu of narrative research, the Williams model assisted me in answering the “what” question best; “…all narrative inquiry is, of course, concerned with content – “what” is said, written, or visually shown – but in thematic analysis, content is the exclusive focus” (Riessman, 2008, p.53).
I used narrative thematic analysis using the Williams model following a set of interview questions found in appendix C 1 and a thematic analysis matrix found in appendix C 2. Focusing on the content, this approach helped me explore personal stories within their cultural context (McAdams, Josselson, & Lieblich 2001). It also afforded the research participant a unique opportunity to uncover specific themes and new meanings within the story as they desired. The primary goal during the field interviews was specifically focused on what was said and demonstrated how the research participant understood justice, forgiveness and trauma healing and their absence within intra-group reciprocal violence context.

Williams attempted to reconstruct few selected stories in order to explain the research participant’s self-understanding and interpretation of their arthritis condition from the 30 interviews. Emerging patterns were listed in order to assist with further analysis and interpretation. Detailed and long quotations from the interviews were accomplished in order to understand as much the “whole” narrative as possible. For example, in my interviews with KLFA veterans and loyalist survivors, I documented their lengthy narratives transcribed directly from the audio recording. Thematic analysis discussed above provided the best process for research participants to identify and describe emerging themes later transcribed as a rich body of data (Riessman, 2008; Williams, 2008).

The long verbatim excerpts could allow other researchers to create their own meaning and interpretation. The model supports “cleaning up the speech” concept. While I question what could be lost in the process, it is a necessary step in order to make the narrative accessible and conducive to interpretation and analysis. The role of the
researcher is less prominent in the William’s model while the research participant and her message dominate the conversation. The interpretive process was a shared meaning making experience by the research participants and the researcher. Careful and patient listening were necessarily as I followed the narrator annotating nonverbal communication elements without disconnecting from “in the moment” experiences. I refrained from introducing new themes during the interviews and focused on documenting details from whole narratives. The choice of words, expressions, metaphors, proverbs, did offer deeper meaning and understanding on what was said; a step that aligned well with Williams’s position where language is used to convey meaning within the narrative.

Another reason why the Williams’s model was a preferred approach for this research was its capacity to develop and accommodate theoretical analysis based on the research participant’s theme (Faircloth, 1999). While thick descriptions were captured in detailed and lengthy excerpts, I intentionally listened to the audio recordings several times in order to capture merging points with themes discussed under literature review. Participants narrated deep and rich experiences covering both individual and group dynamics (Plummer, 2001). What these stories revealed became the primary unit of careful and detailed analysis. The concepts of justice, forgiveness and trauma healing and their absence became critical lenses to analyze gathered data.

Thematic narrative analysis enables the researcher to identify, develop and analyze primary themes expressed and shared in the narratives (Riessman, 2008). The entire story is the unit of analysis. Archival data identified as relevant to the narratives was also subjected to the same thematic narrative analysis discussed later in this section. The flow and sequence was important to the uncovering of the “whole” narrative which
could be close to Cain’s method that attempts to unveil the “master narrative” (Riessman, 2008). Caution is necessary here for the researcher; a master narrative might not exist and hence the need to follow the narrative flow devoid of any preconceived notions. By leaving the story intact as a unit, one is able to maintain the integrity of the story and the intended message from the research participant (Shaw, 2011). Recognizing that research participants recollect and interpret their past and offer a fresh re-imagination of these experiences could enrich the process of listening, analysis and interpretation (Riessman, 2005).

Thematic analysis does not focus on analyzing the language or its context, the why and how (Labov and Wallensky, 1967). The primary goal is on what is being said in the story. Narrative thematic analysis is closer to the life story method approach because, “...it is a fairly complete narrating of one’s entire experience of life as a whole, highlighting the most important aspects” (Atkinson, 1998, p.8). Thematic narrative analysis helped capture how the major themes in the stories were being framed with ease and sometimes with complexity. Research participant’s beliefs and subscription to both African traditional religion and Christianity at times seemed to influence their narratives and how they chose to re-construct them (Williams, 2008).

Research participants narrated what they considered to be most important for others to hear in reference to their experiences because “…the thematic approach is useful for theorising across a number of cases finding common thematic elements across research participants and the events they report” (Riessman, 2008, p.3). Meaning making became a shared experience between the research participant and the researcher. The
patterns and themes that emerged from the narratives formed a diverse display of themes discussed in the analysis section.

Chaitin’s (2009) eight basic steps for data analysis, provided helpful pointers some of which I used during the analysis as follows: (1) listening and transcribing the data, (2) read and re-read the transcription, (3) global analysis, (4) chronological overview, (5) thematic analysis, (6) list hypothesis, (7) combining identified themes, and (8) commencement of analysis. Understanding the reality as expressed by the participants, their context, and most important how they made meaning and interpreted their narratives informed my interpretive approach. This helped me keep my interpretations close to what was said by each research participant.

As a researcher, it was important to listen to the whole story and not just parts of the story that addressed my questions because “…we are to understand the meaning of stories to those who use them, rather than some truth they tell us…we must study them in their contexts of use” (Sutton-Smith, 1986, p. 68). While I am in agreement with Sutton-Smith, the interpretive frameworks could be compromised between the researcher and the research participant especially during interpretation where a different understanding might occur and I was on guard to prevent this from happening by quoting verbatim the shared narrative. Research participants as owners of their story may have different motives for telling the story that they choose to tell (Polkinghorne, 1988). Voice recording was invaluable and helped me to maintain the narratives and their translations from Gikuyu language to English as close as possible to the narrator’s words and expressions.
Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, and Zilber (1998) offered four criteria that I referenced to analyze the narratives. First, the width and comprehensives of the narrative as expressed by the narrator in order to provide space for further interpretation; second, through external and internal coherence highlighting how all the small parts fit together and how the theories in this case (hatred, dehumanization, and structural violence) were situated in the narratives. Third was the the insightfulness and original creativity demonstrated by the research participants themselves. Fourth, was the ability to analyze the story using other theories to illuminate oral accounts and further help explain forthcoming insights from the interviews (Lieblich, et al., 1998, p.173). Riessman concurs with Lieblich by adding that validation through analysis could be achieved through persuasiveness, correspondence, coherence and pragmatic use (Riessman, 1993, pp.65-68). These principles guided the process of analyzing data shared by participants while staying very close to what was said by each.

Validity

To fully understand and appreciate human experiences, narrative thematic analysis offered the best opportunity to arrive at practical interpretive outcomes that advanced validity. Identifying repeated themes across the narratives, use of codes, expanded the capacity for reliability (Creswell, 2009). The writing of clear and thorough field notes, margin reflective memorandums and identification of salient themes increased the threshold for validity. Maintaining a clear logical flow of data, comparing and contrasting different narratives provided a unique data set leading to objective verifiable data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Thematic analysis allowed me to observe a clear flow of data and the identification of key themes within the narratives (Stephen,
MacQueen, & Namey, 2011). Validity simply asks whether the interview questions met the intended purpose of producing data in order to elicit interpretive meaning through careful and respectful procedures that honored the research participants intentions.

Data analysis spiral offered important pointers in data collection, management, evaluation, interpretation, and organizing it in respective categories (Creswell, 2007). Thematic narrative analysis encouraged long passages that honored the research participant’s thick descriptions. Multiple re-reading of the entire lengthy transcripts while listening to the audio-files several times brought clarity to the interpretation process. Important themes emerged from the narratives as expressed by the research participants unveiling layers of experiences. In order to analyze narratives within their rich context, extreme care was taken during the collection phase to ensure that the flow and pace of the interviews honored and captured “in the moment” feelings, pauses, contradictions, awkward statements, metaphors, proverbs and riddles (Czarniawska, 2004).

Intuitions, hunches and deeper level moments of discernment happened during the interview and noted in my field notes (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Asking clarifying questions elicited deeper meaning. A detailed chronological flow of each story was recorded including moments of unprepared and unexpected twists and turns as the research participants chose the pace and direction they wanted to go with their story. Highs, lows, new revelations, surprises and deeply emotional personal cathartic moments occurred and were handled with great care. A respectful response, silence, deep listening and being in the moment with the research participant created an appropriate environment for a rich and genuine experience. The level of detail and due diligence promoted a trusting and safe environment for personal revelations.
Bracketing

Bracketing in data recording and analysis helped me to establish a healthy boundary as a researcher with the participants. As a trained Christian theologian, I was aware that the concepts of forgiveness required intentional bracketing in order to conduct a neutral analysis free from religious attachments. In self reflection, I paid attention to researcher biases and worked hard to ensure that they did not interfere or compromise the flow and thought process (Husserl, 1931; Moustakas, 1994). In two instances, I used gatekeepers to check my interview process to check against potential bias. Inviting the research participant’s feedback was valuable and increased data reliability. Listening to the unfolding emerging experiences without commentary or analysis helped in preserving data flow and integrity (Creswell, 2007). Chunks of units broken down into reasonable pieces assisted in making the field notes and transcripts accessible for analysis (Saldana, 2012; Riessman, 2008). The goal was to maximize the ability to preserve with accuracy the participant’s experience and its primary themes (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003).

Reliability

At the end of every interview, I summarized the main themes in each narrative and asked the research participants to confirm whether I had accurately captured the major themes in the whole story. This enabled me to make sure that their experiences were documented as desired while corrections were made on the spot. The process of verifying reliability was tedious and time consuming but a major necessity and affirmation step. If another researcher desired to follow the narrative research method and obtained similar results or comparable outcomes; this could further verify and affirm narrative analysis research establishing further credibility and trustworthiness (Creswell,
Measuring reliability and validity can be challenging in qualitative research, however, the ability to demonstrate consistency and meaning collaborated by other researchers could raise the objectivity and confirm the results. My role was to come alongside in a shared meaning making process while deferring the final interpretation and meaning to the research participants. Reviewing the summary field notes together with research participants raised the degree of accuracy and integrity (McAdams, 2006).

**Confirmability**

Confirmability is an on-going process throughout the research phases. In qualitative research, confirmability is important since it appraises the quality of the outcomes and congruency with the research participants’ narratives. Ultimately when other researchers in this field are able to replicate the same research outcomes and obtain similar results, confirmability could then be fully affirmed (Guba and Lincoln, 2007). Even after all these validation steps have been accomplished, the research outcomes could still contain elements that are impossible to fully confirm and hence the need for continuous analysis to ascertain credibility and accounting for potential threats or “rival hypothesis” that requires evidential proof for validity (Maxwell, 2005). Credibility and trustworthiness are linked to confirmability. The questions of trustworthiness, validity, and reliability in narrative research have been addressed in the past (Silverman, 2001). Four pillars could also be used to evaluate and analyze data and are compatible to narrative research (Guba, 1981). These four are credibility (in preference to internal validity); transferability (in preference to external validity-generalizability); dependability (in preference to reliability); and confirmability (Guba, 1981, p.64).
Integrity and credibility is a valuable research concern that added fidelity to the research process.

**Dependability**

Dependability was established through triangulation especially the use of other data sources to validate the field research (Guba, 1981; Brewer & Hunter, 1989). Archived data from print media and internet resources enriched the process of triangulation and ascertained further reliability. Miller and Brewer (2003) endorse triangulation where different methods are combined in order to reach a comprehensive data analysis. The triangulated approach was sought to combine the best data from various sources in order to build and establish potential predictable patterns. Dependability is also important in ensuring consistency between research conceptualization, field interviews, data transcription, analysis and reported implications. Major themes from archived data sources and field interviews were congruent, a step that raised the dependability value.

**Delimitations and Limitations**

Delimitations for this research included the specific nature of the study sample. An explanation was offered elsewhere on why narrative thematic analysis was preferred and not participant action research or oral history approach. Only Mau Mau war survivors were selected for participation based on the research question. Gender was not a primary focus for this research, however, two women and twelve men participated in sharing their narratives. The age for research participants was a delimitation since most survivors were between 75 and 92 years of age. The specific geographical area where the participant’s lived was within central Kenya villages and a few on the border of central and eastern
province in Embu, all known as hotbed Mau Mau strongholds and no other areas were visited (Anderson, 2005b).

Limitations might also have included overwhelming data due to the thick descriptive narratives generated during the field interviews. Time was a major factor given the sample size of fourteen participants and the varying travel distances between their residences. As a researcher who was born and raised in central Kenya, some research participants might have viewed me as an insider; however, as a student who has lived in North America for over two decades; I could have been assigned an outsider role initially although I did not detect it during the interviews. Building credibility required a fine balance between the insider and outsider lenses (Hays, 2004; Venegas-Garcia, 2010).

Colonial based violent conflict was not just limited to the Gikuyu people. For example, the Nandi community in the Rift Valley province waged remarkable resistance among the Nandi people. Koitalel Arap Samoei doubled as a spiritual traditional healer and political leader. He was allegedly trapped into a falsified peaceful negotiation meeting with Meinertzhagen, a British colonial officer. When the Arap Samoei stretched his hand to greet Meinertzhagen, he shot him at close range killing him instantly (Meinertzhagen, 1983). In the coastal region of Kenya, the Giriama people led by their gallant female warrior Mekatalili Wa Menza put up notable resistance against the British colonial occupation. Mekatalili was fed up with the corrupt male leaders and she decided to take over as the warrior leader (Brantley, 1982, pp. 86-87). The colonists deported her from the coastal region to western Kenya in the town of Kisii where she escaped and supposedly walked over 400 kilometers back to the coast and continued with the fight (Mugi-Ndua, 2000). The scope of this study could not encompass all these other people
groups. However, they deserve recognition for their significant contribution to Kenya’s war of independence and offer future research opportunities.

My role as a Gikuyu researcher with family members on both sides of this conflict presented a challenge and maintaining that awareness at every juncture during the field interviews was important. Bracketing helped me minimize my bias against native loyalists or the urge to side with the KLFA. Verifying with participants prior to concluding my interviews assisted in reducing researcher bias including during the transcribing process of the recorded interviews. Fourteen participants from three separate regions in central Kenya may not adequately represent KLFA veterans and the native loyalists’ collective experiences. The sample selection targeted known hotbed areas for the Mau Mau war but even with this criterion, 14 people could not claim to represent the experiences of an entire country.

I did not focus on non-Gikuyu communities who have their own narratives about how they experienced colonial occupation. The scope of the study could not have been manageable and hence the limited choice for the experiences of residents from central region covering Kiambu, Nyeri and Embu counties. Future research could endeavor to study the experiences of the natives of the coastal region and compare these with other regions of Kenya under colonial occupation and how they experienced reciprocal violence, justice, forgiveness and trauma healing and their absence.

Narrative analysis as a research method bears various limitations some of which were discussed earlier under the methodology section especially researcher bias (Anderson, 2010). I was keenly aware of my deep interest in this subject which was not
necessarily a negative factor in itself but nevertheless kept that awareness in an effort to maintain objectivity. The ability to immerse myself into the village life similar to where I grew up and sharing the same language with research participants without the need for an interpreter added value to the research process. The quality of the interviews was improved by member checking where every participant was given an opportunity to listen to my summarized themes for clarity. Another criticism has to do with rigor. In response, each research participant rightfully owned her experience and had the freedom to determine the degree of thoroughness despite any outsider assessment of the same.

As the researcher, my ability to capture the whole story in a detailed verbatim format demonstrated a rigorous effort shared by the research participant and most important, a process that honored each one of them and their story. I concur that qualitative research process is not only time consuming but expensive in terms of travel and locating research participants with a specific type of experience willing to share them with a researcher. While within the wider scientific community questions might still linger about qualitative research, it is probably one of the rare opportunities of lived experience and empowerment that added great value to the research process, the participants and the outcomes.

As each one of my research participants shared their story, a deep sense of emotional twists and turns unfolded but with an overall sense of satisfaction in that someone was willing to listen to their entire story without passing judgment. Scientific acceptance may still be slow, however in order to study the lived experience, narrative thematic analysis provided the most affirming and authentic method. It also provided a
platform for voices that would probably never make it on the stage of traditional scientific processes. Another criticism levelled against qualitative research is the impact of the face to face encounter with research participants and the presumed ability to influence the research process. In my experience, these encounters invited me to some sacred grounds where few others have set foot and overrides potential influences.

Being in the moment with the research participant’s emotions of joy, sadness and silence added an intangible value to the research process that honored the owner of the information. Concerns of anonymity have been expressed. However, the ability to use pseudonyms mitigated this concern. The research participants were aware that even with all the measures to protect their personally identifiable information, a degree of exposure remained. All research participants reaffirmed their desire to share their story, educate younger generations, prevent conflict and build peace. These were by far much greater contributions that were worth the minimum risk of exposure involved according to them.

Using thematic narrative analysis proved to be a rich experience first for the research participants who in most cases did not feel restricted to answering specific interview questions. They seemed to enjoy the freedom to share what they thought was most important to them and skipped what was not (Riessman, 2008). This research method allowed the researcher to dig deep into their rich experiences weaving a story that they probably had not narrated before to anyone. As new details emerged, almost in a seamless manner, there was a place for them since there was no restrictive formulae to abide by.

The rich human element of these encounters was something that other research methods could not have been able to elucidate. The powerful validating criteria for
qualitative research specifically narrative thematic analysis was its capacity for transferability. If other researchers will in future be able to arrive to similar results using the same processes, it could further provide affirmation and credibility while strengthening the outcomes. Limitations as noted raised valid questions that research practitioners could utilize in order to fortify the qualitative research process as a major avenue to create new theory as well as best practices in the field of conflict analysis.

**Ethics and Reflexivity**

My training and background as a theologian deeply informed my sense of self-awareness as I listened and documented the narratives as well as during the interpretive process. I maintained a daily process of self-debriefing and analyzing how the narratives were impacting me at a personal level an effort that helped me maintain objective flexibility (Bold, 2011). Exposure to repeated traumatic narratives could lead to vicarious trauma. Bearing witness to the suffering of others and listening deeply to multiple narratives of pain could have an impact on the researcher. I found a healthy way to address my potential vicarious trauma and emotions through the process of daily debriefing while consciously maintaining resilient self care practices (Rambo, 2010; Wicks, 2009). Guillemin and Gillam (2004) view reflexivity as a critical tool for researchers especially becoming aware of their vulnerabilities and potential internal conflicts with personal biases and dilemmas. Experiencing a degree of vulnerability isn’t a negative influence and it could cultivate humility, integrity and a healthy perspective of being human.

Respecting others, their need for self-determination, destiny and capacity to make responsible choices without manipulation by outside agents is critical to all human
engagements (Pope Paul VI, 1977). The requirement for ethics in qualitative research has far reaching consequences if violated since it cuts deep into the meaning of human dignity and moral bearing of all people. The eliding of basic human moral imperatives in qualitative research could potentially lead researchers towards a slippery slope and without safety mechanisms in place cause irreparable damage. Ethics and regulations could also allude to the values and choices and their motivations (Pellegrino & Thomasma, 1996). The researcher’s guiding principle should always be driven by doing the right thing on behalf of the research participants and for the integrity of the research process. Even with a signed consent for participation, I reminded the research participants that they were whatsoever not obligated to continue with the interview if one felt pressured or manipulated (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1994).

The potential for the qualitative research’s capacity to stir up troubling memories for the participants has been documented (Cowles, 1988). Since the researcher and the participant don’t know what will happen before it does, seeking continuous consent was a safe step (Shaw, 2008; Munhall, 1988). Even after all the precautions had been undertaken, there was still room for risk where the research participant could potentially feel objectified and treated like a data source. The potential for cognitive dissonance could leave the research participant with a sense of powerlessness and inadequacy (Smythe & Murray, 2000). Talking about this possibility during the ongoing consent seeking process built a safety net against potential feelings of inadequacy after the interview and became part of the protocol of care for the vulnerable research participants.

Protection of human subjects in qualitative research demands a thorough risk mitigation process. There is no degree of risk that is worth the life of the participant and
hence deep respect for the participant in qualitative research is required. Building a trusting relationship was an ongoing and sometimes renegotiated process. Psychological and emotional wounds were most likely to be re-opened by the traumatic impact of retelling stories of violence and violation of human life. Most research participants seemed to negotiate the dark places in their journey with ease although it was emotionally draining to do so.

Building trust with known perpetrators living in the local villages was most challenging since some were afraid that their information could be used to alienate them or bring dishonor to their family name. Use of pseudonyms was employed to protect the identity of all the research participants. The participants were also selected from different regions with distinct distances in order to increase anonymity. Post-research published work will maintain the same anonymity in order to protect and prevent disclosure of any private information. Personally identifying data was deleted in order to protect research participants. Such information included names, residence addresses, village of birth, and clan membership. Anonymity and principles of confidentiality were clearly understood and practiced. Streubert and Carpenter (1999) raised an important conflict of interest question between the requirement for confidentiality and reportable legal obligations.

There was never a time any legal parameters were considered during this research.

I was keenly aware of the significant interest I had in this research subject. My parents and grand-parents lived through some of the most violent period of the Mau Mau war of independence. My maternal side of the family actively supported the Mau Mau warfighters. As the war advanced, my father attempted to join the colonial school system through the religious sponsored schools. On suspicion that he was assuming a neutral
position, he was subjected to physical violence by the Mau Mau adherents some of whom were distant relatives. In line with my research interests, my family of origin had a share of both perpetrators and victims as the cycle of violence and revenge unfolded. I was conscious of this important dynamic and did not allow bias during the field research and data analysis.

I continually sought a validated understanding by asking the research participants consistently whether my summary was in line with what he or she shared during the interviews. In the next section, I will provide the excerpts from the research participants and a brief thematic analysis for each interview. The element of coda where a clear ending of the narrative was noticeable proved to be a challenge because I was sensitive to unnecessary interruptions and followed the pace of my research participant. This created space and freedom to tell their story, starting and stopping as they wished while making the conversation assume a natural flow as possible.
Chapter 4 – Results

In this chapter, I will present the results in three categories tied directly to my research question: What do the narratives of perpetrators and victims in reciprocal violence reveal about their understanding of justice, forgiveness and trauma healing or their absence? I will present the findings categorized in three broad themes: experience with reciprocal violence, justice, forgiveness and trauma healing with indepth and sometimes long participant quotes to amplify the participant’s voice as the owner of their story. I have combined forgiveness and trauma healing since the participants had the least to say about these categories. Fourteen in-depth interviews were conducted in July 2014 consisting of two women and twelve men. Pseudonyms were used in order to protect their identity. None of them explicitly self-identified as a perpetrator, however, the story they told revealed their status. Each narrative was subjected to a full and complete thematic analysis (Williams, 2008). An illustration of thematic data analysis is offered in appendix C 2.

The research participants resided in various villages in the counties of Kiambu, Embu and Nyeri in the greater central Kenya. Each narrative was unique and the details revealed directly and sometimes indirectly indicated whether the participant’s experience was that of a perpetrator or victim. While I had prepared interview questions, almost all the research participants did not directly address the questions I posed. They narrated the story of their lives they considered most important to them. The lengthy transcripts included in this section were purposed to maintain the integrity of the narratives. At the end of each interview session, I reviewed the summary of the emerging themes and verified with each research participant that this was an accurate record of their story. This
was an opportunity for the research participant to clarify, correct or reject the major themes captured in my notes during the interview. This process further strengthened trust, credibility and a sense of empowerment for the research participant as the owner of their story.

I used thematic narrative analysis, a method that advocates for detailed long verbatims of what was said. I divided this section into three summative categories that are tied directly to the overall research question. The three areas were categorized as follows:

(i). Understanding reciprocal violence
(ii). Understanding justice
(iii). Understanding forgiveness and trauma healing

**Part I – Understanding reciprocal violence**

**Participant 01 – Nyambura (P 01 N)**

Nyambura was approximately 92 years old. She was born at a time when the Gikuyu people did not keep birth records. One’s birthday was remembered by associating it with a specific weather pattern, season or historical event. She was the first wife in a polygamous household shared with several wives (number not disclosed). Nyambura did not provide direct answers to the interview questions but rather shared the story she wanted and felt was important to her. She switched from singular to plural especially while discussing negative experiences. This mechanism noted throughout her narrative and among others illustrated the collectivist cultural practice of inclusion where one does not call attention on themselves but rather makes it a shared experience. This could also have been a tactic for placing a distance between her individual involvement and the event being narrated to minimize personal impact while retelling a traumatic story. The
interview took place on a chilly morning in her hut in the village of Lari, the site of the “Lari Massacre” in Kiambu County, central Kenya.

Nyambura opened her story by stating how her defiance to the Mau Mau oath ritual presented an imminent threat to her life. She did not go into the details of how the massacre unveiled right away but immediately recalled seeing many dead bodies. She looked away from me, and avoided a direct face to face contact. Her narration was interrupted by multiple coughs since she had been fighting a cold flu. Her story quickly connected the oath ritual, the massacre, followed by the forced removal from their village into a detention camp. She revisited the more graphic details of the massacre recalling the killings and the burning of homes. Her tone of voice changed and almost in whispers stated that the emotional pain experienced during the night of the massacre was undescrivable and still present. This was followed by a brief silence. Without any indications of a subject change, Nyambura introduced a new topic altogether. Her decision to change the topic seemed to have successfully pulled us back from an intense emotional flashback of the massacre to a less intense and probably safer subject. Her recollection of the Mau Mau war continued our conversation:

I refused to take the Mau Mau oath before the Lari Massacre happened. I saw a lot of dead bodies the morning following the massacre night and the next day we were forced to move from Lari village to Gituamba village concentration camp. When the Mau Mau fighters arrived in our village, their intentions were unclear to us. As the hours of darkness drew near, they started killing and setting homes on fire with no regard to who was inside… (silence - 02 seconds) I remember one man, Kimani who was caught between both sides. He tried to mediate the conflict
pleading for the lives of women and children but without success. He was among the few Gikuyu people who were in the middle and did not take sides in the war. He attempted to build consensus and co-existence without violence but no one listened to him. (Nyambura, age 92).

In what sounded like a more relaxed tone, she briefly introduced a man who had taken a neutral position in the conflict as noted above. She gave him credit as a mediator even though he was unsuccessful. The loyalists and the KLFA forces were extremely polarized and at the height of the violence, mediation was not an option. She hinted about the loss of the lives of women and children pointing out the extent of the violence and sadness in reciprocal violence. This “middle’ group was rarely talked about and even in later narratives; there were indirect hints of the “middle” group but with nothing much revealed about their activities. Nyambura then returned to the Lari Massacre night and introduced her husband in the story where we learn that he was a Mau Mau supporter and had taken the oath to fight the colonists. She did not disclose any details about the other wives in the household and what happened to them during that night of the massacre. Her refusal to take the oath suggested that she was against the violent resistance. However, her loyalty and devotion to her husband who had taken the oath and was a Mau Mau supporter illustrated how the violence divided families. She was forced to choose her family or the colonist side. Her decision to stick with her family led her into a path of great suffering as she travelled with great difficulty from one detention camp to another to visit and support her husband. She was afraid that he would die in detention like many others.
A group of suspected Mau Mau supporters was picked up from Lari village and transported to Githunguri town and later to Mtito-wa-Ndei detention Camp. My husband was among them and was detained there. I visited him with great difficulty, later they moved him again to Molo detention camp. Many men never made it out of the detention alive but my husband did only by God’s grace. Nyambura revealed that although she had not taken the oath, she did not endorse the violence unleashed by both sides of the conflict. She identified the colonial native chief Mr. Makimei as one who defended colonial interests without directly labelling him as the “enemy” or perpetrator despite the revenge attacks he presided over following the Lari Massacre. Great sensitivity exists today on how one is labelled (perpetrator/loyalist or KLFA Mau Mau warfighter) in the greater Gikuyu community resistance war narratives. She grieved over the hatred and divisions that fractured what was a harmonious life at Lari village. Without specifics, she stated that her family members died and that there were no winners in this conflict. The arbitrary detention camps where suspects were physically and sexually assaulted amplified hatred and reciprocal violence. Nyambura picked up the theme of hatred situating it in the “hearts of the people”. The result of this conflict was loss, broken hearts, death, and trauma.

Nyambura blamed the colonial invasion that forced people to choose between the two sides resulting to the bitter divisions of a once homogeneous people group.

Senior Chief Makimei, a colonial loyalist was in total control of this area and defended the interests of his colonial masters. Hatred was deeply rooted in the hearts of the people and most important led to many losses. There were no winners in this conflict. We were one people and group but our hatred was based
on the side one supported and this led to many deaths. We spoke the same dialect but some of our people gave their hearts to the colonists. My family members died and there were no winners (*soft tender and sad tone*) we all became losers in this fight. Following the massacre, people lived in this village like in a frozen state due to the suffering, trauma and loss they endured.

Discussing the power of the oath, she indirectly addressed her fear as one who had not taken the oath. There was no middle ground or safe place when it came to the oath. The theme for her personal suffering resurfaced again, but without specified atrocities directed at her. The long pause that followed this disclosure suggested an internal struggle with this recollection. Nyambura returned again to the Lari Massacre incident disclosing more details, naming another colonial chief as the “enemy” who was murdered the night of the Lari Massacre. With a deep sigh of expression, she in a sad way summarized the entire experience, “I was always closer to death than life”.

The people who took the oath viewed this as a source of moral courage, inspiration and a trust builder between them and their resolve to fight all those who were siding with the white people and their native loyalists. Those who refused to take the oath were afraid of the consequences especially the threat of death if one betrayed the oath or was discovered to have taken the oath by the native loyalists. I refused to take the oath and as a result, I suffered greatly (*long pause*)...the oath was the clear line of division between the two sides.

Senior Chief Luka wa-Kahangara supported the colonists and did not listen to the fellow Gikuyu people. On the night of the Lari Massacre, the Mau Mau warriors killed him but several of his wives, few family Members survived the attacks.
The destruction that happened that night was unimaginable. I was always closer to death than life. I met with a lot of trouble and suffering (long pause)

Personal suffering was briefly mentioned without going into specific details. She disclosed the element of fear as a motivator for not taking the oath. The violence and destruction of life surrounding her became part of her new identity. The extent of her suffering was affirmed by her raw emotions five decades after these experiences. What was left unsaid probably was more than what was shared.

**Participant 02 – Wambugu (P 02 W)**

Wambugu was approximately 87 years old and in relatively good health. He also resided in the village of Lari near the site of the Lari Massacre. He was very proud of his involvement in the Mau Mau activities and enthusiastically supported the KLFA war effort. He wanted a reassurance from me that his story was going to be treated with care and not contain any personal identifying data. He was comfortable and energetic as he faced me directly face to face in all the responses that he provided.

His direct involvement with the oath opened the conversation. He did not only take the oath but officiated at oathing rituals locally referred to as “tea drinking sessions”. He did not deny physically assaulting those who resisted the oath but explained that this was a routine practice. Wambugu seemed quite jovial as he explained about the transforming power of the oath. He revealed the hierarchical organization and the psychological and practical functions of the oath with practical results for total loyalty ridding all fear and tightening solidarity among the KLFA and their supporters. As noted in Nyambura’s story, he also switched from singular to plural expressions in what appeared to create a sense of safety and probably attributing the violent acts to others and
not directly to himself. He was unapologetically proud of the violent attacks he carried out.

We decided to administer the oath. The recipient was required to bring a goat and Kshs.60 in order to join the secret group. If an oath candidate seemed undecided, I would invite them to come for a cup of tea and once inside the house, we would initiate them by a thorough beating followed by forced oath. In the Rift Valley, natives who were working in settler farms lied to their white employers that they wanted to go back to Kiambu to check on their sick parents. They showed up and we gave them the oath and upon return to the colonial farms, they secretly undermined the colonists. The secrets of Mau Mau were heavily guarded and could not be betrayed. Senior Chief Waruhiu Kung’u insulted the leaders of the Mau Mau. A plan was hatched to assassinate him. I was working at Unga Limited (maize flour plant) when news arrived that Waruhiu had been assassinated. Sirens were blaring in the entire city of Nairobi once the colonists realized that Waruhiu had been killed. I left the city and headed home and at Lari we were all detained in a village camp and surrounded by heavily armed colonial soldiers. Ex-Chief Luka Wa-Kahangara proclaimed that the “big snake” had been captured and in custody and that all his short sighted followers will soon be arrested as well. This was a reference to Kenyatta, our leader here in Kiambu. Most native chiefs had taken the oath except Waruhiu, Harry Thuku and Luka-Wakahangara. Chief Makimei was double dealing since he had taken the oath too.

To take the oath, I made the recipient bite into a raw piece of goat meat while goat intestines were tied around his neck; this was oath level I. Oath level II was
known as Batuni (Platoon) involved more secrets and oath level III was for senior leaders only. After the oath, we built 70 guns and hid them at a nearby farm. (Wambugu, age 87).

Raiding police stations was an operational tactic widely employed by the KLFA. Wambugu also shed more details and provided first hand account of the Lari Massacre. We stepped outside his house and he pointed from a distance, the epicenter of the attack, the compound of Chief Luka Wa-Kahangara’s home. Following a vivid recollection of the grass thatched huts in flames with families inside, he abruptly changed the theme as if to remove himself from the scene. His tone of voice changed and in whispers disclosed his own very close encounter with death when a white military officer placed a gun on his head and was only saved by a letter of endorsement in his person from the local forest officer who was a friend of the Indian businessman Wambugu worked for. The letter confirmed that he was a loyal subject to the colonial governor, another survival mechanism widely used by the natives to escape arrest or death. Describing further the darkest aspects of reciprocal violence, Wambugu mentioned his own arrest following a false accusation and without much detail disclosed a rape incident of a close relative where a mother and daughter were raped in the presence of the husband and father. As if to revenge that descpicable act, he described his own attack of a loyalist that caused him to relocate to prevent further revenge attacks. This was the second account where he personally assaulted another person. Dehumanization, hatred and structural violence seemed to have enveloped the Gikuyu people and turned the violence into an intractable intra-group conflict.

On March 26, 1952 the platoon was broken into small units and ordered to go and
raid Naivasha Police station and take all the weapons and bring them to the Mau Mau leaders. Another group was sent to attack Ex-Chief Luka Wa-kahangara’s Home killing a lot of people. One of his surviving wife died recently and she lived with one hand until her death since the other hand was chopped off that night of the Lari Massacre. Chief Makimei knew that an attack was impending and he told his cousin to flee ahead of the attack. Immediately, targeted homes started going up in flames as home guards were viciously attacked by the Mau Mau (*change of topic*) The homes were grass-thatched and burned fast. In my place of work where I worked for an Indian businessman; the colonial forester showed up and offered to issue letters to me and a colleague stating that we were loyal subjects. As I went to pick up milk for my boss, I recognized one man lying dead and I continued walking with great fear. Soon, a land lover arrived and the white colonialist placed a pistol on my head. I produced the letter from the forester and he let me go. I was betrayed by a man who was making moves on my sister and I fought him back to protect my sister; he saw an opportunity to revenge and he had me arrested claiming that I had taken the oath, but I survived. My relative’s wife and daughter were raped by the home guards in the presence of their father who had been beaten to unconsciousness…(*silence*)…we hated the home guards.

Wambugu’s angry face and slow whispering tone highlighted the depth of his emotional pain when recalling this heinous crime of rape. With a strong exclamation the hatred towards the home guards was not only in the past; he seemed to be re-living the past in the here and now.

On one instance, I gave a home guard a thorough beating. He is still alive
today. He was a decorated loyalist and he attempted to destroy goods at my small kiosk mixing sugar with kerosene since I was a known Mau Mau member. I hit him on the head and he passed out and I took the weapon away from him. I hid the gun under my bed. My neighbors who heard the commotion and responded were unhappy that he was alive and I did not kill him; saying that I should have killed him. As a result of this incident I had to relocate from that area to avoid killing each other. Revenge attacks were rampant; I had to be on watch at all times to survive. I had multiple close encounters with home guards and colonists.

In almost a celebratory mood, Wambugu’s anger seemed to evaporate as he excitedly described how he almost killed a loyalist home guard. Some of his neighbors were annoyed with him for not killing the home guard. Reciprocal violence was almost viewed as a means of getting some sort of instant justice between the two sides. He also added that the colonist psychological warfare had negative effects on the KLFA (see appendix D and E)

**Participant 03 – Gicheha (P 03 G)**

Gicheha was 90 years old when I met him in the village of Lari, Kiambu County. He was battling ill health and was having lunch in his living room when I arrived. His overall demeanor was sadness and a sense of deep betrayal by the political elite he had assisted in various ways during the war. However, following the end of the war, he was forgotten and bitterness dominated his story. Gicheha affirmed that the oath was the glue that held the KLFA together. He also attributed the attraction to the home guard to the false sense of protection loyalists felt. Injustice and unfair treatment by Kenyatta who
became the first president pained him greatly when he recalled his own contributions to support him. He also offered his own understanding of the origin of the name “Mau Mau”. His arrest and heavy manual labor punishment as a result of taking the oath made the memories painful to narrate. With a sense of emotional difficulty, he shared his story:

Home guards did not take the oath. Kenya Land and Freedom Army (KLFA) took the oath and the two groups fought each other. The home guards felt false security because the colonists protected them. Here in my village, 80 people were hanged at Githunguri and buried at Kamiti Maximum Prison grounds. I witnessed the Lari massacre and the KLFA hangings. In Ndabibi village, near Naivasha, one Dorobo man – I cannot remember his name, did not understand Gikuyu language and the oathing process; he told a colonist that all he heard was “Muu Muu” during the secret oathing and from then, the term “Mau Mau” was spread by the colonist as a derogatory term for the KLFA fighters. Revenge attacks followed the Lari Massacre the colonists were revenging against the killings of the loyalists. As a Mau Mau supporter, I was severely punished. I remember digging the grounds of the Embakasi Airport with bear hands – this later became Jomo Kenyatta International Airport. The punishment was revenge by the colonists against those who had taken the oath something I did in 1951. I also joined the organizing committee that facilitated Jomo Kenyatta’s trip to the United Kingdom to present our demands for land and freedom. We raised money and sent Kenyatta by sea to London. I was also present when he returned. I went to welcome him back to Kenya following a long journey by sea. It took over 30 days from London to Mombasa. Later he boarded the train from Mombasa to
Nairobi. I and five others picked Kenyatta up from the Nairobi train station.

No one among us owned a car; we boarded a transport lorry and took Kenyatta to the home of his wife in Dagoretti town outside Nairobi. Sadly, he was ungrateful and he never remembered me and the five others after we did so much for him. When he became the President, he forgot us completely. (Gicheha, age 90).

Contained in a brief narration was a mixture of different subjects but to him, they were all connected (oathing, hangings and detention as forms of punishment). Recalling another incident of betrayal and injustice, Gicheha was disturbed by the selfishness of the same people he had literally rescued from dire circumstances. In exchange for his generosity, he was forgotten and his kind acts went unrecognized highlighting further the degree of injustice and personal betrayal.

Another incident happened in 1948. I owned a small duka (roadside store) in the village of Ha-Mbira. One night Kenyatta was travelling from Elburgon. It was around 1 a.m. It was Kenyatta, Waira wa Kamau, and Mbiyu Wa Koinange. Their car ran out of petrol. They pushed the car to my store and called me out to assist. They were very cold and hungry. I supplied them with five loaves of bread and made 5 cups of tea. I did not charge them. Unfortunately, I felt betrayed because when he became President, Kenyatta and his friends never remembered me. They never thanked me for rescuing them from danger. Not even a single day did they ever come back to thank me for what I did for them that night. This was selfish and the betrayal causes me pain to this day.
Gicheha felt left out and ignored after much suffering. He has resigned his quest for justice and stated that he had given up and asked God to take over and act on his behalf in order to address these hurts.

Gicheha highlighted two incidents where he was nearly shot by colonial soldiers simply because of being in a place where the soldiers assumed he was not supposed to be. He reiterated that co-existence after the war of independence was out of necessity and not justice, forgiveness or reconciliation. His struggle to advocate for his brother failed and he was condemned to detention for several years.

After the massacre, and the war that followed, we were tired and did not feel the need to continue with the cycle of revenge. We did not actively sort out who hurt who but we just continued to live together. However, my brother was arrested and I had to go to Githunguri a distance of about 80 kilometers to testify that he was not Mau Mau on a bicycle. At Githunguri law court, a Tanzanian colonial soldier pointed his gun at me to shoot me.

Foreigners were conscripted as colonial soldiers assuming that they would be loyal than native Kenyans. People from other ethnic groups like Kalenjin and Maasai were also used by the colonists as soldiers to fight the Mau Mau. I quickly produced the court summon and he put his gun down and allowed me to go inside the court house. The court later transferred my brother’s case to Nairobi High court Number 5. Another Colonial Chief Makimei was filled with hatred against my brother he wanted to make sure that he was sentenced to be hanged. While at the Nairobi law courts, a colonial soldier loaded his gun and pointed it towards me; I quickly displayed the court summon and he reviewed it,
he allowed me to proceed, coming close to death for the second time. I testified on behalf of my brother he was sentenced to detention. He was detained in Kisumu and later transferred to Lamu. After several years in detention he was released.

The bloodshed witnessed by both sides persuaded them to stop the reciprocal violence. He personally chose not to ever engage with home guard survivors. The physical and psychological disengagement assumed self-protection as well as a method to give successive generations a chance to live in peace.

We declared, “Tiwega kuhe hiti keri” “no second chance for the hyena” there is no need to continue with the cycle of revenge based on this premise, peaceful co-existence was possible not based on justice but as a result of experiencing the bloodshed among us. I would rather not speak with home guards or raise questions about what they did. I decided to leave them alone. To fight them again would be destroying our own country and the future of our children and heritage.

**Participant 04 – Kihato (P 04 K)**

Kihato disclosed more details about the oath and how “non-oathed” people were viewed with suspicion and looked down upon. Forcible land evictions caused the highest probable cause for more violence and revenge.

I was circumcised in 1947 and in 1948 I took the oath and joined the fighters *Mau Mau* and later the council of elders. It was a highly secretive oath. I never disclosed to anyone that I had taken this oath; we would eat and drink together but I would never tell what I knew to anyone. If two of us met who had taken the oath, and a third person joined who had not been oathed, I would simply say,
“*hena thuya irandaba-ii, ndiui kuria ndaire nigetha indaabe*”, “there is a flea crawling on me, I am not sure where I spent the night to get it” this would be the signal for others to watch their words in the presence of a potential spy. Around this time, the Gikuyu people in the Rift Valley were being forced out of their settlements by the white community; upon their return to Kiambu and other central province communities they found that they had no land, it had been taken by home guards and the white colonists. With this degree of suffering, we decided to take action by first taking the oath followed by the war. In 1950 another large group was kicked out of Olenguruone area in the Rift Valley and they joined efforts with others who had lost their land this group started pushing the home guards very hard demanding that they too take the oath even as they resisted. About 1 kilometer from where we are seating right now; I attended the first night meeting with almost 2,000 people; Nyeri, Murang’a and Kiambu areas were well represented. Bound with the oath agreement, we renewed our commitment to fight. (Kihato, 85)

Kihato was not ashamed for his role in killing others and he freely talked about his experiences. It was apparent that killing others was fully justified because they had chosen to support the colonists. He defended his actions by comparing the same level of atrocities that were carried out by the home guards. To him these reciprocal attacks were a just response to the suffering they had endured. He calmly built a case for killing others and did not seem disturbed. In his opinion, the other side deserved to be stopped even by death.

The first priority was to kill every home guard within Lari in the next 21 to 30
days. A group of senior KLFA was appointed to draw out the plans for the attack. March 4, 1952 was the designated day to kill all the home guards on that day, each group gathered outside their area of assignment. The mission was simple-deal conclusively with home guards. I was armed with a *panga* (machete) others armed with homemade spears all of us took another oath at night under a very bright moonlight and divided up into small units the senior elderly men were asked to return to their homes around mid-night. We surrounded the residences of the home guards. We killed them from midnight up to 3.00am in the morning. I killed many running away and my colleagues did the same with machetes and spears. In the early morning hours, there was a heavy downpour and this helped slow down the colonial forces and reinforcements enroute to aid the home guards.

Details of hide and seek, betrayal and arbitrary arrests increased the reciprocal violence widening further the chasm of hatred and violence on all sides.

We were exhausted from killing them. I escaped with one group to the village of Ndeiya to get our supplies for food. We built underground tunnels that would end up at the foot of the mountain where we had built up our hiding place. Later I left for Makongeni Estate in Nairobi to escape from being arrested. At Makongeni, there were expansive sisal plantations with thick undergrowth that climbed to the top of the sisal plants. The over and undergrowth was known as *igooka* and this vegetation cover provided an ideal hiding place for us. We went undetected by the colonists for a long time. One day, we decided to administer the oath in Bahati Estate and a home guard spy betrayed
us. The colonists covered the entire area before we got there; massive arrests were carried out; Mau Mau and none Mau Mau were all arrested. Brothers took to arms and killed brothers. The hatred was deep and still lingers to this day. Surviving home guards have lived in isolation and they avoid public places today. The trauma that they live with because of the violence they committed has continued to keep them in almost a frozen state.

Personal accounts of physical assaults and one near death experience have taken center stage in Kihato’s life. In order to preserve the memory of his suffering, stories have been passed on from one generation to another creating narratives that endure across time.

I remember another incident when one home guard arrested me and brought me to Kirenga shopping center. I was forced to carry massive rocks from one quarry to the construction site. While carrying a huge boulder, the home guard hit me very hard. I lost my balance, fell and passed out. A good Samaritan picked me up and placed me under the water at a nearby stream and I regained consciousness. To this very day when I ran into him, I openly remind him of what he did to me. That near death experience stays with me every day. I also tell my children the story and how this home guard almost killed me. I make sure that my children know how much I hate him. This is a permanent dent that cannot be repaired after the war was over, I decided to agree with the rest of the Mau Mau warriors not to revenge. We said, “tutingihe hiti keri”; “we will not allow the hyena to attack us twice”. We knew that if we continued killing each other, there would be no one left standing.
Revenge was then slowed down and eventually stopped after the native loyalists and the Mau Mau realized that the colonists were least interested in bridging the gap between them but widening it further at every opportunity.

**Participant 05 - Muchiri (P 05 M)**

Muchiri’s narrative was unique in that it seemed to have revealed more about his efforts to avoid the war and survive and not so much joining in with the rest of the KLFA fighters. He linked the initial stages of the conflict to cultural practices like female genital mutilation and the opposition by the missionary fraternity. This became the catalyst for change and native self determination through local education efforts delinked from the colonial establishment.

The genesis of the war of independence in Kenya was generated by the Gikuyu people. The conflict was old and went back to 1929 when the Gikuyu disagreed with the English missionaries opposed to female genital mutilation. The families who refused to stop the practice; their children were expelled from mission schools and as a result, the natives established their own schools for the Gikuyu *karing’a* “authentic” Gikuyu people. The objecting natives also established independent churches at Githirioni, Matathia and Kanyakii-ini centers.

Mbiyu Koinange established the Kenya Teachers College in Githunguri. The goal was to train teachers for the independent schools system. Overall, the focus was independence from the colonial establishment. I was a teacher then and in 1945 I joined KCA and took the oath to defend the secrets of KCA. I helped draft the memorandums agitating for independence and also helped translate what the English memorandums were relaying back. When Kenyatta returned from Britain
he was hired by the KCA and stationed at Githunguri. He was supported with food from the local villages. Mbiyu Wa Koinange and Kenyatta fondly referred to each other as “korobi” and I am not sure what that term meant.

As one of the few literate Gikuyu’s he participated in reading and writing for the Kikuyu Central Association (KCA). Having taken the oath, he was a trusted agent. His exposure to direct violence was limited and he seems to have played on both sides of the conflict as a survival mechanism. Muchiri did not answer the questions directly and proceeded to explain the genesis of the reciprocal violence. In what appeared to be a life of privilege for a school teacher at the time, his experience with violence was limited since he decided to leave Kenya for the neighboring Uganda to do business. Coincidentally his three year absence was also at the height of the Mau Mau war. It’s not clear whether he went into hiding in Uganda but his close relationships with colonial leaders who extended personal favors to him pointed what side he was supporting.

Senior Chief Waruhiu wa Kung’u loved the white colonists like food. He was assassinated by KCA members later to be known as Mau Mau in broad daylight. His death signaled the beginning of some dark days of death and destructive revenge between the Mau Mau, native loyalists and the whites. A state of emergency was declared following his assassination. In 1950, Kenya African Union (KAU) was formed to fight for independence. Following Waruhiu’s assassination, Kenyatta was arrested and other leaders. Waruhiu was very mean to us and I remember one day, my students won the athletics competition and after the trophies were presented to them; Waruhiu demanded all of them back and he took them home. The day Kenyatta was arrested I had plans
to travel to Uganda for a business trip and it was very difficult to board the train from Nairobi because colonial soldiers were keeping watch against anyone attempting to escape from Kenya. I knew the station master from previous trips to Uganda and he allowed me to get on. When we arrived in Tarbo town all the Gikuyu people were forced out of the train but for some reason, I was spared and allowed to continue with my trip to Uganda. Upon arrival, I decided to stay in Uganda for three years. (Muchiri, age 79)

He returned to the reciprocal violence topic and revealed that his dad was a close friend of the murdered colonial senior chief Luka Wa-Kahangara. He also disclosed his close association with the colonial chief confirming earlier suspicions of probably going back and forth with ambivalence and indecision as long as these helped him survive during the reciprocal violence. To the eyes of the Mau Mau warfighters, he was a double dealer and to the eyes of the colonial establishment, he was loyal to the white masters.

The state of emergency created a split between loyalists and the war Fighters. Self-interests and protection motivated the loyalists while the oaths motivated the fighters who were fearless to take on the colonists.

Here in Lari, the Mau Mau warriors were bitter with Chief Luka Wa-Kahangara, who was a close friend of my father. Plans to assassinate him and his supporters were underway; I did get along with him and infact I bought my first bicycle from him in 1950. Also Chief Makimei, was a great friend of mine too. Luka Wa-Kahangara used to openly tell the people, “when you the Mau Mau kill me because I know you have plans to do so, Kirenga open market will not operate for
one year”. This proclamation came to pass. On the night of the Lari Massacre, many loyalists died. Luka’s surviving wife, Gacheri died recently. She survived the attack although she lost one arm, cut off on that night of the massacre.

Muchiri’s close association with the colonists and the native colonial chiefs made his story difficult to tell since he had no direct experience as a victim of reciprocal violence. He situated himself at various locations and activities where he played it safe and survived the war. He faced directly to the wall in front of him for the longest time during the interview and avoided direct eye contact with me. His voice was a monotone almost like one reading from a manuscript.

**Participant 06 – Burugu (P 06 B)**

Fighting for land and freedom was Burugu’s motivation for joining KLFA. In an unrelated detour, he revealed the possibility that foreign fighters were present among the Mau Mau warriors like Idi Amin who later became a brutal violent dictator in Uganda’s post-independence years. Having taken the oath early in his life, his commitment to the cause for land and freedom was unshakeable. Enemy number one was the colonist. He stated that the home guard joined the colonist for:

…self-preservation and protection. Selfishly, they joined out of fear of death. Most of them were not willing to go and risk their lives in the forest fighting for independence. I joined the Mau Mau in order to fight for land and freedom. My colleagues who did not join the ranks and became betrayers were loathed and deeply hated. I hated them for their choices to support the white man who was stealing our land and subjecting us to suffering. It was easy to revenge and the goal was to try to kill and finish the Home Guards who thought that they
would survive the war and accumulate a lot of wealth for that reason they wanted
to kill off the Mau Mau. My job within the Mau Mau ranks was as a security
officer for oath operations here in Nyeri. I was also an electrician and used my
knowledge to support the war efforts. You might not know, but the former dictator
of Uganda, Idi Amin was a young sergeant with me in the forests before he left
for Uganda. My story of pain is very deep; five Kenya African Rifles came
from Uganda and I was instrumental in administering the oath to these soldiers so
that they could give us bullets and other supplies to send to the Mau Mau
warfighters. (Burugu, age 84).

His daring courage to administer the oath, collect ammunition and used military
uniforms for the Mau Mau pointed to his determination to fight the colonists. Although
at present he felt like his suffering had been in vain.

One day I had gathered a full bag of bullets. I passed them to women who
pretended to be wrapping a child and passed them on without detection. I was
nervous but very pleased when the bullets were out of the compound and on to the
Mau Mau warfighters in the forest. I also supplied used military uniforms to the
Mau Mau from the Quartermaster colonial compound. I was secretly promoted to
a full sergeant but kept it secret so that the colonists would not discover and have
me murdered. I have suffered greatly and it’s sad to say that justice never
materialized for me and others. So in reflection, land is the only just
compensation that would make me realize that my suffering was not in vain.

Administering the oath was an important job that he took seriously and had no
feelings when it came to killing the home guards and their sympathizers. They ceased to
be human the moment they decided to join ranks with the invading colonists. In reciprocal violence, this mentality fueled the conflict leading to more death and destruction on both sides.

The theme of revenge and the pacification efforts led by the first president of Kenya returned in this narrative as was in the previous one. He concurred that in reciprocal violence no one would have won even if they were able to revenge and kill all the home guards. His deep disappointment though remained with the failed promises for land re-distribution after the war.

The home guards were deceived by the colonists and agreed to support them. Our enmity with the Home Guards was minimized by Jomo Kenyatta after the war was over, he came to a meeting here in Nyeri and reminded us that we had made a commitment while in the forest “nitukamunya ithuki”, or “we will uproot the tree stumps” after the war. The tree stumps were home guards and we had vowed and taken the oath to kill all of them after the war of independence. However, Kenyatta persuaded us not to pursue revenge by stating that “tutingihe hiti keri”; “we cannot allow the hyena to attack us for a second time”. He argued that some of the Home Guard families could even give birth to the next President of the nation and hence if we decided to go on full scale revenge our Gikuyu people would be the losers. He persuaded us to find unity and co-existence between the two groups. Kenyatta made it easy for us to find a new path for non-revenge between us although we did not like it. However, since we were denied our land, this co-existence was of no use to me.
The “unity” that was found seemed to have only stopped reciprocal violence but with high levels of dissatisfaction with the way KLFA veterans were neglected and abandoned. The educated loyalist aligned elite took over the new government and proceeded with apportioning huge parcels of land for themselves without any regard to the freedom fighters.

Participant 07 – Rimura (P 07 R)

Rimura pointed to a possible linked web of network between the colonists and the missionaries. He offered that religion was used as a tool to pacify the locals in order to eliminate opportunities for questioning and resisting colonial occupation. Religion was an effective tool for dividing the people into the categories of “us” and “them”.

The worst enemy in my understanding was the Home Guard because they were betrayers of our course. They abused their position and privilege to oppress their very own people. The Gikuyu people used to say, “ita ritaari ndundu riuragagwo na gacuguma kamwe” “a disunited military can be destroyed by one hit”. These were our very own people who betrayed us. They were manipulated by the colonist in many ways including the missionary religious groups like Presbyterians, Anglicans and Catholics who converted to the colonial faith and became our major enemies because of their support for colonists. Religion was used to divide us so that we can be finished by the colonist.

(Rimura, age 78).

Native religious beliefs supported the oathing dimensions of building solidarity and unity of effort. He credited the oath for the successes achieved by the KLFA.

Revenge attacks were brutal and played an important role in the struggle for
independence. The Mau Mau warfighters had a strong religious faith although not based on the colonial missionary wrapped teachings. I am a member of the native and authentic independent church. I was saved from the colonial jaws of death. I don’t subscribe to the colonial based religious teachings. I had taken the oath and it kept me going despite the difficult suffering I met with. I jumped over the intestines of a goat and took three oaths. There were seven different types of oaths depending on the rank of the Mau Mau warfighters. Senior Mau Mau Generals took a higher level secretive oath privileging them to lead the war effort. The oath differentiated people from the same household and created blood solidarity. I can say that a small degree of justice was realized because we became independent; however, land remained and still remains a major problem to this day.

The blame for the first president had been an ongoing theme and Rimura was categorically disappointed with Kenyatta as well. The eventual capture of the most senior KLFA commander became the turning point for the brutal reciprocal violence and resistance.

Kenyatta also betrayed our course to a certain degree because the colonists had asked him who would be the rightful leader between himself, Mathenge and Kimathi and he self-nominated himself. Later he did not remember Mathenge or Kimathi which is very unfortunate. Kenyatta said, “njamba igiiri itingiturania kihaaro”; “two leaders cannot be in charge of a small compound”. One day Kimathi came out of his hiding was shot on the leg; the home guard that shot Kimathi lived a life of isolation and untold suffering. At Ruring’u Stadium here in Nyeri, Mau Mau warfighters used it as a staging area to gather all their weaponry
after the war of independence was declared over and independence won from the colonists. I was there when all sorts of weapons and homemade bombs were surrendered. I appeal to the government to preserve Ruring’u stadium and honor the freedom fighters by naming that stadium after them.

The call to surrender the weapons was partially heeded but a deep sense of betrayal remained to this very day. While pointing to the other side, he mentioned the possibility of trauma based on the reciprocal violence. He did not assign the same impact of reciprocal violence on his side. The effects of the violence are still felt today although in a much smaller scale.

The home guards were not held accountable and responsible for the evils they committed against us. In their heart of hearts, they lived with deep trauma and the curse still hovers over them despite their efforts to seek refuge in religious involvement. That power of the curse still holds on them and even today, we don’t intermarry with them. Bride price and gift exchanges are not possible between these two groups, although with the new generation, things are changing because they don’t have the same understanding people my age have about the home guard atrocities and suffering they inflicted on the Mau Mau warfighters.

Rimura reflected on perpetrator trauma and in an almost suggestive way, he alluded to the fact that loyalists deserved sympathy and probably an opportunity to tell their story as well. This was probably one of the rare pragmatic observations made by the research participants. A generational gap between KLFA veterans and present day generations was a cause for concern to him since some of them were not informed about the unresolved violent conflict that divided their grandparents in past generations.
Participant 08 – Yakiyo (P 08 Y)

Yakiyo was direct and straightforward with her responses. She looked at me directly face to face and confidently and proudly discussed her role in the war. Women used whatever it took to support the war effort. Manipulative tactics including the use of sex to obtain information and weapons could be associated with structural violence. Hatred and betrayal broke down families. She brought up the same description of human beings who acted like wild animals against their fellow humans. Yakiyo was proud of her role in the war but sad because there were no benefits for her following independence.

I suffered in many different ways during the war of independence. As a woman, my job was cooking, supplying food and looking for weapons and ammunitions particularly from male home guards. I and others would go and seek them out and out of dedication to the war of independence, would have sex with them and after the man was fast asleep would slip away with the gun and ammunition. The Mau Mau warfighters would later come and pick-up what we had gathered. Even our children were very important in the struggle we used them to look out for enemy troops through the fences and to report that to us immediately. The worst enemy was the home guard. We also were our own worst enemies because the white colonist did not know where to start unless the home guard supplied him with information. Our people were selfish and only thought about their own well-being for the home guards, “Mundu no wiitu no ni nyamu”, “he is still one of us but he is an animal”. They had no hope that the war of independence would be won and thought that the easier way was to support the colonist. I witnessed revenge attacks between our Gikuyu people and it was based on a deep level of hatred.
between the home guards and the Mau Mau warfighters. I saw many people betray their own brothers resulting to their deaths. The betrayal accelerated further the hatred and even to this day, the painful betrayal and hatred remains among us in this area of Nyeri. The revenge attacks widened the chasm of hatred even between families and villages. Home guards could not marry girls from Mau Mau fighters and if it happened, that girl would be picked up and returned to her parents. Time has passed and the generations are changing with the younger ones who are unaware of their hatred past and new relationships are now forming between these two formerly divided homesteads. The children might be able to get over this hatred with time.

The home guards were self-centered and selfish. They took most of the lands before those detained were able to return and take their share of the lands. In 1958, most of the land was subdivided and taken by the home guards and loyalists. They picked up title deeds for these lands and it was impossible for the warfighters and survivors from detention camps to get even a small share of the land. (Yakiyo, age 83).

She was unable to reconcile how the home guards that caused so much harm ended up being the largest beneficiaries of the war that they did not pay the price for. Yakiyo addressed the present outcome as a result of the reciprocal violence of the past where Mau Mau war survivors like her have now become slaves to the new masters, land owners and former home guards. She was grateful that violence and revenge did end although there were no tangible benefits for her and many others. She did not see any difference between the white colonists who enslaved her and took all the land and the
present political class that has grabbed the same land and subjected her and the children
to a new form of slavery. It took incredible strength and trust for her to share intimate
details about sexual exploitation and in many ways the abuse and degradation of women
in the name of warfighting. This illustrated the depth of structural violence during this
war.

Looking back, I can say that these revenge attacks had no benefit among us the
Gikuyu people, only loses. The church played a part in reducing the hatred but
could not uproot it completely. If we revenged, this war and bloodshed could not
have ended. I and others live in the hope that one day a faithful leader will rise
and hear our cries today, we are casual laborers on the farms owned by former
home guards and their children. With our children, we labor like slaves on their
farms. Unfortunately each leader we put in office becomes just like the one before
him; “mwana wa hiti no hiti”; “a hyena’s young one is also a hyena”. There was
no justice whatsoever! Even without forgiveness, revenge attacks ended. I still
hope that one day, I will be given a small plot of land to start the healing
process for me and my family. Almost all the women supported the Mau Mau
warfighters but were subjected to a lot of torture and suffering forcing some of
them to join the ranks of the home guards. Home guards behaved like animals
because during the forced labor sessions, some male home guards would select a
the good looking women and send them back to their homes in the name of
cleaning and cooking duties. These married women would be consequently forced
to marry the home guards while their husbands were either in the forests fighting
or suffering in detention.
She did not hide her contempt and anger with home guards and their successive generations. The damage that was done back then continues to bite her today and her life and her childrens’ lives slowly gride in an endless cycle of poverty and hopelessness.

After independence, most Mau Mau warfighters came back to their villages only to find out that their wives had been forcibly married by the same home guards who had betrayed them and forced them to detention. These women lived terribly unhappy lives in these forced relationships since they would never willingly marry these “barren village lot” (*thaata cia ituura*), a term of utter disgust used to describe and express the disgust held against the home guards. Most of the Mau Mau survivors had no homes and they came back to nothing. Land and freedom came to some but not all. Today, 50 years after independence, many have died with their trauma and pain. Others have no ability to develop those plots even if they were given to them today; they can only pass them on to their children. It is a sad state of affairs. A woman like me, who fought for independence and suffered greatly, now without a husband. I am even rejected by the extended family because I don’t have any means of supporting myself and my children; “Githi riu to kuruma ciana ciakwa ta cia ngui o kuria turithii”, “hence or all I can do is “grab my children like a dog grabbing its puppies and go wherever we will end up.”

As a widow, Yakiyo suffering was immense since she was responsible for providing the needs of her children who have now started bearing children out of wedlock making it almost impossible to survive on casual labor with unpredictable financial source. Disregarding the question on reciprocal violence, she goes on to address
the most pressing matters in her life right now. Her voice almost choking in some deep emotional pain, she broke down as she described the state of impoverishment and the dark future for her children. Another indirect outcome of structural violence was the degree of poverty impacting generations of the freedom fighters children. Bearing children out of wedlock was frowned upon. The same sexual exploitation their mother experienced continues today but with an extra ordinary burden of newborns whose future was bleak based on the harsh surrounding environment. Yakiyo and her family redefined the meaning of resiliency and inner strength in her story. She refused to give up and gets up every morning to fight for survival and is a role model for her children despite the challenging circumstances.

**Participant 09 – Ugi (P 09 U)**

Detention as a form of punishment for a crime that was not substantiated set Ugi on the trajectory of resistance. Violent treatment while in detention hardened his convictions and hatred for the colonists. He spoke softly with a genuine tenderness but resolute articulation of the injustices he suffered. At times, it seemed like he was whispering to me in a manner that suggested he was being cautious as if someone out there might overhear what he was saying although we were in a private setting that guaranteed his safety and confidentiality.

I was arrested with a one gallon container full of bullets that I had stolen for the Mau Mau warfighters. I was picked up at Mweiga village near the landing strip that the colonists used for landing and takeoff for the bombing missions in Mt. Kenya forest and the Aberdare ranges. I was employed there as a sweeper and I diligently picked up bullets one by one and hid them until I filled up two
containers and while on the third one, I was arrested. It was at the end of the day when I was arrested with the one gallon of bullets and locked up for six months while waiting for murder case. I was locked hands and feet with cables. The case was ruled in my favor since there was no conclusive evidence that I had stolen the bullets with the aim of arming the Mau Mau warfighters. However, I was still sentenced for detention. I was condemned to the hostile Manyani detention camp near Mtito-Adei. (Ugi, age 86).

After several months at Manyani, he was transferred to Mwea Irrigation Scheme to work on colonial rice farms. The physical assaults and hard manual labor in the rice fields were designed to break their stiffness and surrender their aspirations for independence against the colonist. The natives who did not join the KLFA were highly vulnerable for attacks by the Mau Mau and some of them would spend the nights at the nearest colonial chief’s camp for protection and would return to their homesteads during the day. The dehumanizing aspects of the detention camps was brutal as he explained:

I was detained there for two years and the torture there was unbearable. We were beaten for one hour continuously while guarded by armed loyalist soldiers. After two years I was transferred to Mwea to dig trenches and rice growing paddies. We were forced to dig rice paddies with bear hands and carry the soil with containers over our head for long distances. The prison wardens were extremely brutal. After digging the paddies, we we were forced to mix dirt with water by hand in preparation for rice planting. The back breaking labor was unbearable and there were no breaks in between inside that filthy and muddy water. If the rice paddy was irregular in shape, we were forced to go get the dirt to make the field
level. The colonist and loyalist wanted me to admit that I had taken the oath but I refused and was further tortured. Once people confessed, they would then be set on the “cleansing” pipeline and later released. I hated the home guards and those who had surrendered to join the colonist because of the great harm they did to us and our people. The Mau Mau warfighters hunted the loyalists down and If captured, death was the only outcome.

Destruction of life and hatred drove reciprocal violence. Families were split apart while close relatives attacked each other. His home was burned down and his animals stolen by the home guards.

Reciprocal revenge played a major role in widening the gap of hatred between us and the home guards, This hatred led to the deaths of many even one’s very own family members were not spared by their own. These were dark days. As for me, I owned a gun, it was a sub-machine gun. One night my brother arrived with some other men having travelled all the way from Nyandarua. Little did I know that my home would later be reduced to ashes. After the home guards burned it down having suspected me of hiding the Mau Mau warfighters. Soon, I heard some gunfire from a distance. I stepped outside to carefully investigate what was going on. The second gunfire burst went off and I rushed back in and told my wife to pick our son and leave the house fast. I followed quickly cutting through the farm using the vegetation for cover all the way to Karurumo village. After I closed the Karurumo river bridge, I saw a gun lying on the wayside. I quickly picked it up and went back in the woods to
find a secure path. Upon arriving to the first homestead, I called the man who I knew well as a Mau Mau and he helped me dig a hole where we securely hid the gun, cut up leaves and spread them all over to hide our tracks. After two days, word spread that I had a sub-machine gun with a full magazine. The Mau Mau caught up with me and I took them to my secure site and gave them the gun and the magazine. I was celebrated by the Mau Mau leaders for the great resources I was able to gather for them.

These were highly anxious times for families and as Ugi described, both sides were always on the move to escape the attacks. In this incident, his wife and infant child were separated for days and in hiding not knowing the status of each other. Upon returning home, they found out that his home had been burned to the ground by the home guards since they suspected him rendering support to the Mau Mau. For the Mau Mau every opportunity to secure ammunition or weapons was put to good use and as such continued to fuel reciprocal violence.

**Participant 10 – Lungu (P 10 L)**

Lungu appeared distracted during the entire interview. He also looked to the right side from time to time avoiding face to face contact with me. He narrated what seemed to be a story of privilege and protection from the brunt of the Mau Mau war. His close connections with colonial military officers explained some of the details he was omitting in his narrative. He shared his story with what seemed to be a sense of extreme caution.

My role in the war of independence was to ensure that the colonist oppressive ways were stopped. I also was aware that the identity pass book known as KIPANDE had a secret meaning: (Keep Inferior Poor African Native
Down Everywhere). This was my understanding of the word KIPANDE
and the local interpretation. I attended Kangaaru School here in Embu. I was
disturbed by the identity card system because it was a movement control tool. No
one would go anywhere without the Kipande. One did not dare
travel from without permission annotated on the identity card.
The home guards were used to enforce the identity card system. In
consideration of who was the worst enemy I would argue that even the home
guard was fighting for independence and indirectly supported the Mau Mau in my
opinion not all of them but some. I remember being able to give reports to the
colonial Special Branch unit on who was Mau Mau and who was not. I believe
my role helped save innocent lives as well. I remember one colonist named
Archer who also owned Archer’s Post. He was also the head of the special
branch and we helped gather necessary information to help him do his work. The
enmity between the Mau Mau warfighters and the home guards was severe
because of the harm and destruction during the counter attacks.
Home Gaurds harmed and killed many people. The colonist paid them for
each death they carried out. Revenge attacks were scattered and based on the Mau
Mau warfighters ability to organize and act fast in the cyclical attacks turning
them sporadic and deadly. (Lungu, age 88).
For the first time, the claim that home guards were paid for every KLFA member
they killed appeared in the interviews. Lungu’s attempts to distance himself from the
privileges of supporting the colonist and his sympathies for the Mau Mau amplified the
degree of ambivalence communicated in his narrative. His closeness to the colonial
officer incharge of the criminal investigation department at a time when natives could not have such a relationship suggested a highly privileged loyalist status. This tension highlighted the beauty of narrative thematic analysis because the research participant as the owner of the story was free to include and exclude themes he or she wished.

As a loyalist, he was free to move around central and eastern Kenya. He was always on the lookout since he was a prime target for the Mau Mau. He could not even trust his own brother who had joined the KLFA.

I did not suffer any personal harm because I also refused to take the oath. I was given a permit authorizing me to freely move around Embu. My brother joined the Mau Mau and went into the forest to fight. One day, I actually ran and hid myself in the colonial district commissioner’s office and the Mau Mau were unable to find me. My mother encouraged me to hide to escape danger. My brother tried to send emissaries to me to buy machetes to aid the Mau Mau warfighters and I refused (almost talking in hashed tone) I was also with a friend of mine, the son of Senior Chief Muru Wa’Tetu who was hiding with me at the time. He would vouch for me and tell everyone that I had taken the oath in order to save me from potential killers. Several times strange people emerged from the nearby maize farm and demanded to know whether I had taken the oath and I would tell them yes even though I had not taken the oath. My friend vouched for me since we were good friends and he was one of the key oath leads.

As a forest officer working for the colonial government, Lungu stated that he was kind to the Mau Mau prisoners and prohibited their abuse by the wardens who escorted
them to work in the forest. He seemed to try hard to demonstrate that his actions supported the warfighters while clearly he was a colonial loyalist.

I worked as a forest ranger for the colonial administration and supervised the laborers who were all Mau Mau prisoners at the time. I tried my best to maintain their dignity and prohibited the prison guards from abusing the Mau Mau prisoners during their work of maintaining forest nurseries. The white colonists trusted me and did not suspect me of supporting the Mau Mau. I also maintained close contact with Archer the head of colonial special branch and that way, I was aware of some of the Mau Mau activities in the area. He was known for his coldness and inhuman cruelty on the natives. All the people he interrogated had two choices, he would either let them go or he would shoot them to death after interrogation. He was known to have killed many people whom he suspected or had reports on them as being Mau Mau warfighters. He trusted me because I personally refused to take the oath because of the aftermath consequences especially if one disclosed the secrets and I was not comfortable taking such vows that had the potential to destroy my life later.

Lungu seemed to take pride in that he refused to take the oath and was able to play it safe between the colonists and the Mau Mau. He seemed to carefully distance himself with perpetrator actions while blaming others for the atrocities they committed. Despite being an informer and associate of one of the notorious colonial murderers at the time, several of his experiences point to the same sense of entrapment and ambivalence. The inability to reconcile the two polarized sides made the loyalists life difficult and highly vulnerable to attacks from the KLFA militia and the colonists.
Participant 11 – Aina (P 11 A)

Aina hailed from a family that had aligned itself with the colonist first by converting to Christianity and embracing western education. He also stated that he secretly took the oath and supported an underground ammunition collection network for the Mau Mau warfighters.

What I remember the most about the Mau Mau war of independence are the severe fearful conditions we lived in. For example, no one could get married in the church in an English wedding style because the Mau Mau warfighters would come the very night and chop the heads of the newlyweds off. I knew several people whose heads went missing the day after their wedding. The Mau Mau opposed all foreign practices like weddings and anyone participating in such was viewed to be loyalist and an enemy of the natives. However, even with all these risks, I planned and had my English style wedding in church. My father worked at the mission school at Kangaru and we lived in the school compound in relative safety. I also became a teacher and it was therefore easy to hide my movements and secretly get married in the church. I got married in 1955 at the height of the Mau Mau war of independence. My step brother was a Mau Mau warfighter. Our family was divided in terms of our choices some openly supported the Mau Mau while others promoted education and chose to convert to Christianity; a decision that was viewed as being betrayers and loyalists. As a student at Kangaru School, I was sympathetic to the Mau Mau war. I was able to directly support the Mau Mau warfighters through an underground bullet collection network. We used to fill empty containers halfway with bullets and
other half with beans on top. We would take these to a group of women who formed part of the logistics supply chain for the Mau Mau warfighters. For the record, even though a Christian, I took the oath but kept it a top secret. Even my father did not know; he himself was detained after being suspected to be a Mau Mau supporter. His accusers made up lies that he had taken the oath together with a local Anglican clergymen. (Aina, age 84).

Aina’s story demonstrated further the aftermath of structural violence and the varying decisions families were forced to make for their own sake and that of their children. Minimal involvement meant that Aina was remotely touched by the violence. He became animated telling his story and some of the details shared with me had not been disclosed to many outside the tight circle of his family and friends. The murder of his three brothers shocked him and he clearly did not want to talk about it. He slowed down and in a hushed tone indicated that he did not desire to discuss that subject.

The enmity was experienced at different levels; the home guards hated the Mau Mau warfighters although there were a few home guards that had also taken the oath and worked as double-dealers for both sides. When found out, the consequence was death. Home guards were motivated by self-protection and fear. I can also add that senior chiefs like Muru-wa-tetu, Muhoya, and Koinange were instrumental in supporting loyalists and colonial agenda. Senior Chief Muru-wa-tetu and I were good friends. At one time I worked for his release from detention. My intervention helped win his release and allowed to go back to his family. Secret meetings were held to plan the oath which became the glue that held the fighting forces together. There were three
types of oaths depending on the level of commitment and trust. Near my home in Kigali, many who took the oath were arrested and detained. I was a school teacher and secretly had taken two oaths for survival and no one ever discovered me. If I learned when and where the colonial roundup was going to be done, I alerted my brothers and informed them they would in return tell others and before long word would get around and the Mau Mau would escape arrest. As a school teacher, I also invited my brothers to come and play soccer in the school field and no one suspected that they were Mau Mau. Unfortunately my three brothers were later discovered by the home guards and they killed them. That was their end.

It’s possible that survival and self-interest drove many to take the oath in secret while they did not believe or support the KLFA activities as demonstrated by Aina in his story. He nevertheless lived a life of privilege that enabled him to secure a teacher training opportunity followed by a full career as an educator in post-colonial Kenya. He owned a decent size of land and had built a permanent home.

**Participant 12 – Jiiru (P 12 J)**

Jiiru’s overall experience was described in general categories highlighting his understanding of the violence that was happening around his village. He mentioned atrocities of rape and death as the war escalated. The power of the oath featured in his experiences and remained the sole glue holding together the unity of effort among the Mau Mau warfighters.

As the war of independence was starting, I was a student, something that the Mau Mau warfighters were opposed to. I remember they harassed and intimidated us to leave school and join them in the forest. KAU was formed and became the engine
to drive the opposition against the colonial government. As we got close to 1952, there was increasing nervousness all over the central region as the Mau Mau started to recruit and administer the oath. Any resistance was met with death.

Even families suffered since there were wives who were given the oath secretly and they would never disclose to their husbands. Many women were raped and others murdered mostly those who resisted the Mau Mau warfighters wishes. Home guards and loyalists were hanged in the open and the trouble we saw cannot be expressed in words fully. Colonial police and native guards retaliated.

The cyclical violence was out of control. Going to the farms we had to be escorted by home guards from detention camps. Secretly there were still women who cooked and prepared traditional porridge for the warfighters and since they had taken the oath, nothing could stop them, not even the threat of death. The oath operations were increasingly brutal depending on the degree of resistance; a goat was slaughtered and the oath takers would bite into the raw meat and swear to never reveal the secrets and operations of the Mau Mau warfighters. The home guards and colonists abused people with terrible physical beatings in an effort to get confessions and information on who had taken the oath among the people. For me the beatings were unbearable and some of us broke the oath and became informers and essentially betrayers of the Mau Mau. The cyclical revenge was terrible because once the Mau Mau found out who the betrayers were; they would come in the evening and kill the suspected betrayers. This cycle produced extreme hatred and enmity among us. (Jiiru, age 89).
Without a direct reference to self, Jiiru alluded to betraying the oath after some thorough beatings. Any oath betayers who were caught by the Mau Mau were murdered without any hesitation. Once more, he avoided any direct personal experience discussion but carefully generalized his observations. He offered that colonists were known to intentionally set one group of people against another, deeply entrenching revenge and reciprocal violence.

Home Guards were the worst enemy among us. I personally witnessed them torturing people like animals in the name of pleasing the colonist. They saw their brutal behavior as a means of winning favors with the white colonial masters. I remember one loyalist who would openly discuss how many “itoi’s” “Mau Mau” he had hanged and he was rewarded openly by the colonial leaders. This brutality was carried out between ourselves, “sisi kwa sisi”, “us versus us”; we killed each other as the white colonist watched on the side sometimes. The colonist set us up against each other and they suffered the least.

In 1952 we were forced to move into village camps and life was next to impossible. Even while in camps, some still supplied food to the Mau Mau warfighters. Almost 75% of the entire village where I lived had taken the oath. For those who disclosed following thorough beatings and torture, they did not live long because even among them were many spies. Even among the home guards who spied for the Mau Mau warfighters and reported on anyone who caved in and betrayed their oath. For 100/= in 1952, one would take the money and betray his fellow villagers. The currency value was high then and the home guards were happy to take the money and kill their own. The hatred among us has crossed over
several generations. We knew had who hanged our loved ones; in my family these stories were passed over and were never forgotten from one generation to another. We were able to keep the hatred of the perpetrators going for generations to this very day. For the Mau Mau warfighters who came and attacked my village and killed many people, we never forgot their actions and hence the same reciprocal hatred existed for generations. However today, most survivors are above 70 years of age; others have died. As a result the hatred and its depth is receding slowly. The younger generations are not able to carry on the same emotional burdens of past generations’ which they did not directly experience.

Depending on the degree of suffering and violence, families have kept the narratives of betrayal and hatred across generations. He made an intentional effort to distance himself from incidences that involved violence. This could have been as a result of extreme caution and self protection from potential unfavorable self disclosure that could have placed him on any type of risk. He lamented that younger generations seemed to not have appreciated the suffering endured for the freedom they were enjoying today.

**Participant 13 – Wairagu (P 13 W)**

Wairagu offered a variety of experiences with the war having served earlier as a conscripted soldier fighting for Britain in World War II. He showed me huge cut marks on his left hand. A colonial soldier made an attempt on his life but he survived. He also switched from singular to plural when describing the acts of violence. His remarkable military experience served the KLFA well in the area of intelligence gathering.

In my experience the worst enemy was the colonist because he grabbed the
best land among us. No one would dare raise a finger. I was detained during the war and part of my punishment was digging the Embakasi airport with bare hands. I survived death by a whisker. Do you see these wound marks on my hand, this was a bayonet cut when a colonial soldier made an attempt on my life (displays huge cut marks on the left arm). It was in October 1952; I was almost killed but somehow survived. I had led 2,000 Mau Mau warfighters in taking a fresh oath to fight. The oath united us all and bound us for a common purpose. The goal was to eliminate all the English occupants from our land. We targeted them for murder. I am a member of the Mau Mau Veterans Association of Kenya today. I am unsatisfied with the manner that our case against the British government has gone; illegitimate people hungry for potential pay-offs registered themselves as former Mau Mau and I know for certain that some of these people were not in the forest fighting alongside us. A lot of us are still waiting to be compensated and the case will soon be concluded and we are hoping for good results. My experience as a warfighter goes back to the Second World War. I was conscripted by the British and sent to Israel for training lasting one full year in special operations after the Second World War. We were not recognized by the British administration. We were the brains behind the Mau Mau war planning. I was appointed as a senior military intelligence officer and my job was to interrogate all the new Mau Mau fighters before they joined the Land and Freedom Army to ascertain commitment and readiness to defend our cause. (Wairagu, age 83).
Wairagu was alarmed at the level of neglect the Kenya government has extended to the KLFA veterans. He remained hopeful that the United Kingdom would rule favorably on the ongoing compensation case for the KLFA veterans. Without specific experiences of reciprocal violence, Wairagu provided a lengthy general commentary on his disappointments with failed justice. Independence from colonial occupation did not seem to mean much as long as he lives in poverty with no land he could call his own.

Revenge attacks happened between the native loyalists and the Mau Mau. Sometimes the colonists watched on the sidelines as we killed each other on their behalf. After the war, since justice was not served, the peace that followed was just the peace of the mouth without any tangible actions like land re-distribution. Empty promises for land kept us waiting in false hope to this day.

The first administration of Jomo Kenyatta failed to fulfill the promise to compensate the warfighters with land redistribution. There were self help efforts that people formed as an attempt to buy back the land through cooperative societies and even with this effort only a few people benefited. The government did not have the will to help. All we were asking for was justice. As some of the warfighters received some kind of land compensation, they abandoned the fight; our unity of effort was divided and as a result lost the momentum. Freedom and independence to those of us with no land means nothing. The pain that I carry in my life and those of others can only be relieved through justice. First, only those of us who were genuine warfighters should be shortlisted for compensation if it will ever happen. As a military intelligence officer I used my experience to collect
weapons and ammunition to support the war effort. Just compare what I did and other Home Guards who now are claiming that they also fought in the war of independence and they are making the same claims like mine. It is sad to say that there is no integrity in this process. This even adds to my pain and hatred for the fake claimants. Some people even bribed their way to have their names included on the roster for claimants because people are hungry and selfish and hope to get easy money.

The contested compensation claims on the ongoing case in London seemed to have reopened old wounds since some known home guards have attempted to be shortlisted on the Mau Mau roster. Wairagu was deeply disappointed by the lack of integrity in the litigation process and he felt less hopeful that fairness would happen as a result of this lawsuit. He seemed to have reached a point of giving up on ever getting justice. Having served the first president’s security detail after the country’s independence and having to live in impoverishment at his advanced age was challenging to reconcile. The emotional pain in his delivery of this story was obvious with visible agitation and animated visual use of hands when expressing himself.

**Participant 14 – Chui (P 14 C)**

After taking the oath, Chui proceeded to recruit others to join the KLFA. Plans to eliminate the home guards following the end of the war were complete and it took much discussion and persuasion to prevent the revenge attacks from happening all over again.

Just before the war started, I had been employed by Kenya Railways which was still in the hands of the colonial powers. The first step I was involved with was the oath. Mbiyu Koinange came to my home with three others and we sat down to
discuss how the oath could be administered in the greater Embu region. He offered us to recruit a few young men to join the teacher training college he had helped establish in Githunguri. He also stated that he had a piece of cloth that he would like to show these young men to inspire them since he got this cloth from London. This was coded language to recruit young Embu men for the oath and the planning cell for the war of independence. Initially I did not understand but later with other elders here we understood what was going on. We supported the oath efforts and vowed to keep the secrets of the elders in order to join the efforts of kicking the colonists out and take back our land. There was hatred of the highest order between those who agreed to take the oath and the home guards who refused and supported the white man. Those who took the oath were branded as arch-enemies of the whites and their goal was to eliminate this resistance by detaining and killing the GEMA people. This hatred was very deep and we had vowed as the Mau Mau warfighters to kill all home guards and their families after the war; however, we reflected on what such acts of further revenge could do to cause even greater harm among our people and we decided not to carry out mass revenge killings after independence. Since we had succeeded fighting the whites, there was no need to kill each other despite the pain of betrayal that we felt at the time. The home guards were probably the worst enemy in our midst they did the most damage. There were a few home guards that doubled as Mau Mau as well. After independence here in my village, we have managed to co-exist without harboring the hatred although we still have some leftover feelings but they are not strong enough to cause revenge violence today. (Chui, age 85).
For the home guards who also had taken the KLFA oath and tried to play it safe on both sides, their end was disastrous when they were discovered by either side. Serving a long detention sentence for his oathing activities seemed to be his period of growth and hardening to fight the colonists. A sigh of relief seems to have come as a result of the native government taking over from the colonists despite the aborted justice process.

I was arrested in 1952 in Nairobi and brought back to Embu for trial. I was sentenced to a three year detention at Manyani camp. While there, we organized ourselves and planned a lot of political goals including supporting each other morally in order to survive the torture we encountered in detention. As prisoners we were united by a special bond and trust with one another. I must add that a small degree of justice was served when the colonists left this country. It was a joy to be able to attend the independence ceremony in 1963. Hence we won the freedom; however the land question remained unresolved for the Mau Mau war veterans alive today have nothing. The first Kenyatta government was responsible for the land that the colonist occupied at independence. When the colonist left, the land question was left unresolved because most of the native colonial chiefs and home guards took the lion share of the land. The colonist claimed that they purchased the land initially hence they had to sell the land back to the natives. The truth though was that they grabbed the land then sold it for profit when there was no other option but returning back to their home country.

With no direct reciprocal violence activities, Chui proceeded to narrate how the native colonial chiefs and the first native administration failed the country by leaving the
land redistribution question unresolved. The first president compromised the ideals of the warfighters and how he ended up rewarding the loyalists and home guards remained a very bitter pill for the KLFA veterans to this day.

**Part II – Understanding Justice**

**Participant 01 Nyambura (P 01 N)**

The dominant theme in her narrative was injustice. Nyambura described the despicable public hanging of KLFA members by colonial forces as revenge for the Lari Massacre, an act that further drove apart an extremely polarized people. Reciprocal violence generated more hatred and violence. She raised the theme of peaceful coexistence pointing out that while the violence did come to an end, hatred, injustice, unforgiveness dominated the lives of perpetrators and victims. Self-forgiveness and the forgiveness of others remained impossible without justice. Life for Nyambura could be compared with a rock formation exposed to weathering, gradually being chipped away and eroded by the injustices she suffered over time. The sense of betrayal and bitterness hinted to the power of reciprocal revenge and injustice 50 years on. She revealed her suffering in what was probably the most personal revelation during the entire interview. An interesting shift took place in her statement that she often felt trapped in the middle. Her attempt to defend the native loyalists who took the side of the colonist in a way demonstrated the level of ambivalence she had to contend with as one who had not taken the oath but forced to support her husband who was a KLFA member.

Her narrative shifted from personal generalized descriptions of harm to a few specific examples. She was clear that justice was never part of her experience then and now. Public hangings were the highest demonstration of injustice. The decision to move
on without justice seemed to have been informed by the desire to end the violence and
destruction of life. Reconciliation and forgiveness were described as “impossibilities”
that had continued to negatively impact the lives of Mau Mau war survivors on both
sides.

At Githunguri town, many Mau Mau supporters were arrested and brought here
and were hanged in public to revenge the Lari Massacre. The hatred lodged in
people’s hearts was very deep and drove the revenge attacks between groups. The
people behaved like they had lost their minds and the results were total
destruction of life. Revenge served no purpose. Hatred seemed to flow out of
senior chief Luka. Today when we meet with other survivors, we do remind each
other about the dark days of violence among us. Since a lot of time has passed,
there is no active animosity or revenge but goodwill for the sake of peace.
Reconciliation did not happen, however, today, it can only happen if individuals
choose to live in peace. God is the fair judge. This understanding could
pave the way to a lasting peaceful coexistent. Forgiving self
and others is not easy. Some refused to accept the forgiveness. This made finding
peace between us impossible. Without justice, no internal peace; reconciliation is
not possible. A sense of justice is impossible without that inner peace. There are
some people in this village who still harbor that deep sense of hatred and it tends
to eat away peace and joy at a personal level (long pause). (Nyambura, age 92)

Another point of self-disclosure revealed her experience with harm suffered by
family members and the decision not to revenge for the sake of peace despite the heavy
burden of having to live alongside those who caused this great harm.
The colonial rule ended, a native government formed, but no justice and the peace came about. I still have a degree of uneasiness. I know neighbors who killed their neighbors on the other side of the fence and have lived with that deep bitterness. My bitterness stays with me. Justice was not found between me and those who terrorized me and my family. I am still bitter with what was done to me; betrayers continued to live among us but we chose not to revenge again. I got to a point where my anger subsided and I refused to carry the burden of my suffering that was extremely haunting (change of topic) as far as justice goes, sometimes I think even the home guards fought for Independence but in a different way. To resist the Mau Mau warfighters in favor of the loyalists or the other way round, caused a lot of ambivalence and I felt trapped in the middle at times.

Nyambura’s attempt to exonerate the home guards seemed inconsistent with her theme of personal harm, injustice and other undisclosed form of suffering. Her sense of being trapped in the middle captured one of the dimensions of intra-group violence and a possible by-product of structural violence.

**Participant 02 Wambugu (P 02 W)**

Detention without trial, torture, starvation leading to death was common. After two years in detention and torture, Wambugu was released but re-arrested on multiple occasions. Having lost three brothers who were sentenced to hang in public, his resolve to fight on was even stronger. He believed there was no justice on both sides of the struggle. Hatred and revenge drove the reciprocal violence. The land they were fighting for was never regained and hence justice was never accomplished.
In detention for 8 days straight, we were denied food and water on a regular basis. Starvation was a tactic to psychologically weaken us to confession. The home guards assaulted us without mercy. The whole detention facility was infested with rice and many starved to death. Luka’s family was brought to help identify the killers and since it was late in the night, there was no accuracy or truthfulness as to who participated in the Lari Massacre. One spy implicated me, saying that I was seen with guns before the attack and I denied all that but was still sent to detention in Manyani. Suspects were sent to detention without trial in Manyani. At Mwea, digging trenches for rice farming during my detention was painful. Many perished at Manyani because the food was often mixed with foreign objects that made most of us sick. The hardened among us were being selected among the detainees to be murdered every day. I quickly devised a plan and changed my name from what was on the record and that is how I escaped death. After 2 years; I and others were transported back to Githunguri. Upon return, we learned that eighty-three people were accused of murdering Chief Luka and his family during the night of the Lari Massacre. Majority were condemned to hang in public. I lost 3 brothers who were sentenced to be hanged. There was no justice; many innocent people were summarily executed. I saw the clothing that people were wearing the day before all bloodied. Those who faced the gallows went to their deaths singing and urging the others to never sell their soil but fight on to the end. (Wambugu, age 87).

Death, survival, and a deep sense of betrayal seemed to have widened the chasm of injustice according to Wambugu. Even the eighty-three suspects who were hanged in
public could not be proved guilty beyond reasonable doubt. Charges were based on
suspicions, hatred and animosity between the two sides. The attacks happened in pitch
darkness and made it extremely difficult to identify the actual perpetrators.

**Participant 03 Gicheha (P 03 G)**

Injustice seemed to be the dominant theme. Compensation in the form of land
never happened. Gicheha blames the first Kenyan government for ignoring the plight of
KLFA veterans.

Justice was not found because although freedom came, we were cheated out of
our land. The whites who occupied the best lands sold them to the native elite
who never fought for this land for a single day. As a freedom fighter I never
received justice. I was never given back my land. Other tribes did not bear the
brunt of the colonial woes only the three ethnic groups (Gikuyu, Embu and
Meru). After independence, Kenyatta’s government failed. They failed to
recognize us, those who fought the colonists. No Justice for the
Mau Mau survivors. Kenyatta should have delivered justice but he refused to
address our woes, it is impossible to find justice for us today. Surviving home
guards today live quietly among us. The atrocities are not revisited in the open but
they know about all the evils they committed. Kenyatta’s government failed to
deliver justice among us. (Gicheha, age 90).

Blame for injustices was attributed to the government’s failure to address the fate
of KLFA veterans. As Gicheha recounted the bloodshed right there in his village, his face
looked overwhelmed and disappointed. Justice according to him was still possible, with
recognition of those who sacrificed so much. He alluded to possible nationalism as a
potential outcome and the need for unity around the only one country, Kenya that belonged to all people.

The government has the power to correct the historic injustices and that is the only way that our suffering will not have been in vain. Righting the wrongs today can only be done by the government by addressing these past painful issues. The many people we lost here in Lari between the Mau Mau and the loyalists were instigated by the colonists. These heavy losses should not go unrecognized right here in this village, over 100 people were killed and many more people suffered as a result. For lasting peace to be sustained in Kenya, unity among the multiple ethnic groups must be established; all other ethnic groups that suffered for independence need to be recognized. All the economic resources found in this country must be shared through building nationalism. There is no other Kenya, this is the only Kenya and it belongs to all ethnic groups.

It is tragic that opportunities to deliver justice have been missed even as many survivors on both sides of the conflict continue to die of old-age having never experienced justice as they defined it. Recent reciprocal ethnic based violence around general election periods could partially be attributed to the same injustices that have remained unaddressed for decades.

**Participant 04 Kihato (P 04 K)**

Detention without trial was the most common open abuse of the justice system back then. Physical assaults and cruel treatment rendered the Mau Mau suspects helpless and deeply bitter with the inhuman treatment they received. Justice was not part of his experience.
We were taken to Lang’ata screening camp in Nairobi and we were denied food for several days. Starving the detainees was an attempt to break them down for information. After one month of suffering in Lang’ata; I was sent to the dreaded Manyani detention camp with 200 others. Upon arrival, native colonial soldiers lined both sides of the road with heavy weapons pointed towards us we were ordered to run forward and not look back. I was detained for three full years at Manyani. In 1956, I was moved again from Manyani through five detention camps: Mwea, Kandongu, Thiba, Wamumu and Tebere. These detention camps were organized by the degree of radicalness determined by the screeners. Soft detainees who betrayed their oath were treated with less brutality. The hardened one’s like me suffered greatly. Home guards were transported from Kiambu and Murang’a areas to identify the Mau Mau suspects and once identified the suspect would be taken to court, charged and hanged. I know many people who were hanged in that way. As I was getting my name registered in Lang’ata, I changed my real names and reported a fake one. When the home guards called my real name, I denied that name and there was no possibility to verify my claim. Some actually created names of animals and registered with such. Those who did not change their names were sentenced to hang. This method of changing names saved many lives during the screening process despite the efforts made by the home guards to finish us. I was moved to Thiba, Kandongu and later returned to Yatta detention camp. A massive trench digging project was underway to build a barrier around the detention camp at Nyamindi. I was given a mattock to dig a trench. Let me tell you; Mwea’s soil is
very hard! I even cried; to dig a one mile trench was very painful and developed blisters on my hands. Ruthless colonists and home guards did not a drop of mercy; they treated me and others like wild animals. At Manyani I was forced to break rocks with another rock to fill one gallon container. At Mwea the treatment was totally inhuman. The home guards changed shifts while we were still digging trenches there was no break…. *(silence)*. I tried to wash these wounds and the pain was unbearable. I only could let the water run over my hands and walk away in anguish. Physical healing took a long time. The suffering was unbearable. Freedom did come but I am yet to see the fruits of this freedom. *(Kihato, age 85).*

As Kihato facial expressions relived these painful experiences, he seemed to look outside as if to avoid the discomfort of recalling the details in the here and now. His voice softened and with a dry throat described the hurtful experiences noted above. He had no kind words for the first president Kenyatta since according to Kihato, he did not deliver what he promised them.

Kenyatta, the first president did us great harm because he refused to honor the promise to remember and compensate the Mau Mau warriors who suffered greatly in detention camps and in the forests fighting for this land. He instead sided with the colonists who rewarded the home guards with massive land and property for free or at throw-away prices. Kenyatta wanted to please the whites especially with their demand that natives buy back the very lands they had stolen from them. Unfortunately, only the children of home guards were wealthy enough to have the means to buy the land back from the colonists. As a Mau Mau warrior and my
colleagues we had no access to wealth we had no ability to buy the land stolen from us by the colonists. Home guards and their children are the ones who benefited the most after the war of independence. Some were given free land as reward by the colonists while others purchased these stolen lands. The Mau Mau warriors who survived decided not to fight again. They were tired and exhausted; the fact that they regained their freedom and independence, they decided not to use violence to demand land that was rightfully their own.

Kihato summarized the sentiments shared by many others; the first native government dominated by former home guards and loyalists extinguished the possibility for land compensation for the KLFA veterans. Guided by their own greed and selfishness, they acquired most of the land previously occupied by the colonists even as they gave the colonists the option to stay in Kenya if they wished after the independence. During the oath ritual, the Mau Mau had vowed to never pay anyone for their own soil. The claim the first president of Kenya made, that the colonists had developed the lands and needed compensation lacked merit and exposed probably what history will forever attribute as a major failure; neglecting to conclusively deal with the land question. The KLFA veterans and their families were not offered back their soil and a national land policy was not established, a sensitive issue to all people groups residing in Kenya.

**Participant 05 Muchiri (P 05 M)**

His narrative further revealed a life of privilege and protection by the colonial native chiefs exploiting his family ties with them. His claim of having taken the oath earlier was contradicted by his rather comfortable and safe life in the midst of extreme suffering of his fellow natives. He addressed injustice dealt to his family relatives but not
directly to him. He mentioned one mild incident of attempted arrest when trying to purchase livestock from a white farmer. All indications were that even with restricted freedom of movement; Muchiri had an official passbook that allowed him to move freely while the majority locals were locked up in concentration camps and detention centers.

Over a dozen people were hanged following the massacre but a few of my relatives won their cases and while they were not hanged they were detained in several camps in Mombasa, Manda Island, Kisumu and Mwea. Later after the “rehabilitation” process, a few men were able to return to their native villages.

In 1954, the icaagi camp system was established as a means of command and control by the colonists. I was one of the last people to move into the forced camp life since Chief Makimei was my friend. After I returned from Uganda, he warned the home guards never to touch me. The icaagi camp system was also used to punish the people with hard labor. Digging roads, deep security trenches and the back breaking labor was done from 7am to 6 pm without a break. This was a means of preventing people from farming and hence not be able to feed the Mau Mau warriors. However, there was plenty of food even in the farms with no one taking care of the farms. Potatoes and cabbages grew freely; hence the Mau Mau warfighters were well fed despite the colonial efforts to stop them. There was no freedom of movement from one town to another. I couldn’t even travel 5 miles to Limuru without written permission on my passbook. No one was permitted to give a ride to another on his bicycle without permission. Even the bicycle had to be licensed and the penalties for not having a bicycle license were severe. In all this work, there was no justice for us.
If a colonist drove by and the natives fail to stand-up, he had the right to arrest you and prosecute you for not standing up. I was even threatened by one colonist in Naivasha while trying to buy livestock and he asked me to leave Naivasha fast in haste – “rudi narua” and I complied. (Muchiri, age 79).

He revealed how the loyalists were used by the colonists against their very own neighbors. The story he told appeared to be of a person who watched these activities from a distance but not as a direct participant. Cases of hatred and betrayal that led some to falsely accuse others demonstrated the extent of the structural violence in these suffering communities. Regardless of Muchiri’s personal circumstances, he observed that there was no justice during and after the reciprocal violence.

The loyalists were also known as “gakunia” one with a bag on his head and they were used as agents of death and destruction. Their heads were covered with a bag and a small opening in the eyes and they were used to identify Mau mau warriors who would later be hanged. They erroneously identified many people and they were hanged as well. A relative of mine was almost hanged but was spared the last minute because one of Luka Wa-Kahangara’s wife hated him but her testimony was not judged as credible by the colonists and he was released.

The colonial religious organization also testified for his credibility and he lived despite the fact that he had actually taken the oath and supported the Mau Mau. There was no justice and many people lost their lives for no reason. I knew the vow that the Mau Mau had made following independence. At the exit of the colonial powers, the Mau Mau had vowed to assassinate all the loyalists and their families. However, after Independence Day, Kenyatta gathered the
freedom fighters in Nyeri and pleaded with them not to revenge

The popular saying attributed to Kenyatta (first president of independent Kenya), calling upon the KLFA veterans not to revenge was highlighted by almost all the research participants. The majority agreed not to revenge with the hope that the government would work out a land re-distribution system but their hopes were betrayed and they regarded this as the highest level of injustice. It was also viewed as a wrong that they waited in hope for the government to make right for them. Muchiri revealed the details of a failed land re-distribution scheme where the KLFA veterans were asked to make a small payment in order to be issued with land but they refused. The very oath they had taken prohibited them from buying soil that was their own prior to the colonial invaders arrival.

His argument was that – “Tutingihe hiti keri”, “we cannot give the hyena a second chance to kill” Despite the fact the loyalists killed and tortured, in revenge, you will kill your brother, your uncle and our Gikuyu people will be further destroyed

The colonists were financially compensated by the British government in buying back “their” land and the natives were asked to pay 10% of the value. This opened the loophole for many loyalists to purchase the colonial occupied land at throw-away prices. The Mau Mau warfighters could not afford since they had no funds but the home guards who worked for the Colonists had access to money. The colonists who wished to become settlers were pleased with Kenyatta’s offer for them to stay in Kenya or sell their land to the Kenyans through the compensation scheme offered by the colonial government.

The Mau Mau warriors rejected in principle to purchase their very own
lands the colonists had forcibly occupied. They demanded that the land be re-distributed free of charge just as the colonist had taken the land without any cost to them. In a meeting that Kenyatta called in Nyeri, he tried to exonerate himself by telling us that we were not buying land, however, we were paying for the development the colonist had made on the parcels of land. The Mau Mau warfighters did not agree with Kenyatta’s approach. Majority of Mau Mau war veterans did not get any land. However; few parcels of land were freely distributed in Limuru and Nyandarua.

Disclosing further indirectly his position of privilege, he narrated his own attempts to go against the common KLFA vow not to buy land. He made an offer to purchase a farm from one colonist in Limuru where he used to grow carrots. He referred to the colonist as his “friend”. Only a death threat from the Mau Mau veterans once they learned about it stopped the purchase from happening.

A colonial agricultural officer who was my friend had introduced me to him. We negotiated the price for the 200 acres to be 400,000/= However; I was severely warned by the Mau Mau veterans that If I made the purchase, and show open opposition to the Mau Mau principle of non-purchase of native land I might as well be digging my own grave. I never bought the land. My father was very upset with this threat and the fact that I lost an opportunity to buy the 200 acres of land. Until his death, he was very upset with the Mau Mau veterans. Later, Njenga Karume bought that piece of land. Another example of how land was unfairly distributed was a guy known as Njoroge; a government diplomat in Britain after independence. He purchased 700 acres of land around that time because he
was able to pay for the land directly in London. The colonists favored those with the ability to deposit their funds directly to a London bank otherwise it would take a long time to transfer the money to London back then. At one time, I even visited a bank in Limuru to request for a loan to purchase land. The limit for a native was 2,000/= only. However, I was asked to take a pledge and sign some papers declaring that I was no longer a member of the black community and once I did, my loan was more than doubled to 5,000/=. I still have that certificate today designating me as number 1 citizen of Kiambu district. Home guards continued to live in isolation and rejection by the Mau Mau warriors and their families but as time has gone by, the desire to revenge has waned and successful generations know some of the stories of hatred but are not keen to carry on with it.

Muchiri’s story was fascinating in that he seemed to have made in-roads with the colonial establishment as well as the native colonial chiefs. He revealed a lot of “insider” information in reference to land ownership and transfers during the colonial to native political transition period. His life of privilege, colonial favoritism and protection situated him as a wealthy politician in post-independent Kenya.

Participant 06 Burugu (P 06 B)

No justice was ever extended to Burugu. He apportioned blame directly to the first president for going back on his promises to deliver the soil that had been forcibly occupied by the colonists back into the hands of the Gikuyu people in central Kenya.

Justice has never been served because I don’t own even a tiny piece of land that I could call my own. The blood that was shed on these lands incurred a curse that could only be lifted by giving land to the surviving Mau Mau war
veterans. Up to this day, justice has not been found for me and others who fought for the freedom of this country. While Kenyatta gets credit for his leadership, he deserves the criticism for failing to allocate land and compensation for the Mau Mau war fighters. I lost my land, my house; family, livestock. I have never been compensated or remembered. Kenyatta unfortunately rewarded Home Guards and their descendants still own a lot of property in this country.

Some people from Murang’a were taken to Eldoret and given farms while I and others were neglected and given nothing. No justice was served whatsoever. Without justice, Kenyatta’s idea of forgiveness and reconciliation was useless. There are many widows and widowers who lost everything and to this day they still live in poverty. Justice and forgiveness is meaningless to them today. As for me and the other Mau Mau warriors no one welcomed us back or recognized the efforts. (Burugu, age 84).

A deep sense of betrayal was expressed by Burugu. The idea that the very people who supported the colonists now owned most of the land Burugu and his comrades were fighting for, appeared to hurt him deeply. Without justice, he believed that forgiveness was not possible.

**Participant 07 Rimura (P 07 R)**

Injustice was the dominant theme. His experience with landlessness and abject poverty demonstrated the degree of injustice. In principle, the refusal to pay any fees for the soil was in keeping fidelity with the oath and strong convictions that soil was sacred and could not be a commodity of trade. A ray of hope remained for justice pegged on the unbreakable trust in the God of justice according to Rimura.
Land and justice cannot be separated. No land, no justice. I lost my home, it was burned to the ground by the colonists. I lost my livestock since the Home Guards stole my cows and slaughtered them at will. Once the war was over, the new government asked the Mau Mau warfighters to pay five shillings in order to be allocated land. Ngaru was a loyal Home Guard; he led the effort to charge the five shillings in exchange for land. I and others refused to pay five shillings for land. We clearly stated that we fought against the colonist to get our soil that belonged to us and our children and could not be charged even a penny for our very own soil that was forcibly taken by the colonist. Most of us fighters refused to take the land at a price and as a result did not get any compensation. I have lived in poverty and suffering for decades. Even with the recent Mau Mau case in London, I refused to participate or to take any money because that is not what we were fighting for. We have been denied justice for generations; but we still believe that God has not forgotten us. We wait in hope for justice that can only be satisfied by getting our land back. (Rimura, age 78).

In a generalized description about the indigenous justice system, he offered his insights that building restorative justice frameworks based on native practices could have produced better results. Betraying once oath resulted in death. The instrument of the curse also played a critical role in understanding and practicing indigenous justice. These social-ethical principles seemed to steer the Gikuyu people in peaceful, just and harmonious living before all this was ruptured by the invading colonists. Indigenous justice was not given a chance by the new crop of political elites probably driven by their protection of self-interests.
Justice was carried out and severe punishment administered by the elders if that kind of abuse was disclosed. A penalty was also imposed by the elders where several lambs were required to be sacrificed in order to atone for the discretions. After the lamb sacrifices another elaborate ritual followed known as “gutahikio” or being forced to “vomit” the evils one had committed and thereby getting a cleansing and release from the grip of the curse that was capable for inter-generational transfer. I even saw three different types of diseases getting healed through the “vomiting” cleansing process. It was powerful and effective. Forgiveness among the Gikuyu people was an elaborate process and violations were addressed among the warfighters. For example, no one would consume the colonist’s alcohol or cigarettes and only the traditional brew and homegrown tobacco was allowed. Violators were punished accordingly. If one betrayed their oath and disclosed who the Mau Mau fighters were, a platoon of women was sent to pick up the culprit who would assume that the girls were picking him up to go and enjoy themselves. Female agents were most effective in picking up male suspects and upon interrogation, none of them would be spared, death was the only punishment for anyone who had violated their oath and betrayed fellow warfighters. The death was painful because multiple fighters with machetes would descend upon the betrayer and cut him into many pieces in haste. There were small crimes where offenders were punished and allowed to continue living and major offences that resulted into a death sentence. There was also the power of the curse. It was widely believed that deformities occurred in the lives of those who engaged in sexual abuse. The same sense of dignity and respect between women
and men was instilled at an early stage. The freedom fighters had the same
discipline and would not engage in sexual relations while on duty fighting
because the same power of the curse would come upon them bringing misfortune,
humiliation and defeat by their enemies.

The quest for justice continued since the moral-ethical principles offered
relational guidelines but did not address the big justice questions of land re-distribution
which remained the principle barrier to justice.

**Participant 08 Yakiyo (P 08 Y)**

Her deepest frustration was with the absence of justice throughout the post-
colonial rule. Her suffering seemed to have been all in vain at the moment. Looking at the
faces of her children and grandchildren pained her a lot when she remembered that their
future was at risk due to the denial of her justice.

I can confidently state there was no justice then and even now; we have not
received justice up to now. After much devotion and suffering for independence,
we still wallow in abject poverty. I have nothing to show for all my suffering. I
live in a small room here in town with my children and survive on a day today
basis selling fruits and vegetables on the streets; “gutiiri kihooto ndoniire”, “no
justice experienced”. The people who suffered the least and afflicted the most
harm upon us took the lion share of the land and political power.

My painful memory weighs heavily on me especially now that I have children and
grand-children who are looking up to me. I have nothing and they have nothing to
financially support them; “ndiri kindu ndi ona kimwe”, “I have nothing, not a
single thing”, after all that suffering during the Mau Mau war of independence.
(Yakiyo, age 83).

Her hurt was deep. She remembered the lives that were lost during the war only for all that to benefit a few people in a big country like Kenya. A small plot of land where she could build a small hut and grow her own food was all she yearned for. If this happened, justice for her would be served. The element of the curse returned in her conversation because she believed that the injustices could not go unpunished. She expressed confidence that the few wealthy individuals might not be able to enjoy the stolen wealth while the rightful owners who shed blood in the name of freedom lived and died in abject poverty.

We help each other day by day. Justice has never been done! If justice was found, I would have a small plot even a quarter of an acre for my children to live on or a decent home and have enough food for them. This is a big debt that could only be paid back by distributing land however small it might be in order to get justice; “ndingiona kihooto ndi-o barabara na ciana ciakwa ii barabara”, “I cannot find justice when I am roaming the streets without a home and my children roaming the same streets as well”. I hurt for the future of my children and grandchildren because if they had means of helping me they could but sadly the future does not look better than today for them. The conscience of this nation should never be at ease until the blood that was shed for this nation and those who survived today are assisted at the minimum with a plot and materials to put up a low cost decent home. That will be justice. I see these wealthy selfish land owners selling land at prices that none of us can afford and it hurts deeply to know that blood was shed for us to live in freedom and happiness
but that only became true for just a few people. This nation must realize that the Mau Mau warfighters who suffered and continue to suffer today, their blood and the gross injustices could bring a curse on this nation and especially when the most deserving survivors are ignored and left to die in loneliness, poverty and disease. It is possible that the current problems ailing this country are as a result of the curse that will continue to hurt the country. I weep in my heart and others die weeping and hurting because of betrayed promises for land and freedom. The only way to right the wrong is for the government to rise up and distribute small plots and construction materials to lift up the lives of those who gave their all for the freedom and present day prosperity of this country. Doing so could remove the curse and usher a blessing on the children and their future generations. These political elites know exactly what happened and what justice demands for the Mau Mau warfighter requires, if not, "kiria gikamakora gutiiri hindi gigacooka gutharuka", "what will befall them, (referring to a curse), will never be erased".

She was adamant that despite all this suffering, revenge and violence were not the answer. Her hope for the political class to realize their injustices and address their plight remained but with a degree of skepticism.

Here in Nyeri, the land formerly occupied by the colonists was grabbed by those who had influence. For the second time, they betrayed us, stole the land for themselves. The home guards and their children were responsible for land re-distribution since they were the educated elite at the time and held government positions. Some became division officers and district commissioners in the new
Kenyatta administration. They were no better than hungry hyenas for the land.

For me and others were in the forest fighting. We had no education and did not have a chance to get land and our poverty status did not change then or now. This second betrayal was painful but we did not revenge. I chose to keep quiet in my pain. I live with the hope that things might change for the better.

Her life of silent suffering represented many others whose voices have been silenced by poverty, ill health and the feeling that nothing will ever change about their poverty and injustice. She expressed her worry for the future of her children who were now vulnerable and could live in poverty for the rest of their lives. She remained hopeful that some form of compensation might happen to uplift her family’s life from impoverishment. Yakiyo expressed the fear of a curse on the powerful unless justice was served. The strong belief in the curse was the point of departure and empowerment for her because she had no other recourse to recover lost soil. Whether the political leadership of the day would even yield towards recognizing the KLFA survivors based on their fear for the curse might not be readily established. Her determination for justice remained unbreakable despite her present hopeless circumstances.

**Participant 09 Ugi (P 09 U)**

Ugi’s understanding of justice was defined by its absence. In several near death experiences, he bitterly lamented that there was no hope for ever getting his justice at his age.

The biggest enemy in this war was the home guard establishment. The beatings I received at Mwea in their effort to make me confess that I had taken the oath were truly deadly. I could hear them whisper, “ari-oho...” “he is still alive” after
inhuman and brutal beatings. They took a water hose and sprayed cold water on my fresh wounds and the burning sensation was worse than hell; (*folded face in bitter recollection*) such pain drove the urge to revenge and hit back the home guards and the colonial police wherever the opportunity presented itself. This pain is fresh in my memory like it happened last night, almost 50 years later. I did not get any justice even after the independence war was over. Home Guards and their children took the lion share of the land. They grabbed powerful positions in the new government. We were looked down upon like we really were nothing by these people who were our very own Gikuyu but treated us like wild animals. There was no justice for me and my fellow comrades who suffered in the forests and the detention camps. Kenyatta used to say, “...*ino ni ng’unda, ningunyita rwathatha, nimukumiriria mateke?*, “the colonist is a donkey and I will place my hands on his neck to twist it, are you going to bear the kicks from this donkey? We said yes, but unfortunately after the war was over, Kenyatta and the home guards became the new donkey. He refused to honor those who suffered the most. In a move to consolidate his power and influence among the colonists, he offered to forgive them and abandoned the Mau Mau Veterans. That’s why forgiveness without justice is a dirty word. The oath more than anything else became the glue that held us together; anyone who refused to take the oath was viewed as a betrayer and enemy of the Gikuyu people. Justice could only be found if there was equitable distribution of resources. The same people who were loyal home guards today control most of the wealth and the Mau Mau veterans and their families live in abject poverty. They have suffered in silence for over 50
years since independence, a much longer period than the war lasted. If justice is to
be experienced, the Mau Mau warfighters must be compensated, give them a
portion of land and support to build a shelter, this would bring a sense of justice
and the first step towards healing. I am very bitter when I remember my own
suffering and that I have nothing to this day. It is deep pain that cannot be
forgotten. Recent Mau Mau court case in London was a farce because some of the
beneficiaries were double dealers. They were home guard agents and pretended
to be also Mau Mau and some of them were the first to be compensated – it is a
miscarriage of justice in my opinion. (Ugi, age 86).

He likened the post colonial native elite with a donkey that kicked the very owner
who fed it. Soil is the only answer. He was also deeply hurt by fake Mau Mau claimants
in the recent London case and views that as a mockery for those who suffered and
continues to struggle with abject poverty today.

**Participant 10 Lungu (P 10 L)**

Lungu acknowledged that justice was done and in the same conversation turned
around and stated that it was not fully achieved since the question of land redistribution
remained unaddressed.

I can state that justice was achieved. I gained a much higher level of freedom
and I also did get some land. Freedom was achieved for the country, but land was
not distributed to the Mau Mau war veterans. Kenyatta and the people who
became leaders grabbed most of the land out of selfish reasons. The home guard
loyalists also known as “thaata cia bururi”, “the barren lot of the land”, a term of
disgust and hate took the lion share of the land. Anyone who dared question the
Kenyatta administration was silenced fast and some were murdered in unclear circumstances. Like the Late Josiah Mwangi Kariuki from Nyandarua who was a Member of Parliament in the early 70’s. His murderer’s remain unknown although the suspicions were high that the government was involved in his murder. The deep pain, anger, compounded by the fact that land was not distributed to the majority Mau Mau veterans has kept these wounds fresh in this sense, justice has never been found. (Lungu, age 88).

He alluded to a brutal reign by the first post-colonial government that seemed to have had a high degree of intolerance between the new native political class and the KLFA veterans demands for justice. Political assasinations at the time were targeted against those raising their voices against the new native administration miscarriage of justice in the abandonement of the KLFA veterans contrary to what the first president, had promised them.

**Participant Aina (P 11 A)**

Not losing land and given his family background, Aina was satisfied that justice had been served despite the unresolved land issues. As noted earlier, he had managed to avoid the violence by escaping to the neighboring country of Uganda during the war. Upon return he enjoyed the protection of the colonial chiefs and clearly had not personally suffered any harm.

Justice was found because independence was achieved, however, there are still some areas like land yet to be sorted out for the Mau Mau warfighters who did not get any land. They are yet to receive their justice. The new government administration and the clan elders who knew about the land kept the land for
themselves and did not distribute it according to need and most important to the Mau Mau warfighters. (Aina, age 84).

The mentioning of clan elders here and their role in advocating for land was not clearly articulated. Traditional elders knew what land belonged to who; however, they were never engaged after independence to restore the stolen lands back to their rightful owners. The principle of “willing buyer and willing seller” that favored the home guards and the political elite was used as a cover-up to transfer native lands to those in positions of power and influence.

**Participant 12 Jiiru (P 12 J)**

Deep sense of betrayal seemed to have blocked any positive experience with justice. Lack of access to land remained the major roadblock to justice. The themes of betrayal and dishonesty dominated Jiiru’s laments. Unless measures of land redistribution were adopted quickly, most of the survivors are not going to be around much longer.

In my experience the people who were detained were very bitter with those of us who were not. It’s sad to say that most of these people died with the deep bitterness. Freedom and justice did come, however, the selfishness of the new political elite who grabbed most of the land and kept it all to themselves deprived the very people who fought and shed blood for this country. The sense of betrayal and dishonesty that these people have lived with is incomprehensible. To this day they do remain landless because of the selfishness of the first administrators who took over after the colonial government left. The children of the home guards own vast acreage of land and the colonial chiefs who were closer
to the colonists grabbed the land hence; no justice has ever been found. I am in
doubt as to whether justice will ever be found. (Jiuru, age 89).

The understanding of what needed to happen for justice to be found was uniform;
some form of land ownership even if it was a small plot to put up a house for the family. The fact that some of the current major land owners are still powerful political actors in
government explained why the land question could go unaddressed forever.

**Participant Wairagu (P 13 W)**

Justice remained unattainable goal since the best lands were grabbed by the home
guards and their native colonial chiefs. The unresolved land question will continue to
haunt successive governments until action steps are taken to address the plight of the Mau
Mau war survivors.

The Home Guards and colonial chiefs claimed that they bought the land from the
whites but the truth is, “ithaaka ciitu ciaathire na ngati, niio mari na mbeca hind
iyo cia kuguura ithaka”, “our land was taken by the home guards, they are the
only ones who had money at the time to buy them from the whites”. This pain of
betrayal and loss of land remains the primary cause for deep pain inside me and
others. Kenyatta died in 1978, however, the succeeding governments
have continued to ignore this issue. The land re-distribution question remains
unresolved to this day and many have not been able to go forward beyond this
point since they live in abject poverty. During our detention days, after a long day
of hard work, recreation included an imaginary parliament. We preoccupied
ourselves with an imaginary self-government and how we will kill the home
guards first in order to establish our own government. Following Independence
Day in 1963, the drive for revenge was still there but Kenyatta travelled around the hotbed areas for Mau Mau veterans and survivors declaring; “mwoga nimukumoraga, ona ciana cianyu nimwanina”, “if you decide to kill the home guards who married some of your daughters while you were in detention, you will be killing your own children”. (Wairagu, age 83).

The first post-colonial president of Kenya was on a mission where he attempted to unite both sides. While this brought immediate relief from the threat of another round of reciprocal violence, in the longterm, it could have created pseudo forgiveness and pseudo reconciliation. The first post-colonial government miserably failed in this area and hence land has remained a hot button issue for ethnic violence in Kenya. The major error was the government’s effort to build a pseudo-reconciliation that was narrow and lacked the strong foundations of justice. Having suffered in detention himself, we wondered what happened to Kenyatta’s leadership in the area of land re-distribution, a subject very familiar to him and the entire KLFA veterans and their families. During the 2013 Kenya Truth and Justice Reconciliation Commission hearings, several prominent political families were adversely mentioned as some of the few who owned hundreds of thousands of acres of prime land in Kenya. This might explain the reason why the political elite went silent on the question of compensating the KLFA veterans and the restoration of native lands, a matter that has continued to be contested today.

**Participant Chui (P 14 C)**

Chui appreciated the fact that the war ended and to a certain degree, justice was found from a general perspective that bloodshed stopped. Despite his unjustified arrests and unfair trial followed by detention, he was glad that the colonists (most of them) left
Kenya and a self government was established. However, like others before him, the unsettled land question drained and erased previous understanding of justice.

I must add that justice was served when the colonists left this country. It was a joy to be able to attend the independence ceremony in 1963 and hence freedom we did achieve; however the land question remains unresolved for the Mau Mau warfighters veterans still living today. (Chui, age 85).

The undying quest for justice continued to be the dominant theme among most of my research participants. Given the highly flammable nature of the soil issue, all the previous three administrations avoided it despite several deadly ethnic conflicts around the land question. By keeping the official ban on the Mau Mau Veterans Organization until 2012, silence on the matter was guaranteed. Second, by simply ignoring the plight of the Mau Mau war veterans, their wish was that the matter would disappear with time.

**Part III Understanding forgiveness and trauma healing**

**Participant 01 Nyambura (P 01 N)**

In the absence of justice, forgiveness was not possible as Nyambura indicated that creating a psychological distance between her and those who harmed her was a better way of handling the situation. It became “…a silence that has never known justice or forgiveness.” Despite of embracing religious faith, the pain and bitterness seemed to have been passed on from one generation to the next. In the deeper recesses of her life, Nyambura admitted that forgiveness was yet to be truly experienced. At a personal level, the pain was still fresh and forgiveness was not a practical option. Religion seemed to be providing her some kind of hope although reconciliation in her own words was not possible.
I had chosen not to forgive; however, for the sake of peace, even without justice, we continued to live together but it was not easy; we still did it. I had no ability to gain justice. I found that distancing with those who harmed me was the best option. There was no forgiveness extended to me; we continued to live together with the loyalist home guards but in a silence that has never known justice or forgiveness. There were no large scale reconciliation efforts but the Christian churches attempted to bring people together immediately after the war without success. The feelings of hatred have lingered around but I have found peace in my religious commitment. There were a few people who chose to forgive those who caused them significant harm and were able to move on but they never forgot their pain. They will never forget! Succeeding generations have lived in separation for many years because of this hatred. I do occasionally remember the painful past but my memory seems to be failing me and my recollections turn fuzzy sometimes. In all my misfortunes, I have learned to process them through prayer and meditating on God’s word. The weight of these memories causes a lot of discomfort and agony even today. There are people that we don’t talk to because of the past. We decided to co-exist even without peace because our hearts are deeply troubled. Reconciliation has never been possible. (Nyambura, age 92).

She purposely switched between singular and plural while describing negative experiences as if almost to include others in her suffering and as result build solidarity with them while breaking the loneliness of facing the struggles alone. This was also consistent with the African collectivist culture where one does not seek to bring attention to themselves so as not to be viewed as selfish or seeking attention or sympathy.
Nyambura mentioned the possibility of trauma in her life. She connected her traumatic experience with the aftermath of war and another level of betrayal at home. After risking her own life for her husband, she seems to have been marginalized with her children in favor of other younger wives in the polygamous household adding to her suffering.

Nyambura’s deep self-awareness was revealed in a self-diagnosis of a condition that probably was linked to her past trauma and physical suffering. While the incident of “falling on thorny bushes” was a literal one, there could be rich hidden imagery describing her entrapment in reciprocal violence and domestic violence. Religious faith featured again as a resource for her trauma healing through prayer, yet the trauma doesn’t go away. Comparing traumatic feelings with the feeling of “being paralyzed” on the inside powerfully captured the sense of helplessness and the inability to fight back or stop the negative feelings.

I have a condition in my body that prevents me from attending congregational worship services. Once the traditional African drums are played, the loud banging noise affects my sense of physical balance and sometimes I fall and pass out. The memory of loud sounds during the war does not sit well with me. It makes me sick; in one incident, the drums were played; I was outside on the fence line between my compound and the church. I fell on a thorny brush/thicket and a nephew found me and pulled me out. I suffered multiple injuries, poked by the thorns and he assisted in pulling the thorn heads from my skin. I dedicated my life to God (change of topic) since my early days of living in a polygamous marriage. I was the least favored wife. My husband punished me at the beckoning of his other wives. My children and I suffered a lot. I decided to look for manual
employment. I was going to work in the local farms in order to buy clothes and 
food for my children since he neglected me and my children and favored the other 
wives and their children. My husband’s hatred and partial treatment taught me 
deep lessons about forgiveness and non-revenge. It was not easy to survive with 
my children but once we endured, the suffering made us stronger and resilient. 
The trauma I experienced during the detention years of my husband stayed with 
me. I had no means of dealing with it. The deep sadness that came when my 
husband was in detention and while some other family members died in 
detention or continued to suffer (…..silence…..) the pain was heavy. 
Religion influenced many to support the colonialist and oppose their fellow 
Gikuyu people especially on oathing practices. We also prayed a lot to deal with 
sadness. My enmity and deep hatred lingered long but because of my religious 
convictions, I have decided to move on and get along with those from the other 
side. The deep wounds are still there but I have found religious beliefs to be 
of great help in dealing with my trauma. Healing for my trauma has been slow but 
its based on my religious convictions. There were times when I felt paralyzed 
on the inside. I was not able to do much because of this feeling. We did talk to 
each other about our suffering but it was rare (long silence).

The absence of justice and forgiveness was evident and while there were no 
hostilities, the memories of the atrocities seemed fresh among those who lived through 
the reciprocal violence. These could have the capacity to be passed on to succeeding 
generations. For Nyambura, the struggle with trauma healing continued; she suffered 
from a physical condition that could be linked to her trauma. Religious practices seem to
be a possible path for relief in her life. In one single conversation, she weaved together multiple subjects without fully detailing them. As the owner of her narrative, she did an outstanding job allowing me to only access the parts of the story she felt were important to her.

**Participant 02 Wambugu (P 02 W)**

Wambugu was frank about the absence of forgiveness: “I never asked for forgiveness from those I assaulted; neither did I receive forgiveness from those who tortured me”. He summed it up by stating that forgiveness was and still is impossible today. With a deep sense of bitterness, Wambugu disclosed the rape and sexual assaults of family members and then his own castration experience. He seemed relieved that the perpetrator was dead but his pain resides within him. He was grateful to God that even after the partial castration; he was able to father 10 children of his own. To demonstrate why forgiveness was impossible, he cited the recent Mau Mau case in London whereby some claimants who were not even part of the KLFA corruptly presented themselves for payments while veterans like him were disregarded and not compensated.

There was no forgiveness! Forgiveness can never happen! Although recently families of home guards and the Mau Mau are intermarrying ….these are young children and they don’t have the entire historical awareness of hatred and division. A home guard recently died and we all said, the “ngaati” has died. I have resigned their fate to God; how can you forgive such atrocities…(*silence*) like the rape of my relative and pushing an empty bottle inside her vagina; these are not human beings! They are animals (*…long silence…*) As you see me here today, I have only one testicle the other testicle
was extracted from my private parts by a home guard using pliers. I could not pass urine for weeks and have endured many surgeries God is still good since I fathered 10 children of my own. The home guard that tortured me is dead now but this pain lives with me. Gichuru said, “let’s forgive but we must not forget the pain we suffered”. I disagreed, how can you forgive this kind of atrocity?

Recently the Mau Mau Veterans Association manipulated us and lied to us that we will be compensated by the British government but I never got anything. All these experiences of pain live in me. Over 90 cows and sheep were stolen by the home guards from me. After from detention there was nothing from my father’s household. The rapes they committed against my family are a curse to them; three of them gang-raped one woman…(silence) “No aitu no ni nyamu” – “They are part of us but they are animals”. (Wairagu, age 87)

Wambugu was teeming with anger as he disclosed this most private and exclusive personal details of sexual assault and bodily harm. He was categorical about the perpetrators, “they were not human but animals”, in his assessment of their horrific acts. The concept of forgiveness was viewed as an insult in the light of his suffering. Forgiveness was not part of his considerations at the moment. It’s instructive to note that the definition of forgiveness remained problematic within indigenous communities and hence does not carry the same meaning and weight as understood in the English language. In the face of intense suffering, Wambugu seemed to seek other means of reconciling his current state and how to move on with life without forgiveness as part of his journey. While he self-disclosed that anger was not a friend but an enemy due to health struggles with high blood pressure, he was actively looking for ways and means of
putting these heavy emotional and psychological burdens to the side, but was not an easy task.

In summary, Wambugu’s narrative was transparent and vivid. He boldly invited me to accompany him into his deep recesses of darkness and pain in order to hear some very personal accounts of torture and that of his family members. His dual role as a perpetrator and victim provided an astonishing contrast that was difficult to reconcile. His story once more displayed the gross injustices suffered during the intra-group reciprocal violence. Wambugu affirmed that forgiveness was impossible in his particular experiences and that finding a way to co-exist with trauma was an ongoing process.

**Participant 03 Gicheha (P 03 G)**

Gicheha was fast in dismissing forgiveness as an option. He expected land redistribution to be the only answer and not forgiveness. At present the pain of betrayal was still fresh in his life and unable to consider forgiveness as an option.

Forgiveness is not possible when dealing with such betrayal. We were never given an opportunity to come together to talk about our painful past. The government(s) that have come and gone following independence, all chose to ignore us and our contributions. Other ethnic groups in Kenya dislike the Gikuyu because of the political and economic domination; however, there is only a few rich Gikuyu not the entire group. (Gicheha, age 90).

Gicheha also attempted to correct the misconception held by many that the Gikuyu ethnic group was wealthy. Only a few individuals were extremely wealthy and should not be used to generalize about the entire population. He recognized the presence of trauma in his life but offered that he had not been able to to talk about it since the
Mau Mau remained banned as an organization until 2012. As if he had not stated some of his painful experiences, he revisited how Kenyatta (first president of Kenya) forgot him and his impoverished status despite the help he had rendered during his trip to London as well as that fateful night when he was vulnerable to many dangers when his car broke down and Gicheha assisted him with his colleagues.

when I remember the traumatic experiences, I am not able to process them; there is no opportunity to talk about this pain. We never gathered again with my colleagues since Mau Mau was an illegal organization until 2003. Time has gone by but the painful memories still remain. Recent governments have not done anything to deliver justice for us. The recent Mau Mau case in London led by Gituwa-Kahengeri is only a drop in the ocean. Kenyatta’s first government was best placed to deliver justice but he chose not to. Compensation by the British government will not satisfy my demands for justice. No justice will ever be found for me. I am bitter because Kenyatta was completely ungrateful to me and the four others who helped him after his return from London. I am angry because he never stood up one day to recognize me and those who sacrificed so much to support him in London. I am bitter and think his heart was in the wrong place.

Deep bitterness and trauma has never been addressed among us. Our dead heroes went unrecognized; their suffering remained unaddressed. Today there are a lot of painful memories. This mess cannot be sorted out.

Gicheha seemed to have resigned to fate stating that he did not think freedom or justice would help sort out the current state of unforgiveness. He raised the probability that forgiveness and trauma healing were yet to be fully redefined and understood, a line
of thinking that pointed again to the problematic western definitions of terms like justice, forgiveness and trauma healing.

**Participant 04 Kihato (P 4 K)**

No forgiveness! Kihato firmly and emphatically stated. While acknowledging that it might work for some, he closed all doors to the process until the time when land redistribution will be offered to all the KLFA veterans.

I chose not to forgive all those who tortured me and I know others like me who chose not to forgive. How could I have forgiven when there was no justice? My cousin once faced off with Kenyatta at Manguo village. He told him to his face that land was never recovered and distributed among the Mau Mau warriors. He asked him – what do you think will be our end? My cousin led a group of people in a walk out from Kenyatta’s public meeting. Kenyatta knew that there were many unsatisfied Mau Mau veterans. Forgiveness can work for some but it’s not easy. Justice was not fully realized because land was not restored, however, we decided not to kill each other anymore despite the injustices rendered to me and others. I have suffered greatly and life has been extremely hard. Many were beaten and left our ranks to join the home guards but I did not do that despite my suffering. (Kihato, age 85).

In his choice not to forgive, Kihato felt empowered and in control of his situation. His sharing about his brothers encounter with Kenyatta went to show that the people were ready to ask the land question but the government was not ready to listen. Those who risked to ask were marginalized politically while others lost their lives in questionable circumstances. Kihato signaled that he was done with the interview before we could get
to the trauma question and he was ready to go. I respected his wishes and terminated the interview.

**Participant 05 Muchiri (P 05 M)**

He avoided a direct answer and even responded in prural, a style highlighted in other interviews, a common practice in collectivist cultures. To the disappointment of the KLFA veterans, the first president extended an invitation for the colonists to live in Kenya after independence if they wished. Adding this kind of insult to the injuries of injustice, the ruling elite betrayed the hopes and great sacrifices and suffering of the KLFA veterans by acquiring most of the farms previously owned by colonists. He stated that trauma healing did not happen and the work of reconciliation was left untouched.

No trauma healing ever happened we just decided to let go in spite of our deep wounds. We decided to let go and not kill each other for the second time.

Kenyatta had the same message for the settler colonial population. He told them that revenge was not an option, and if they wanted to stay they were welcome or if they chose to leave, the government would buy back their land.

Reconciliation did not happen to this day. Kenyatta’s effort did result into some form of reconciliation depending on who you ask. Very few families later did reconcile and accepted intermarriage between the two sides. (Muchiri, age 79).

In what seemed to be a contradiction, he described two traumatic incidences one involving the colonial chief who was his friend who killed his own brother for opposing the colonists. The second incident probably revealed more trauma and unreconciled turmoil in his life where a child was brutally beheaded.

Today some of them are with us in the same houses of prayer and community life
and co-exist in peace. Some home guards have lived in pain and great suffering. Chief Makimei was an example; he developed a strange skin disease and the skin on his hands seemed to have broken up and started withering. He turned to religious faith but even that did not free him from internal turmoil. He had killed his brother as well who did not agree with the loyalists. My parents-in-law were killed by the Mau Mau warriors during the night of the Lari massacre night. Even an innocent child of my younger brother had his head chopped off by Chief Makimei and that pain is still here. Memories are fading about the Lari massacre and there is a risk of not remembering the bloodshed and pain encountered to win the war of independence. Forgetting the struggles could lead to similar suffering with present day ethnic intergroup violence here in Kenya.

Muchiri made a sad revelation that could explain why he fled to Uganda during the war and seemed unsupportive to the KLFA war. His parents were murdered by the Mau Mau and that could have negatively impacted his posture and view of violent resistance against the British occupation. He raised a concern that all these stories of the Lari Massacre and the lessons that they learned were being slowly forgotten and lamented that unless something was done to preserve them for future generations, they might be bound to repeat the same mistakes made decades earlier with disastrous results.

In summary, forgiveness was only talked about but not implemented and trauma seemed to live in the individual and community experiences of the perpetrators and victims of intra-group violence in Kenya’s war of independence. While he was not recommending any land re-distribution process, he seemed committed to finding lasting answers to the unfinished tension created by the gaps of justice and the lack of
forgiveness and trauma healing. As a loyalist he seemed to offer a more reconciliatory tone given the fact he had not personally suffered like others he knew about.

**Participant 06 Burugu (P 06 B)**

Forgiveness was an empty word and had never been achieved. He lamented the fact that as he advanced in age, the further away he seemed to move from reaching the goals of justice and forgiveness.

Forgiveness did not work to bring healing because we were left with the bitterness and regret. Even as a community, we never came back to call the community as elders to sacrifice to God in thanksgiving for giving us the victory over the colonists. Families live with bitterness and memory of knowing that relatives betrayed their own and had them killed today, these memories linger and many know that justice is yet to be delivered. Today we are still demanding for justice and I hope you and others will continue to be our voice for seeking justice since we are old people now and may not be able to continue fighting on for long. Justice can only be found if the government honors the Mau Mau war veterans with a small piece of land then gather the freedom fighters and the surviving home guards and ask them to forgive each other. Once the land has been distributed; then forgiveness could follow, and then seeking God’s forgiveness and reconciliation could potentially help. I have seen many widows laboring hard for their children with very little to live on hence no justice was achieved whatsoever. Give the poor land even a small portion and then ask for forgiveness and justice will be seen as having been done to those who have suffered the most. (Burugu, age 84).
He witnessed untold suffering among the KLFA veterans and quipped that the only hope for forgiveness was directly linked to soil re-distribution. Size did not matter, just a plot to erect a house would be sufficient. While he did not address the question directly, he took the opportunity to detail his contributions to the war effort. He hoped that his story would be a helpful lesson to others in future in order to prevent violent conflict.

Our blood paid for everything you all have today including the pen you are holding. Even after we die, our children will say, they did not die in vain and this soil is what we gained. Field Marshall Dedan Kimathi knew about my supply work. A major skirmish known as “Mbaara ya rui ruiru”, “battle of the black river” was executed with the bullets I supplied. Many colonists were killed that day. I attended Kimathi’s meetings to plan and execute logistics for the war. I have given several interviews to school students about my experiences and I hope that many young people will be educated and learn about our history and contributions to the Mau Mau war and avoid similar violence in future. Eight of my brothers and sisters were killed by the home guards and there is nothing that will ever erase this memory. The bitterness remains and I still did not get justice.

In closing, he touched on trauma following the murder of eight sibblings. While no details were shared about how they died, Burugu was clearly uncomfortable with the subject and brought it to an abrupt end. He lamented that justice was never found for him and his family. Bitterness and trauma had remained as part of his day to day life with no resources to process these painful memories. The absence of justice was directly linked to the current state of unforgiveness. As a result, trauma healing was not a possibility for
Burugu. As if almost directly including me in his story, he pointed out that the pen I was writing with and everything else in Kenya was purchased by the blood of the Mau Mau warfighters and not seeking a more lasting solution for the KLFA veterans remained a tragedy.

**Participant 07 Rimura (P 07 R)**

The imagery of home guards living with unremovable permanent “bloodstains” was powerful; however, the same was true for the KLFA veterans who had participated in an equally brutal bloodshed against the loyal natives. In reciprocal violence, the perpetrator and the victim seemed to selectively present the other side in negative terms driving the possibility for forgiveness further away.

Home guards were hard to forgive, even with Kenyatta’s claim, “tutingihe hiti keri”, “not give the hyena a second chance to kill” even with our desire to “kumunya ithuki”, “uprooting the tree stumps”. I still feel that there is a debt that was not paid and justice was not served. Forgiveness was not possible and the home guard live with the bloodstains all over them because they shed innocent blood without cause and that curse is powerful over their lives.” (Burugu, age 84).

The conclusion that forgiveness was impossible remained consistent like in previous narratives. The link between justice and trauma healing was revisited here again. The social gatherings for Rimura and his colleagues boosted their resolve to fight on with the hope that the door of justice would be opened when justice requirements have been met, then forgiveness might be an option.

I have deep seated pain and trauma that refuses to go away. There are times when I am able to gather with some of my old friends and we continue to encourage
each other by holding on to our sacred claim for land as the only means for the
fulfillment of justice in our lives. I live with this pain. I trust that
healing could only begin once my land is restored and a grant to build my home
that was burned down.

The failure to address the land question and having to live with an unaddressed
traumatic past seemed to be the common theme shared across all the narratives discussed
above. In summary, Rimura offered great insights explaining why forgiveness was
impossible as long as land re-distribution remained unaddressed. The awareness that
trauma could not be effectively addressed without some form of soil compensation
remained a consistent theme among the research participants.

Participant 08 Yakiyo (P 08 Y)

Yakiyo shared the same belief with a previous research participant that
forgiveness was a dirty word in the light of their gross injustices they had contend with
daily. Forgiveness would only make sense if justice was delivered by re-distributing land
among the KLFA veterans.

Forgiveness of the lips did not have any positive results. Forgiveness could not
work at all to right this kind of wrong. Forgiveness between the two groups was
not possible because the hatred was very deep. While some home guards and Mau
Mau survivors attempted to return to some form of religious based forgiveness,
this still could not erase the hatred. Forgiveness was only from the lips but not
from the heart. For those who claimed to be Christians, their memory of the
atrocities remained although without the desire to revenge against the
perpetrators. The independent church of East Africa did a much better job to build
solidarity among the people and their native understanding of God without the colonist supported missionary imposed beliefs. Once the war started, the independent schools and churches were shut down. The children of Mau Mau warfighters were expelled from the missionary sponsored schools. Religious conversion was a requirement for admission. Forgiveness could have worked if the land was fairly and equally distributed however, because land still remained in the hands of the home guards, forgiveness without land was and is still impossible. Even if I was given a plot to put up a tent for my family, that could have opened the path towards forgiveness. (Yakiyo, age 83).

She raised possibilities for forgiveness from a religious understanding but quickly added that religion could not take the place of justice. Yakiyo’s deep reflection was equally disturbing since she could perceive the river of trauma flowing from her to the children and she did not like it. Her desire to stop the flow of trauma and shield her children from the toxic nature of trauma and hopelessness seemed unsuccessful and did not know how to address this matter.

The deep trauma in my life and even in the lives of others has caused me to live a life of impoverishment. The future does not look promising at all. My suffering and pain is slowly being passed on to my children and their children and that is very sad. I long to help my children and grandchildren. They also long to help me but they have no means of doing it which causes that trauma and pain to expand further. Talking to others who suffered with me helps to temporarily relief of that stress of remembering the past but beyond that, nothing
could erase my trauma permanently. We encourage each other spiritually and this has been a good source of support among us.

Learning how to live with this trauma and its impact was part of her new task now. She still thought that the answer would only come from the delivery of justice through land re-distribution for her and the children. This could give them a second chance in life.

I am still traumatized and deeply hurt when I recall the hard times we went through and the results today are abject poverty for me, my children and my grandchildren. My generation, all the way to the third generation has nothing. No hope for their future. I am at peace with myself despite the suffering because I sell fruits around this town. I work and feed the children and if they go and find work, they buy food and we share. We continue to live in our pain; the heavy memories of trauma are haunting but I have to put all that aside in order to labor for my children. My wound was never healed. The darkness of my traumatic past stays with me every day. Go and let everybody know that we are still waiting for justice and hopefully the future will be better for our children.

Her deep sense of self-awareness was amazingly comprehensive. She could look ahead and see the seemingly foggy future for her children and their children. Her resiliency and strength to fight each day to feed her children was admirable. Her thick descriptions of pain brought the past to the present in a vivid manner. Unfortunately, the current political environment in Kenya may not be open to revisiting the KLFA veterans demands since some of the political class members hoarding thousands of acres of land
would be the immediate losers. Even with the recent court case filed in London, local efforts to seek justice have not found support in order to address the plight of Yakiyo and many others in her situation.

**Participant 09 Ugi (P 09 U)**

The burning of three homes to the ground and the inclusion of a character witness who knew about the three homes explained to a certain extent why forgiveness was so hard to come by among the victims and perpetrators of reciprocal violence. Tangible and intangible losses had never been addressed and hence forgiveness seemed not to have a place in the present narrative.

For my suffering I will never forget or forgive until some compensation is given to help me start afresh. Forgiveness is on the lips only and does not reach the bottom of my heart. These home guards were the worst enemy. There is no peace that can be found until an effort to compensate us bears fruit. The government cannot look the other way forever. Peace is not possible until justice and compensation is made to us. General Muchugu was from Murang’a and his leadership was exceptional; I worked closely with him and he knew about my three homes that were burned down by the Home guards. General Muchugu was also a senior religious traditional elder who conducted all the sacrifices that were to be given before God. He is alive today and knows about my story. I can tell you that home guards today are still hated and we cannot forget what they did especially burning my three homes and taking all my cows and goats. I know these are terrible people and I cannot get along with them. I still see them around and while time has passed, feelings of hatred has gone down the emotions are not
as high since we are tired about all these burdens. Towards the end of the war, some whites covered themselves with dark paint and wore wigs disguising themselves as Mau Mau warfighters in an effort to hunt them down and force them to surrender; they caused untold harm among our people. My role was significant even after the war although I live in poverty, my work was well known among the leading warfighters in Nyeri. Home guards have never admitted wrong or asked for forgiveness. (Ugi, age 86).

Ugi made a bold statement that even the people who committed these crimes against him do not live in peace. He took comfort in assuming that their atrocities haunted them deep in their hearts. He was particularly focused on the harms he suffered rebuilding homes three different times and having them burned to the ground each time. He also mixed different themes in the same short narrative and the flow made sense to him and I simply followed along. His reignited memory of the atrocities stoked the flames of trauma and he categorically denounced calls for forgiveness without justice.

We hated them and there was never a time I considered or they considered establishing forgiveness and reconciliation. We are silent but it’s a silence with a lot of hurt and pain. Enduring peace can only come if justice through the restoration of land, no matter how small is granted to the landless Mau Mau war veterans. Even the home guards don’t have inner peace because they know how much blood they shed and how much land they have occupied while the warfighters wiggle in abject poverty. I repeat peace for me and justice could only come from the government leadership compensating the losses of life, property
and deep betrayal that I have encountered no one should ever tell lies about justice again because there is none until I get back a piece of land.

For Ugi, forgiveness talk was just another form of telling lies to one another and he would rather have none of that. Getting back some soil, a piece of land was all he desired at his prime age of 86. Fresh pain was stirred up when he recalled the degree of injustice he had endured. Constant hunger due to food shortages in his current state had become a real reminder that all his suffering and sacrifices were in vain to the extent that he could not afford three meals a day.

Kenyatta attempted to reconcile the home guards and the Mau Mau warfighters but it did not work because the land was only given to the least deserving home guards while denying the same to the Mau Mau warfighters. He himself took hundreds of thousands of acres and kept them for himself and his family. I am filled with fresh bitterness and internal pain when I remember all this and know that I suffered in vain. I cannot be healed in my heart because I sleep without food sometimes; yet all the lands that are lying in waste, no cultivation of food owned by people who did nothing for the war of independence. My healing and peace can only come if I am given a small plot of land to put up a shelter and continue to age in dignity instead of shame; gutiiri kindu kingi ona kimwe kinginiina kieha na ruo, gituhe kihooto giitu, tiga gatiiri”, “nothing else will ever satisfy the demands of justice and remove the deep pain and trauma other than a small plot with soil on it” and that will be the day when justice will have been done”.

My house and two other homes belonging to my parents were burnt to ashes; my cows and goats were slaughtered by the home guards and this hurts deeply. This
little soil could be like an ointment on a festering wound. We had nothing other
than the piece of clothes on our backs when our homes were burned down by the
home guards...that is sad indeed!

The hunger and thirst for soil could not be underestimated and how this was the
single most important topic that could offer possibilities for forgiveness and trauma
healing. Ugi waited in hope that one day, change will come and justice would be
delivered, but he was afraid that time was not on his side at 86 years of age.

**Participant 10 Liungu (P 10 L)**

He concurred that forgiveness was not even talked about because it was not
possible between the two groups. He even provided his own family’s example still
divided today by the sides they chose during the war of independence. Hatred still
reigned supreme among individuals and communities even though sometimes only
expressed in passive-aggressive tendencies.

Forgiveness was not possible due to the continued hatred between the home
guards and the Mau Mau warfighters. This hatred is also complicated by the fact
that in my case, I did not go to the forest. I stayed back and even had a chance to
educate my children. My neighbors who went to the forest to fight, upon return
had nothing to come back to; their homes and property were destroyed they had
no families or the economic means to start a family or once they had one to
educate the children. The gap between the “have” and “have-nots” was wide. This
hatred could be very difficult to erase. Forgiveness doesn’t have to be a major
government resettlement scheme or the church but it only takes one person to do
the right thing and encourage others to do the same for some change to happen.
Otherwise there are many people who have died with that pain, anger and hatred and it’s very sad for something like that to keep happening. Forgiveness is a hard commodity to come by. Even to this very day, my own brother still harbors some hatred towards me because I refused to take the oath and join the warfighters fifty years ago. Hatred has a long shelf life around here and unless something is done about it, the future looks grim. It continues to hurt those around you for generations to come. I am aware that parents tell their children about those who hurt them and even stole from them today. When some look at my nice home, might even say, he has that home because he stole from us. This kind of intergeneration hatred across generations is deep. When they look at my children who happen to have been highly educated, they accuse me of having been given money and wealth by the colonist. There are victims who sacrificed the most and have nothing to show for it.

Forgiveness is almost impossible where injustice have not been addressed. It will take strong leadership to bring these dynamics in the open and address the matters that have never been addressed. Even the recent Mau Mau case in London will not bring justice and healing. Only a few people will benefit and not all the veterans and this will cause even more trauma while opening old wounds of suffering and pain. (Lungu, age 88).

Until justice was carried out, forgiveness was not an option. His own personal struggle in post-independence Kenya to co-exist with people who are highly suspicious of his activities during the war still bothererd him. At a personal level, he seemed to have
attempted to reconcile with his suspicious neighbors and after that kept moving forward with the full awareness that tension did exist and might never be completely wiped out.

He generalized the traumatic experiences of others without any specific examples of trauma in his own life. Based on his privileged life, he does not seem to have encountered traumatic experiences. Having suspicious neighbors though does not make for an all peaceful environment for his family.

Trauma healing and putting off the weight of colonial pain is almost impossible because of the unbearable poverty that continues to hurt the Mau Mau veterans. Until this issue is addressed fully, trauma will continue to be carried over one generation to another. This narrative will be carried over in the sense of a failed justice and passed on across generations. Unity and intermarriage between ethnic groups could be a starting point to addressing ethnic conflicts and trauma among the Kenyan people. We have to ask ourselves how we could heal this persistent disease among us? “murimu uyu utuuraga ri, ungihoona atia? “how could this ailment be healed?” Healing and acceptance of others is the only way that this country could move from ethnic centered to become a nation; we are not yet a nation. Faith communities should also be involved to teach people about forgiveness and healing. The benefits of forgiveness could bring a degree of accepting one another and usher healing and acceptance among these different communities in Kenya today.

He offered unique insights in reference to how trauma healing could be achieved including justice requirements as noted in other narratives. This might be explained by the fact that he himself owned a reasonable parcel of land. While he was not living in
poverty, he sympathized with the impoverished and especially because their sacrifices during the war of independence have not been recognized or rewarded. The observation that Kenya was not a nation yet was very telling of the various ethnic fixtures in operation and hopes for the day nationalism will be embraced over ethnocentrism.

**Participant 11 Aina (P 11 A)**

His experiences were informed by his religious affiliation with the missionaries and he acknowledged the difficulties associated with forgiveness when faced by the atrocities committed by both sides. He did not have any personal direct experience with violence and his observations were general and brief.

As for forgiveness, it was very much talked about within religious circles and communities of faith but not anywhere else. Forgiveness among the Mau Mau warfighters and the home guards was not and is still not possible. Here in Embu, land was distributed among the clans and there were no major disgruntled groups of people. The Mbeere people and Embu people have had some conflicts between them but land matters were generally resolved by the local senior chiefs. (Aina, age 84).

The border region between central and eastern provinces was not attractive to the colonists and hence was not occupied besides the erecting temporary military camps as they pursued the Mau Mau in central Kenya. As a result land disputes were at a minimum and sorted out locally by the traditional African chiefs. As a committed Christian, Aina recommended faith based resources for trauma healing. He offered the same prescription to others looking for relief from trauma and the weight of unforgiveness.

There is still some degree of trauma for those who never received justice. Even
today faith communities are better placed to work for healing and forgiveness and not the government. I have sorted out most of my lingering traumatic past through religious faith. I have found peace through my understanding of forgiveness as taught in Christianity. Based on my experience, I think a lot of people can find peace and healing through religious faith and commitment.

Aina’s understanding of forgiveness and trauma healing was influenced by what seemed to be a life of privilege based on his parent’s decision to embrace Christianity and send him to a missionary school. While he acknowledged the difficulties surrounding forgiveness between perpetrators and victims of intra-group violence, he was unable to fully connect with their dire need for justice, since he was not a direct victim of injustice. His prescription for trauma healing was religious faith; something he noted might work for some but not all people.

Participant 12 Jiiru (P 12 J)

He had no direct experience with unforgiveness and trauma but narrated a general discussion on the merits for forgiveness and the betrayal the people still experience today as a result of the actions and inactions of the first native post-colonial administration in Kenya.

The government could address these injustices and restore justice and fairness through land distribution. Faith communities could also promote healing but are limited since land is still missing. Following independence, Kenyatta gathered Mau Mau veterans he appealed to them and the home guards to pursue unity and forgiveness in order to build the new nation but without a fair distribution of land. This was just empty talk; few people agreed but the majority
did not forgive. They continued to seek for justice but with little success. The bitterness has diminished but forgiveness is still an impossibility. For those who chose to forgive, there was a degree of unity and peace that was experienced. I still think Kenyatta could have done more in delivering justice specifically by re-distributing land to the Mau Mau war veterans. Kenyatta went around the country conducting meetings to try and unite the former Mau Mau warfighters and the home guards but unfortunately his message lacked practicality in that land compensation to validate his claims of delivering justice was missing. Unfortunately the revenge attacks would have continued to kill our people and as a result they decided to discontinue with the cycles of revenge even without tangible justice of land redistribution. (Jiiru, age 89).

Indigenous understanding of forgiveness was not considered since the relationships were totally broken between the two sides. The precedent was land compensation and hence all other efforts were viewed as non-starters. After the Mau Mau rejected English missionaries, they grounded themselves in their native understanding of God in order to boost the morale of the KLFA soldiers:

The African Independent Pentecostal Church of East Africa (AIPCEA); an indigenous church was the center of gravity for all spiritual needs of the Mau Mau warfighters. The AIPCEA composed songs, prayers that supported the oath and the war although they were shut down by the colonists. They went underground and continued with their mission. Here in Embu, not vast lands had been forcibly taken by the colonists the majority land was grabbed by the colonist in Kiambu and some parts of the Rift Valley. The coffee plantations and tea farms were all
occupied by the white community. The Embu people sympathized with the Gikuyu and joined in the war of independence. Leadership was critical in making sure that revenge attacks in the conflict did not happen. The present day generation must learn about the past so that co-existence could be built especially among the different ethnic groups and promote nationhood and prevent violent conflict and build lasting peace.

The discussion about forgiveness from the Christian perspective was limited since the native Kenyans had their own indigenous religious understanding of justice and how to right wrongs committed by the colonists and their loyalist sympathizers. Jiru did not have any direct traumatic experience but his general response suggested that until the demands of justice were met, trauma healing and forgiveness seemed to have remained too far out to be realized.

Trauma healing and forgiveness might help but will not erase this pain and darkness even the present generations know the narratives of who purchased their native lands since they bought them at throwaway prices. Whenever the story is told, feelings of bitterness and injustice are rekindled. Injustice then dominates their experience and for them the fruits of independence are yet to be experienced.

In summary, Jiru’s story highlighted the indigenous religious deeper level of engagement and commitment individuals continued to uphold and especially among the KLFA warfighters. Despite not having experienced the war directly, he was still convinced that justice requirements must be met first before forgiveness or trauma healing were considered. Erasing the pain though was probably too much to ask in his assessment. He appreciated the fact that his story could be used to help the younger
generations prevent the kind of hatred and violence they had endured. A general sense of relief was apparent after Jiiru shared his story. He was also grateful that his own contribution is now being shared with others and wished that it would encourage them.

**Participant Wairagu (P 13 W)**

He affirmed that forgiveness was yet to be offered or embraced and he did not expect it to happen until the soil matters were settled. He equated land compensation with the truth. This was the key to forgiveness and healing.

Forgiveness among us has not yet happened in practice. At this time, we only talk about forgiveness but it stays on our lips and is yet to have any effect or impact in our lives. Until the truth is established and owned by those who hurt others, justice and forgiveness will never happen. Until I am compensated with a small piece of land that I could call my own, healing is still imagined and not real. Some of the problems we are experiencing today in Kenyan politics are as a result of the same unfinished business for justice and hopefully forgiveness among Kenyans. Until the national government takes our concerns and address them to a degree of satisfaction, ethnic conflicts will continue to affect the growth of the country in a negative way. (Wairagu, age 83).

He attributed recent ethnic conflicts in Kenya to the same old issues of unfinished justice matters surrounding soil ownership and a fair and equitable resources distribution. The interview ended abruptly and Wairagu made only one comment indicating that his religious faith has been a good resource for trauma healing. As far as processing his own pain, he seemed to have found peace in religious faith and did not carry all the weight since according to him it was unbearable. In summary, Wairagu’s story was dominated
with religious language as a means for him to process the understanding of forgiveness and trauma healing. Forgiveness remained impractical and trauma healing for him was an ongoing process through religious resources.

**Participant Chui (P14C)**

Pseudo forgiveness happened and it was temporary. Chui stated that he was still waiting for genuine forgiveness to happen although he was worried that the younger generation was losing touch with this important narrative of how they got where they are today.

Kenyatta’s message of forbearance and forgiveness resonated with us and we decided not to kill again having experienced the darkness and pain of war. We were ready to kill and destroy the home guards and essentially we could have started a destructive cycle that would have destroyed our people. However even with this forgiveness, it pains me in my heart that I have nothing. There is a massive unfinished business because I am yet to get my justice. We do live together with these home guards but there is still something that cannot be sorted out until we get some land. The younger generation unfortunately is losing touch with this narrative and as the older generation passes on. They depart with a degree of dissatisfaction and injustice in their hearts. The only reason we have peace today is because myself and others chose not to revenge. Towards this end, Kenyatta was wise to encourage us and persuade us to drop the idea of massive revenge killings against the home guards but he failed us by ignoring the land issues. In my opinion today, lasting peace can only happen if forgiveness is extended and offered in reality in order to build lasting peace. Our initial plans
were to take back all the property owned by the home guards but we did not. We must set aside selfish ambitions and seek true peaceful co-existence between all the ethnic groups in Kenya even as the government apportions parcels of land to KLFA veterans. It is possible to live together and share the resources that we have and end the violence that has held us back for many generations. Your generation is in bad shape unless you all rise up above these petty ethnic differences that continue to breed out the nation. Reconciliation and unity among all ethnic groups remains the best hope for Kenya for the sake of our generation. There is hope but there is work to be done to unite our nation and this is your charge and the generation of your time. We shed blood and there is no need for anyone to lose their life today. There are enough resources in this Kenya but it will take some selfless political will and leadership to get this country back on track. At my age right now, my site is failing and the future is now in your hands and the hands of the younger generation. Personally, I must concede that there was a degree of forgiveness because of my religious faith. (Chui, age 85).

Chui made a remarkable point that since his generation paid the price and shed blood for the land, peaceful co-existence was the only option. He argued that violent conflict was no longer necessarily and that the current generation must find ways to establish justice and find lasting reconciliation including genuine forgiveness. Despite finding a shelter in his religious faith, Chui categorically stated that the violence he suffered could only be compensated through tangible land grant from the government.

I have a deep sense of trauma and pain because of the injustices done to me. After all that violence and torture, where did the land go? Until a system is
established to fairly compensate the Mau Mau warfighters there will be no sense of justice or trauma healing.

In summary, Chui demonstrated how the absence of justice had continued the narrative of bitterness and dissatisfaction. Forgiveness was not attainable and as a result trauma healing was unrealistic. He advocated for fairness and rightful recognition for all KLFA veterans for their costly sacrifices that made Kenya the free country it is today. In the next section, a brief summary of the interviews is offered for a quick summary review.
Summary of results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience with violence</th>
<th>Understanding justice</th>
<th>Forgiveness, trauma healing or absence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 01 Nyambura</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Experienced domestic violence in a polygamous marriage</td>
<td>➢ No justice/ chose co-existence with unfinished business</td>
<td>➢ No forgiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Switched from singular to plural/(collective culture style)</td>
<td>➢ Highest form of injustice – public hangings without a fair trial</td>
<td>➢ Even churches were partisan and failed to unite the people in encouraging forgiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Forcible removal Husband’s detention</td>
<td>➢ Felt trapped and free at the same time</td>
<td>➢ Self-aware about trauma but not sure what to do about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 02 Wambugu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Experienced personal harm (castration)</td>
<td>➢ Arbitrary arrests</td>
<td>➢ Forgiveness impossible without justice (how do you forgive a castration experience or a sexual assault on a family member?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Switched from singular to plural</td>
<td>➢ Detention without trial</td>
<td>➢ Repair of lost body parts is impossible so is forgiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Proud role as KLFA fighter &amp; oath administrator</td>
<td>➢ No land, no justice</td>
<td>➢ Living with trauma has been a struggle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Sexual assault on family members</td>
<td>➢ Forced starvation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 03</td>
<td>Gicheha</td>
<td>Witnessed public hangings at Githunguri after the Lari Massacre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Betrayed by Kenyatta and his sidekicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearly shot twice by colonists while trying to advocate for his brother (detained)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated all contacts with home guards to this day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 04</td>
<td>Kihato</td>
<td>Oathed/ Murdered others during the Lari Massacre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Switched from singular to plural while describing violent acts against others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forced manual labor almost killed him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deep ruptures are not repairable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 05 Muchiri</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privileged, protected loyalist</td>
<td>Life of privilege and safety as loyalist</td>
<td>Forgiveness was possible and he had forgiven those who killed his parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained teacher</td>
<td>Witnessed unfair screening &amp; punishment of suspects</td>
<td>Trauma is still present with memories of the beheading of a child coming back occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated that he took the oath and played both sides</td>
<td>Favored justice meant ability to purchase land &amp; access to loan facilities</td>
<td>Went into hiding probably after his parents were murdered by the Mau Mau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-exiled to Uganda during the height of the war</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful link with colonial native chief Luka Wa-Kahangara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P 06 Burugu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oathed/fought for land and freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed personal suffering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced others to take the oath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No justice, no land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyatta knew but lacked the will to address the land matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts to forgive did not work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder of 8 siblings added to the challenge of forgiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P 07 Rimura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion used to divide the Gikuyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oathed three times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embraced “curse” as a weapon. Stated-perpetrators deserve sympathy &amp; place to tell their story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abject poverty indicator for injustice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused monetary compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous justice never given a chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent bloodstains cannot be erased by forgiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social gatherings help lift off the traumatic re-occurrences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 08 Yakiyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 09 Ugi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 10 Liungu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Acted as informer for the colonial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criminal investigation department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Monetary payments for every dead Mau Mau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fueled reciprocal violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ As a perpetrator, he lived in fear because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the many he betrayed to their death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Escaped death from the Mau Mau trap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 11 Aina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Loyalist / oathed &amp; remotely sympathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the Mau Mau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Lived in safety behind the walls of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colonial missionary station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Father detained although he had not taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the oath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 12 Jiiru</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Broken homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Physical assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Forced false confessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Torture made him betray his oath and became a colonial informer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Witnessed public hangings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Forcible removal from home to camp life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>P 13 Wairagu</strong> | | |
| | | |
| ➢ Survived a stabbing attempt on his life | ➢ Great injustice done to KLFA and supporters while loyalists took the lion share of the former colonial lands | ➢ Truth telling and forgiveness cannot be separated |
| ➢ Detained with hard labor without trial | ➢ Pseudo-reconciliation efforts failed because justice needs were not met | ➢ Traditional religious faith has helped consider forgiveness – it is a process that is far from being complete |
| ➢ Dual betrayal by post-colonial government then and today | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violence</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Forgiveness &amp; Trauma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P 14 Chui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Oathed &amp; Mau Mau recruiter</td>
<td>➢ Unjust and unfair arrest and detention</td>
<td>➢ Pseudo-forgiveness remained the worst danger since it blocks the real work from happening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Felt deeply betrayed by loyalists and harbored a desire to revenge</td>
<td>➢ Injustice - Banning of the Mau Mau until 2012</td>
<td>➢ Poverty and landlessness blocks my ability to forgive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Detained without trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Forgiveness requires very hard work but no one is willing to do the work at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Tortured &amp; assaulted</td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ I feel like I have attained forgiveness but I am still waiting for justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Felt betrayed by the first native post-colonial government that rewarded home guards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Archival sources alignment with field interviews**

The internecine violence detailed by the fourteen research participants above was consistent with archival sources. First, the native loyalists predominantly played the role of perpetrators although to a much less extent, they were also victims. Some crossed the lines and played on both sides having taken the oath and at the same time joining the colonists for their own protection and survival. Gatheru’s decision to join the loyalist was an effort to find an alternative to independence since he thought the Mau Mau war was a losing undertaking. Kariuki’s decision to join the loyalists was to revenge the death of his
brother killed by the Mau Mau. Kinaichu, a devoted loyalist joined the “light” of the colonists in order to fight the “darkness” of Mau Mau fighters. Mugo, a recent convert to Christianity believed that the Mau Mau fighters were agents of death and the best response was to kill them (Branch, 2007).

Poverty, hunger, illiteracy, and a sense of powerlessness drained the energy for resistance among some and they closed over to join the colonists for mere survival (Kershaw, 1997). Acts of perpetrators among the loyalists also known as Home Guards included rape, various forms of sexual assault, among others (Elkins, 2005). Archival data aligned with my field interviews and confirmed the results discussed above.

In summary, I divided the narratives into three sections above. Part I described the research participants experience with reciprocal internecine violence. Part II described the research participants understanding of justice and its absence and part III discussed their understanding of forgiveness and trauma healing dominated by the absence of both. Eleven people out of the 14 research participants are still waiting for some sort of justice and as a result are unable to fathom how forgiveness could look like in their circumstances. Three research participants were loyalists and did not join the KLFA forces and claimed that some form of justice was received. The sentiments expressed by the three loyalists were consistent with archival sources addressing native loyalists role in the war of independence described above. (Branch, 2007). The wide chasms between justice, forgiveness and trauma healing could be addressed, a discussion that continues in the next chapter where various recommendations were made including contributions to the field of conflict analysis.
Chapter 5 – Discussion Conclusions and Recommendations

Discussion

Following the results chapter, I now turn to a discussion on the alignment between these results and the literature review in chapter 2. Affirmations, gaps and inconsistencies were identified where they occurred. The focus in this section was on the themes in my research question: experience with reciprocal violence, understanding of justice, forgiveness and trauma healing or their absence. Towards the conclusion, I offered concluding reflections on restorative justice, recommendations and contributions to the field of conflict analysis and resolution.

Experience with reciprocal violence

The literature review highlighted the role of dehumanization, hatred and structural violence in promoting intra-group violence. Research Participant 02, Mr. Wambugu described his castration experience in the hands of native loyalists as an act that totally humiliated and dehumanized him. This kind of violence seemed to align with Maiese’s (2003) description of dehumanizing acts. The diary of one unnamed colonial soldier detailing the counting and naming of of body parts of dead KLFA members described by Foulds (2011) was consistent with RP 02’s experiences. These dehumanizing acts among other reasons provoked KLFA fighters and their followers to take the oath and carry out similar atrocities against the other side. The imbalance of power and resources between the two sides gave advantage to the colonists and hence the countering oathing measures
became the cement of loyalty and bravery that enabled the KLFA to face the enemy; raising the stakes resulting to more bloodshed as the cycle of revenge continued.

In reciprocal violence, the amount of mental and psychological distance seemed to relate with the degree of increased violence. A wider gap meant extreme violence while a shorter one did the opposite (Browning, 1998; Dower, 1998; Semelin, 2007; Harris, 1954; Kelman and Hamilton, 1993). For example, Mr. Gicheha, (P 03 G) was almost shot to death twice by a colonial police officer, a Tanzanian national who had been forcibly recruited to work in Kenya. Given the psychological distance as a foreign fighter from another country, the possibilities of employing intense violent treatment on the natives was high. The small gap between the loyalists and KLFA fighters and supporters was not fully addressed in the literature in order to account for the intense reciprocal violence between the two sides. This could also explain the degree of ambivalence and why some natives took the oath secretly but also served the interests of the colonists as loyalists. More research in this area could assist in determining whether the conflict morphed back into a dormant stage given the inability to achieve the desired justice outcomes and how conflict transformation principles could be applied to address potential future eruption.

An overwhelming majority of the research participants (11 out of 14) tied their experience with reciprocal violence directly to the dehumanizing treatment they faced. For example, following the three massacres (Lari, Chuka and Hola) revenge acts especially in Lari took a total inhuman and extremely hateful dimension including public hangings of alleged perpetrators at Githunguri market without a fair and just trial process.
The literature review data did not address the question whether a perpetrator with shared human capacities with the victim could possibly generate empathy for his victim in reciprocal violence and the impact of such a dynamic. Exaggerated “otherness” could probably eliminate such a possibility.

The full dimension of reciprocal violence could be best summarized by identifying the various forms of violent acts. Some have already been identified elsewhere and once again listed here: detention, torture, rape, castration, starvation, forced hard manual labor, oathing, sexual exploitation, forcible relocation and public hangings to dissuade others from joining the Mau Mau warfighters. The literature reviewed was overwhelmingly silent in addressing these acts as crimes against humanity while ironically similar crimes happening elsewhere around the world were identified as such lending credence to the selective memories and the so-called “single story” that was being told by those with the power and influence at the time. For example, Hitchcock and Twedt in an edited volume by Totten (2009) described the harsh realities of colonization, genocide, poverty and extrajudicial killings by the colonial forces in other parts of the world except Africa. As a result of the reciprocal violence, the natives of central Kenya had limited resources, lack of self-determination and were not included in making any policies by the colonists until the pre-independence period where self-interests in a post colonial environment forced the colonists to negotiate with soon to be native leaders in an effort to guarantee colonists’ security and property.

Colonists granted recognition to some native loyalists while invalidating those who opposed them. This process of dividing a homogeneous people group set the stage for dehumanization and further fragmentation of the native sense of community discussed
under literature review (Foulds, 2011 and Moshman, 2007). As a result, the “us” and “them” construct was exaggerated to the advantage of the colonists. The destructive results of the triad (dehumanization, hatred and structural violence) accelerated intragroup reciprocal violence through intractable cycles of brutality. Research participants expressed the constraints placed on them forcing most to search for alternatives. For example, the massive oathing rituals could be partly understood as their means for self-empowerment, cementing loyalty and galvanizing self-determination.

The Gikuyu people felt that they had been deprived of their basic means of survival in their own homeland. If genocide is the “deliberate and systematic destruction of racial, political, social, religious, or cultural group by the state (Tottem, 2009, p.420); indigenous groups have consistently been the primary victims of genocide. International justice systems failed the Kenyans just like they did elsewhere in Africa for not designating the deaths of close to 100,000 people and tens of thousands more detainees and victims of extreme physical brutality a genocide (Elkins, 2005). The apparent claim for civilizing the “dark continent” led to unknown human suffering whose consequences are still felt today. The dominant literature on the subject was also a product of western scholars; some of them seemed to propagate the same biases espoused by colonists (Branch, 2003). Reciprocal violence in the eyes of my research participants was imposed on them by the colonists and turned households, families and neighbors against each other.

Understanding justice

Justice in the eyes of the KLFA veterans and survivors simply meant land redistribution. While this definition might seem rigid, understanding the spiritual,
economic and social connection that the Gikuyu people attributed to their soil could help appreciate their deep attachment to it. The overwhelming number of research participants who have lived with the fresh awareness of not having received justice was evidenced by their raw emotions that surfaced during the interviews considering that it had been 50 years since the conflict actively terminated. This reflection was consistent with current literature on historicized and memorialized violence to the extent of such becoming a chosen trauma (Levin and Rabrenovic, 2004; Volkan, 1998). It was instructive to note that the ancient hatred theory (Schwartz, 2005) was inconsistent with patterns of intra-group reciprocal violence since native communities existed as one homogeneous unit prior to the colonists’ arrival and did not seem to have residual hatred in their midst to stoke such a high level of intra-group violence.

The emerging story of the absence of justice, forgiveness and trauma healing could have a direct bearing on succeeding generations despite being emotionally distanced from the story of past suffering and pain borne by their grandparents. While structural violence theory (Galtung, 1971) might help explain the inter-generational sense of impairment, it is another important area for future research to evaluate how invested or disinterested younger generations could be with the unfinished work of justice, forgiveness and trauma healing. The old narrative may be disappearing with the elderly owners but potentially leaving behind emotional and psychological deposits with succeeding generations.

Current loyalist survivors who own large parcels of land seem rather removed from the injustices and the socio-economic gap existing between them and the KLFA
survivors despite of their familiarity with the contested narratives of justice between both sides. Majority of the loyalist survivors turned to Christianity following their conversion and close ties to the colonial affiliated missionaries. This raised the question whether religion was employed by the colonists to manipulate and pacify the natives in the light of dehumanizing colonial injustices. Most of the loyalist survivors now find themselves sharing the same houses of worship with KLFA survivors. However, according to my research participants, the pseudo-forgiveness that happened blocked real possibilities for the demands of justice to be fulfilled probably followed by genuine co-existence with or without forgiveness.

Findings in this study caution against pseudo-forgiveness and challenge the assumptions that forgiveness results into a sense of fulfillment or trauma healing. There is also a greater need to understand how problematic the terminologies like forgiveness and trauma healing present. The native Gikuyu people may not necessarily shared the same meaning with the western oriented words and hence the need to seek a localized meaning. For example, collective co-existence might not have required forgiveness to happen first. According to my research participants, forgiveness to them does not mean the same thing between the two groups. For most victims, forgiveness in the absence of justice was considered a “dirty word”. Findings in this study challenge restorative justice literature in that where offenders, victims and the community were unwilling to come together to address the harm, no readily alternatives were offered to those who lived “in-between” zones of unreadiness to face the other side. For example, Zehr’s definition of restorative justice might be inadequate in the light of these research findings. He offered the following definition:
“crime is a violation of people and relationships. It creates obligations to make
things right. Justice involves the victim, the offender, and the community in a
search for solutions which promote repair, reconciliation and reassurance”. (Zehr,

Research participants overwhelmingly affirmed that no amount of verbal claims
of forgiveness or dialogue without tangible justice where soil was restored to them could
ever meet their deepest needs of a just reparation of what they lost. Their definition of
justice and soil restoration seemed inseparable since the soil was not only viewed as their
most valuable asset but rather a spiritual heritage that could not be treated as a trade
commodity. Land as noted earlier was the tangible sign of the circle of life. In it, the
community was nourished, sheltered and when life transitions to the next phase, the body
rested back in the soil offering the comfort and protection. The term “soil” communicates
deep spiritual and socio-economic roots with each generation required to pass it on to the
next without selling or trading it for money. With this understanding, not even the highly
valued understanding of forgiveness (Tutu, 2000) seemed able to persuade my research
participants. Righting the wrong could not be considered without tangible return of the
soil. While I am not offering a rejectionist approach to restorative justice, I offer that
there are some significant hybrid indigenous practices that could make restorative
justice relevant and effective. Two loyalist research participants stated that they were not
ready to self-identify and come forward for a face to face encounter with KLFA veterans.
Only one research participant out of fourteen indicated willingness to participate in a
restorative justice process. The same case was true for KLFA veterans who committed
atrocities and harms against their fellow Gikuyu native loyalists; they were not ready or
willing to openly admit the harms they caused the other side in reciprocal revenge. With such a stance, Zehr (2008) definition of restorative justice where the victim, offender and the community work together is problematic.

Restorative justice seemed to offer no clear way forward when parties are not ready or willing to engage in a mutual search for justice. To fill this gap, I recommend the Gikuyu harmony building process also referred to as consensus building where parties collectively re-defined “justice” which both sides could accept. Verbal acknowledgement could be the first step followed by a grassroots owned process in partnership with a non-government sponsored settlement scheme with low cost housing and shared farming areas. This move could help build further collaboration and working together by the two sides. Since monetary reparations would be insufficient to provide the required resources to meet the demands of justice as defined by the victims, a collaborative process could be the best option with optimal results for all. The reality of fear among the KLFA veterans who are disappearing fast without recognition or a sense of justice in their lives was a consistent powerful emotion among the research participants. All expressed disappointment but with the hope that their children could some day be recipients of the justice that eluded them for a lifetime. While the literature amplifies the importance of closure in trauma healing, the research participants seemed to care more about justice than trauma healing.

With the understanding that justice was the most critical missing element in the lives of the Mau Mau war survivors, stakeholders could mutually build a hybrid indigenous restorative justice process. As a forum for national catharsis, this process
could provide a platform for difficult stories to be narrated for the very first time in public. Traditional elders and probably other trusted public officials could offer a non-judgmental listening ear and thereby allowing the participants to walk away feeling heard. A national dialogue of respect and honoring individuals who suffered untold atrocities could bring great relief in their prime old age.

The stories could offer a stack reminder to the privileged elite class that a high price was paid by the freedom fighters who perished during the war and that survivors were dishonored and unrecognized despite their heroic sacrifices. Even with their advanced age, injecting a sense of honor, recognition, self-determination and empowerment could make a small difference in their psychological wellness and probably open the possibility for a re-defined definition for justice where soil was not the only option.

**Understanding forgiveness and trauma healing and their absence**

Forgiveness has not been possible for the majority KLFA veterans and the native loyalists. These findings also questioned the notion that forgiveness is a choice (Schiraldi and Kerr, 2002). Victims had no choice or the power to influence justice. Their choice for justice over forgiveness highlighted an important conflict analysis principle while working with parties in post-conflict environments. The delivery of justice or the lack thereof could influence the stakeholders understanding of forgiveness and trauma healing.

Vamik Volkan (2004) posits that a group has the capacity to be traumatized without the benefit of psychologically processing the trauma. This could result into an intergenerational trauma transmission process impacting succeeding generations. The
specific community traumatic event could then become the “chosen trauma”, a symbolic permanent fixture for the entire community or ethnic group. The psychological consequences for succeeding generations could lead to renewed tensions and more violence due to a deep sense of shame, humiliation and unfulfilled justice. Researchers of conflict analysis could do more work in this area to mitigate the concerns for potential future conflicts based on a particular “chosen trauma”.

The collective trauma following the Mau Mau war atrocities seemed to have resided among the survivors, victims and perpetrators. The degree of suffering unleashed on each side could be permanently edged in their collective psyche for generations to come. Whether this could become an incubator for a future explosive reciprocal violence or not is not easily predictable. However, a future intra-group reciprocal violence of this proportion could be prevented. Lessons learned from South Africa following the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) suggested that the immediate need for addressing transitional justice issues and the opportunity to mourn and acknowledge the loses could have a direct relationship with the creation of a chosen trauma or not. Public acknowledgement of wrongs without the implementation of practical steps to address long-term holistic injustices seemed insufficient. Decades later, the degree of mistrust and socio-economic realities between the two sides in South Africa have not been completely eliminated evidenced by impoverishment in the South African black community. The dehumanization, shame and humiliation seemed to have lasting negative effects (Volkan, 2007). The heavy task of finding better processes that could lead to better outcomes lies on the shoulders of conflict analysis practitioners in order to overcome past flaws of truth and reconciliation processes that have failed elsewhere. I now turn to a more detailed
discussion about restorative justice including an offer to consider a hybrid African and western contextualized indigenous process.

**Conclusions**

A hybrid of African and western restorative justice model could provide a new path towards a fresh narrative of hope in order to break the current longterm stalemate of dissatisfaction by both sides in this conflict. A mutual collaborative process defined and owned by the stakeholders could change their current rigid definitions of justice. A process created and nurtured by the stakeholders could offer the best chance for implementation. Western understanding of restorative justice offers a strong starting point but requires contextualization with native justice processes for it to remain relevant and applicable to the Kenyan context and probably elsewhere in Africa.

Braithwaite (1999) traced the genesis of restorative justice among the ancient Arab, Greek and Roman civilizations. In Europe, German communities held public justice seeking gatherings understood to be restorative. Hindu communities in India were also credited for restorative justice practices dating back to the Vedic civilizations between 6000 and 2000 B.C. Gandhi’s philosophy of truth and non-violence could also be linked to some aspects of restorative justice. The Dalai Lama advocacy for forgiveness in place of revenge echoes the same theme of restoring the offender and making a bad situation better for the victim and the offender (Braithwaite, 1999). In Africa, Nabudere and Velthuizen (2013) traced restorative justice among the Egyptians, Ugandans, Rwandans, and even South Africans.
Zehr offered the following definition of restorative justice: "Restorative justice is a process that involves, to the extent possible, those who have a stake in a specific offense and could collectively identify and address harms, needs, and obligations, in order to heal and put things as right as possible…” (Zehr, 2002, p.37). Restorative justice generates self-empowerment for the victim, and accountability for the perpetrator focusing on a new understanding of the harms while the community’s involvement ensured that the perpetrator did not repeat the harm. It’s instructive to note that within African collective societies, the terms “perpetrator” and “victim” may not have the same assumed western definitions noted here from western scholars. Establishing the local definitions and meaning is a critical starting point.

De Beus and Rodriguez (2007) widened the definition further by stating that restorative justice flows in three successive steps; (1) acceptance that crime is a violation, (2) understanding that a violation creates obligation, (3) acceptance that reparation fulfills the obligation. The assumption is that once the harms, needs and obligations have been met, parties could start moving towards a better outcome in their conflict. The victim and the offender as primary actors preferably in a face-to-face session fulfill the above obligations. There is recognition that there are some circumstances where meeting physically might be counterproductive; for example, when parties are not emotionally, spiritually and psychologically ready to meet. The role of the community in sustaining the healing of the victim as well as building accountability measures for the offender to prevent re-offending is vital.
In reciprocal intra-group violence discussed in this research, perpetrators and victims articulated a definition of justice that focused on the soil as the single reparation that could open the door for forgiveness and healing. It is possible that a real dialogue has never taken place between the victims and perpetrators in an effort to consider other possible options for an understanding of justice that does not exclusively focus on soil as problematic as this might be. The current definition of restorative justice assumes that stakeholders are always willing and able to accept that a crime or offense has been committed and as a result creating an obligation for the perpetrator.

Research participants on both sides did not express a sense of readiness for a restorative justice process. Two unanswered questions emerged from the restorative justice literature in relationship to this research: In a case where stakeholders are not ready for the process and the conflict is not ripe for restorative justice, what options do parties have? Second, for stakeholders trapped in strict definitions of obligations and justice, what alternatives if any could help close the gap and move them closer to a shared understanding of obligations and justice? Current restorative justice literature does not seem to address these questions specifically within the native/indigenous environments.

According to Zehr (2002), restorative justice invites all stakeholders to have a shared description of the harm or wrong. For this research, the harm done was the systematic torture, brutal abuse and murder among other structural violence based crimes directly attributed to the British colonial rule in Kenya. Hundreds of thousands of acreage of the best productive lands were forcibly occupied while enslaving the natives in the process.
As for the victims, the entire Gikuyu ethnic group and other Kenyan communities were the victims of this crime. It could be a complicated task to describe the offender especially since the native loyalists who aligned with the colonialists were themselves victims of structural violence. However, according to the restorative justice literature, the colonists’ expanding their “empire” could be considered as the primary offenders. As for the concerned community, this might include the KLFA veterans, loyalist survivors and succeeding generations today.

Based on my research participants, acknowledging the harm within context of intra-group violence without attributing blame to each other could be a difficult but necessary step. The appetite for reparations by way of restoration of their soil seemed to have drowned any other voices that might have been proponents of traditional restorative justice. Zehr (2002) was right in stating that restorative justice sought to address the harms where the offenders acknowledged their role in causing the agony, hurt and in this case loss of life. However, in a case where offenders are not willing to step forward and take responsibility, victims could potentially be left without options and could result into a prolonged period of stalemate with no closure as observed among the research participants in this study.

The 2012 Mau Mau litigation case at a central London High Court probably derailed a prime opportunity for restorative justice as majority of the KLFA veterans who were not compensated are now gathering fresh efforts to seek monetary compensations from the British government. This effort seemed to have pushed aside any other means of alternative justice besides retributive. As anticipated, the cost of the lawsuit and the funds paid out to the lawyers drained most of the compensation funds leaving the claimants
with even greater disappointment. Western restorative justice promises to meet the most needs of both the victim and the offender, a necessary step in large scale wrongdoing. This was demonstrated in a study conducted by Mark Umbreit whose findings were published in 2002 offering seven conclusions about restorative justice:

1. Crime is defined by parties as an offense against human relationships.
2. Victims and the community are central to justice processes.
3. The first priority of justice processes is to assist victims.
4. The second priority is to restore the community, to the degree possible.
5. The offender has personal responsibility to victims and to the community for crimes committed.
6. Stakeholders share responsibilities for restorative justice through partnerships for action.
7. The offender will develop improved competency and understanding as a result of the restorative justice experience.

The community centric approach and shared ownership aligned closely to the native understanding of justice (Nabudere and Velthuizen, 2013). For the KLFA veterans and survivors, the opportunity is not completely lost since the immediate dissatisfaction with the retributive justice process could probably move the stakeholders into a state of readiness and willingness to seek a better path towards a re-defined meaning of justice. The answer potentially lies in a contextualized hybrid restorative justice process that could be richly informed by Umbreit’s seven findings listed above. As noted earlier the challenge with this framing of restorative justice in this particular case remained with the unwilling perpetrators and victims who are not ready to engage in a restorative justice
process. The prolonged stalemate between KLFA veterans and Loyalists suggested that there are limitations with restorative justice unless a new hybrid model was built within a contextualized process to address the gaps.

Zehr (2002) offered four important considerations that complement Umbreit (2002) seven steps in order to address the needs of victims. First, information is critical. In this research, if the loyalists provided the reasons why and how they thought that by serving the interests of the colonists’ could have accelerated the goal for independence without bloodshed, it might have opened dialogue focused on establishing the truth. A face to face encounter, if possible could provide the best setting for sharing information. Second, truth-telling regardless of the emotional pain re-experienced in the process, is a necessary step. Zehr stated that “re-storying” by the victims is necessary so that offenders could hear afresh about the harm caused and in this particular research, followed by the reciprocal revenge factor. Third, empowerment could be regained in this process where victims in search for answers met offenders to address the facts and a mutual establishment of who bore the most responsibility. Fourth, restitution or vindication could allow the offender the opportunity to right the wrongs and take responsibility for the offense. The major challenge lies in the “how” of righting the wrongs especially in cases where land may not be available or offered to the KLFA veterans and survivors. With the willingness to work together, it could be possible that other means for meeting the justice requirement not necessarily by land could be found.

Johnstone (2002) used the term, “restorative cautioning” to highlight a practice where offenders agree to meet with victims and their families. Such a meeting could be facilitated by elders in the community. There are six objectives for the meeting:
confronting the offender, hearing the offender’s story, an opportunity for the offender to promise and commit to a new lifestyle free of the offense, apology, allowing the victim opportunity to tell the offender his/her story and if possible, encourage the victim to consider forgiveness. This definition is problematic in its heavy emphasis on “offender” terminology that has the potential to open wide the door for blaming the other side. The Gacaca restorative justice process in Rwanda following the genocide in 1994 remains a model for a hybrid and contextualized process that included some of the elements offered by Johnstone but with a native interpretive approach. Restorative cautioning could be reworked to fit within the cultural and native traditions in order to create a forum where trust is promoted and all sides could feel safe to dialogue with one another.

I question the appropriateness of what seemed to be a rushed process to get the perpetrator unburdened by a simple verbal apology as stated by Johnson above. Given the history and intractable nature of this conflict, patience and endurance are required for all participants. Rushing through the steps should be avoided in order to prevent pseudo-forgiveness. Based on the research participants responses, any process that could address the gap created by the attachment to soil and the reality of the soil not being returned to the native owners could open up an important dialogue that needs to happen.

As for the requirements of the community, the entire Gikuyu community of central Kenya could be involved in a process that acknowledged the harms created and the desire for mutual accountability. The community could commit to provide the nurture and care for the victims and offenders. The community could play an important role in re-building broken relationships and restoring healthy relationships that in time could transform the shared narratives between the victims and the offenders. Johnstone (2002) concurred with
Zehr (2002) regarding the importance of balancing the needs for victims, perpetrators and society. Zehr (2002) captured the essence of restorative justice and reiterated that in violent encounters including reciprocal violence, people and relationships are violated. These violations create obligations to right the wrongs. Mutually acknowledged obligations could signal a shared definition of justice. While Zehr and Johnstone’s principles provided a solid process that could yield positive results, until the perpetrators are willing to step forward and take responsibility, and the victims are ready to hear them out; moving forward could still be problematic. Unfortunately such a stalemate delays the possibilities for finding justice and probably closure.

Despite the noted limitations, a hybrid contextualized restorative justice could provide the best opportunity for addressing past wounds and the hope for initiating justice, forgiveness and potentially the healing process. Meeting the tangible (soil) and the intangible (psychological, social, emotional) needs of victims could restore their humanness. Shriver (2005) offered invitation to adopt a vision of collective repentance and apology as a response to the atrocities committed against the Native Americans and African Americans. A similar parallel for the United Kingdom, where surviving colonists’ could initiate collective admission of responsibility for the wrongs committed might open a new understanding of the intra-group violence and blame attribution. Collective admission of wrongdoing and a desire to right the wrongs could change the narrative of historic injustices, severe violence and large scale wrongdoing.

Unfortunately, for the KLFA veterans and the native loyalists, that journey is yet to begin and the number of survivors dwindles by the day. Australia’s apology to the entire Aboriginal people could serve as a model for taking a first step, not so much in
meeting the demands of justice, but in a re-storying process with acceptance for wrong-doing. This could eventually lead to an admission of responsibility and a mutual search for what could satisfy the demands of justice. The apology offered by Prime Minister Kevin Rudd in 2008 contained a hopeful message for all stakeholders trapped in historic injustices. A partial quote of the apology follows:

“...Until we fully confront that truth, there will always be a shadow hanging over us and our future as a fully united and fully reconciled people. It is time to reconcile. It is time to recognise the injustices of the past. It is time to say sorry. It is time to move forward together. To the stolen generations, I say the following: as Prime Minister of Australia, I am sorry. On behalf of the government of Australia, I am sorry. On behalf of the parliament of Australia, I am sorry. I offer you this apology without qualification. We apologise for the hurt, the pain and suffering that we, the parliament, have caused you by the laws that previous parliaments have enacted. We apologise for the indignity, the degradation and the humiliation these laws embodied. We offer this apology to the mothers, the fathers, the brothers, the sisters, the families and the communities whose lives were ripped apart by the actions of successive governments under successive parliaments. In making this apology, I would also like to speak personally to the members of the stolen generations and their families: to those here today, so many of you; to
those listening across the nation—from Yuendumu, in the central west of the Northern Territory, to Yabara, in North Queensland, and to Pitjantjatjara in South Australia.

I know that, in offering this apology on behalf of the government and the parliament, there is nothing I can say today that can take away the pain you have suffered personally.

Whatever words I speak today, I cannot undo that.

Words alone are not that powerful; grief is a very personal thing.

I ask those non-Indigenous Australians listening today who may not fully understand why what we are doing is so important to imagine for a moment that this had happened to you.

I say to honourable members here present: imagine if this had happened to us. Imagine the crippling effect. Imagine how hard it would be to forgive.

My proposal is this: if the apology we extend today is accepted in the spirit of reconciliation in which it is offered, we can today resolve together that there be a new beginning for Australia.

And it is to such a new beginning that I believe the nation is now calling us...” (Rudd, 2008, pp.3-4).

Words have power and a similar expression of national admission of guilt by the colonists’ and post-colonial native governments. Such an act could have probably changed the understanding of justice among perpetrators and victims in Kenya’s war of independence. The 2013 Kenya Truth and Justice Reconciliation Commission
recommended a similar admission of wrongs pertaining to historic injustices and unfortunately the government of Kenya, two years later, seems to lack political willingness for its implementation. As noted earlier, consensus building could potentially allow the two sides to acknowledge that co-existence was the only life they knew prior to the advent of the colonists’. A dialogue on what could be the new elements of this co-existence even without the fulfillment of the demands of justice could probably move both sides towards a better place of acknowledgement and accountability than the current perpetual stalemate.

The illustration found in appendix B highlights five recommended steps for practitioners and researchers as a hybrid, contextualized native reciprocal justice roadmap. In step 1, harm was initiated by the violent reciprocal violence inflicting physical and emotional wounds. Step 2, introduces the Gikuyu consensus building process similar to the Rwandan Gacaca Courts process, the Egyptian Ma’at process and Ubuntu philosophy from South Africa. Through a consensus building process, the parties in the conflict could confront their fear and rehumanize each other. After more than five decades of co-existence without any meaningful engagement or dialogue, step 3 could bring much needed relief by an acknowledgement of wrong doing, apology and a mutual truth telling and a re-storying of what actually happened. Participants could be encouraged to spend as much time as they need in any one of these steps. Step 4 could introduce restorative justice principles including tangible expressions that might include soil or non-soil options like introducing a community settlement where low cost housing and shared farmland provided by the government for victims and perpetrators alike could meet the urgent need of shelter and food. The critical work of non-tangible reparations that could
repair emotional harm and initiate good will could be major reinforcements for this process. The Acholi community of Northern Uganda practice of Mato Oput where parties sip together a bitter extract from a calabash demonstrated the shared bitterness and signaled the readiness to forgive and move on. Concepts of forgiveness adopted from African traditional religions and Christianity could also be applied where appropriate and in agreement with the parties.

Step 5 could then initiate the hard work of forgiveness, reconciliation and trauma healing. Based on my experience with the research participants, steps 3, 4 and 5 could probably take the longest time but with the most impact. Co-existence is a much longer process that could be initiated through step 5 with positive intergenerational outcomes. The definitions as noted elsewhere could be problematic especially where parties might use terminologies that may not carry the same meaning as generally understood in the English language and included here. Finding out what the local terminologies are and using them could offer best results. Appendix C shows the same illustration offered by Steele (2008) and the destructive nature of what could be a never ending cycle of violence and revenge.

**Recommendations**

The process of re-storying the experiences of my research participants in their search for justice, forgiveness and healing was critical because,…narratives are useful in research precisely because storytellers interpret the past rather than reproduce it as it was. The “truths” of narrative accounts are not in their faithful representations of a past world, but in the shifting
connections they forge among past, present, and future. They offer storytellers a way to re-imagine lives as narratives do for nations, organizations, ethnic/racial and other groups forming collective identities. (Riessman, 2003, p.6).

It is in the same spirit of linking the past, present and future that I offer the following eight recommendations:

First, there is an urgent need for identifying the authentic and genuine victims and perpetrators in contested narratives. The aging process and poor health among the perpetrators and victims continues to make this goal challenging by the day. As the veterans of the Mau Mau war continue to die, the identity of authentic stakeholders could continue to be contested. As a result, the construction of the meaning of justice by third and fourth generation could be different and probably diluted because of the experiential and emotional distance with direct reciprocal violence. This recommendation aligns with the need to harness and nurture the re-storying process for a larger indigenous pool in order to validate the results noted in my rather smaller pool of participants. In this study, the research participants understanding and experiences with justice, forgiveness and trauma healing and their absences highlighted their re-imagined environments and their capacity to address intra-group violence. They accomplished to a degree what Lederach termed as three paradoxes: expression of the past, a place for truth and mercy, and creating time and place for justice and peace, (Lederach, 2008, p.20). Truth and mercy and a place for justice became the bridge that interconnected the separation caused by reciprocal violence, failed justice, unforgiveness and unhealed trauma. The re-humanization process through justice first, could open possibilities for forgiveness and
trauma healing. The narratives revealed more of the absence of justice and the impossibilities of forgiveness and the need to redefine the meaning of justice. While the awareness and presence of trauma was acknowledged, it remained a distant third and of least concern to the research participants.

Second, there is a critical need for including perpetrators in all intervention strategies as a re-humanizing process. In this study, perpetrators expressed their immediate and deep seated need for re-defining justice before anything else could be considered (Horkheimer, 1982). Three research participants by self admission played the perpetrator role and emphasized that their voices needed to be heard and their contributions acknowledged in the effort to prevent future reciprocal violence. Direct engagement and sharing of experiences with perpetrators and victims could open up pathways to mutual understanding and shared need for trauma healing while identifying stumbling blocks to the same (Rothschild, 2000). Perpetrator recovery from trauma could be one of the keys to disrupting future cycles of intergroup violence following their sense of humanization and an opportunity to right past wrongs. Holistic healing strategies may never be complete without a clear understanding of perpetrator motivations. The outcomes of this research could create new avenues towards individual and community wellness considerations (Rothschild, 2010). Kofi Annan, former United Nations Secretary General offered mediation and transformation of conflicts by focusing on shared human capacities, an approach that could be viewed as contextualized and hybrid. Annan also highlighted the power of tolerance, human dignity and equality while speaking the truth to power (Annan, 2012). In my experience with research participants, I
found perpetrators with a desire to reach harmony with others for mutual benefits; however, victims did not readily share the same sense of readiness to engage.

Third, there is a need for education at all levels in order to fill critical gaps of understanding and prevent reciprocal violence. For example, a fresh understanding of dehumanization, hatred and structural violence and how these three worked together to degrade the livelihoods of native populations through colonialism could create an attribution shift and blaming. Learning the root causes for the reciprocal violence that caused the harm is an important part of the re-storied narrative. Grassroots truth telling forums under the banner of educating younger generations could offer opportunities to perpetrators and victims interested with a redemptive re-storying process. The ability to be heard and for others to listen could plant the seeds for tolerance and peaceful coexistence. This could also be simply started by families interested with intra-family dialogue at the village level to learn more about what happened. Five decades of blaming and avoiding one another have not rendered any benefits for both sides. Involving the third and fourth generations from both sides of this conflict and listening to their newly created narratives could help shape their themes of justice and revenge in order to prevent future violent conflict. Addressing the past harms and even in the absence of land re-distribution could assist in creating new narratives with a mutual desire and commitment to prevent future reciprocal violence.

Fourth, the need for hybrid, contextualized native restorative justice processes at the grassroots level where narratives are shared, injustices addressed among all stakeholders cannot be overstated. The research findings in this study offer local and regional perspectives where stakeholders could implement indigenous justice practices
before seeking forgiveness, reconciliation or trauma healing. For example, the work of Umbreit (2000) and Zehr (2001, 2002) shares some significant common ground with Egypt’s Ma’at justice process, Gikuyu community consensus building approach and the Acholi of Uganda Mato O’put practice (Kinyanjui, 2009; Manning, 2012, Ogora, 2009). The recently published Kenya’s Truth Reconciliation and Justice Commission report of 2013 provided examples on why perpetrator and victim needs for justice, forgiveness, and trauma healing are a critical step in building lasting and just peace across post-conflict environments. While the report runs into thousands of pages, its practical implementation and direct benefits to the victims and perpetrators remains in doubt. The timeline of recommended steps is close to 2 years late pointing to the absence of willingness by the government to commence the work of implementation.

Grassroots processes like the Gacaca process in Rwanda, Ma’at process of Egypt, Ma’to Oput of Uganda and the Gikuyu consensus building hold much promise than national level processes that seem to create frustration and dissatisfaction among the stakeholders. The work of Umbreit and Zehr finds important common ground with the African models cited above in order to create an African and western model. If successful, this could offer the desired results for transforming reciprocal violence, delivery of justice, followed by a possible re-storied co-existence.

Fifth, soil may never be available for all KLFA veterans and their families and hence the need to re-define justice without soil. Finding a creative and honoring intangible process could loosen the current rigid understanding and definition of justice. The need to re-define the meaning of justice and how that might look like minus land will be necessary. Establishing a process where the Gikuyu community could collectively
accept past wrongs and restore respect, dignity and lost honor to those who suffered the most could be achieved with a degree of effort by all the stakeholders. With Kenya’s population growth projected to grow at 1 million a year, land will continue to be a scarce commodity and a potential source for intra and inter-group conflict unless effectively managed.

The sixth recommendation is closely related to the third one but goes further in recommending participatory action research where a focused outreach with non-monetary recognitions that could play a major role in honoring the survivors of the Mau Mau war. Communities of faith, philanthropists and people of goodwill could join efforts and lead the way while challenging the government to rise up to its moral obligations. For example, a low cost healthcare bursary fund could cater for the elderly perpetrators and victims health needs at no cost. The government could also set aside funds for a limited monetary compensation that could be invested in setting aside monthly vouchers that could be redeemed for basic food supplies and clothing. Another non-monetary option that requires the will of the government is an unequivocal public apology to all those who suffered untold atrocities.

The Australian apology discussed earlier provided an example that introduced new themes of recognition and peaceful co-existence. A recent effort to build a monument honoring the Mau Mau Commander-in-Chief Dedan Kimathi as well as the renaming of a national holiday from the first president to a “hero’s day” recognizing the freedom fighters were small but important first steps. Restoration of honor and appreciation for all Kenyans who suffered, died and lost everything to free the country from the jaws of colonialism could encourage nationalism while reducing tribalism.
A final important recommendation addresses the systemic cycle of intra/inter-group violence between different communities in Kenya every five years during the general elections. The main grievances in the past were usually directly linked to unfair distribution of resources more than ethnic differences. Historic injustices primarily land related, have continued to be the fuel that keeps the fires of reciprocal violence burning. Grassroots citizen driven action from all sectors across Kenya could do well in addressing regional historic justice issues surrounding what is still claimed to be native lands. A hybrid, contextualized native indigenous restorative justice process at the grassroots could produce enduring results (see summary below).

Perceptions of injustice could be diminished while ensuring an equitable distribution of resources. Matters of forgiveness and trauma healing for victims and perpetrators of intra-group reciprocal violence could be easily navigable once the historic justice questions have been adequately addressed. Integrating faith communities in these processes could add value to the process given the current capital religious influences seem to hold in Kenya and the rest of Africa. A locally re-defined justice process created mutually by the victims and perpetrators alike remains the best hope for indigenous communities in Kenya, the rest of Africa and beyond. The following diagram briefly defines five processes that could be utilized to create a cross-cultural restorative justice, a hybrid from both African and western approaches. All five systems seem to embrace community, truth telling, accountability, mutual understanding and shared restoration among the stakeholders. Engaging local actors on the ground could add most value especially with creating appropriate translations across multiple languages and dialects.
### African and Western (cross-cultural) hybrid restorative justice process proposal

|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| The elders (Kiama) at the lowest village level built consensus/mediate disputes **to keep the community in harmony.** There is no offence that was not punishable or could not be compensated. **Perpetrators always belonged.** For example, P08 Yakiyo, in reference to a sexual assault offense said; “Mundu ni witu no ni nyamu” (He still belongs; but he is like a wild animal right now) | Ancient Egypt’s “connective justice” known as “Ma’at” translated to **truth, order and balance.** These three governed right relationships between individuals and communities/whil e making harmonious community life possible | The practice emphasized **community ownership and participation in taking responsibility for the wrong.** After reparations, stakeholders (a bitter root extract) served in a calabash using long straws to symbolize **shared bitterness & a sign of restored broken relationships** | - **seeking forgiveness**  
- Accountability for wrongdoing.  
These cannot be ignored in Africa today given the **growth of religious groups and African traditional religions.** | - Human relationships  
- Community holistic wellness  
Accountability  
- Shared responsibilities  
- Seeking mutual understanding | - Sharing information  
- Truth telling  
- Empowerment of both sides  
Restitution |

**Summary:**

Summarized definition of a hybrid African and western restorative justice process is one that: (a). Embraces accountability for the perpetrator.  
(b). Encourages a locally defined justice with equivalent reparations/restitution. (c). Upholds truth telling and forgiveness.  
(d). Cultivates a deep sense of shared bitterness and belonging that promotes harmonious community life.  
(e). Fosters right relationships between individuals and communities where empowerment is nurtured and protected. Shared themes are in bold.
Contributions to the field of conflict analysis

This research offers three action steps to the field of conflict analysis and resolution:

First, justice precedes forgiveness in reciprocal violence according to my research participants (perpetrators and victims). As a result, practitioners and researchers in this field could make an enduring difference by investing in building well defined indigenous processes in partnership with local actors. Towards this end, the gap between theory and practice could be significantly diminished and as a result prevent reciprocal violence.

Second, an African and western based restorative justice owned and nurtured in the native habitats could produce enduring results. A collective effort among scholars utilizing the five systems identified above could muster the required accommodation and plurastic attributes when building a model for such a diverse target group. A definition of the proposed hybrid African and western restorative justice process is one that:

a). Embraces accountability for the perpetrator.
b). Encourages a locally defined justice with equivalent reparations/restitution
c). Upholds truth telling and forgiveness.
d). Cultivates a deep sense of shared bitterness and belonging that promotes harmonious community life.
e). Fosters right relationships between individuals and communities where empowerment is nurtured and protected.

Third, more indigenous field research is needed and seems to hold much promise in terms of building capacity and critical mass where narratives extended to multiple communities could remove the tag of “exclusive perpetrators” or “exclusive victims”.
The merging of multiple narratives where communities understand their connectedness and interdependency could encourage and motivate best practices for peaceful coexistence. Reciprocal justice could permanently replace reciprocal violence, establishing and maintaining the critical bridge needed to fully close the gap between theory and practice in the field of conflict analysis and resolution studies.
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Appendix A – Cycle of reciprocal revenge

This illustration shows an example of the steps that fuel and sustain reciprocal violence (Steele, 2008) discussed in chapter 2.
Appendix B – Cycle of a hybrid, contextualized native restorative justice process

This illustration shows an example of a path that could lead to forgiveness, reconciliation and possible trauma healing weaved from known native processes in Egypt, Uganda, Kenya, Rwanda and South Africa (Nabudere and Velthuizen, 2013).
Appendix C 1 - Interview Questions

1. Tell me about a significant episode that you remember during the Mau Mau war?
2. Describe what kind of person you were and the position you took during the Mau Mau war?
3. Describe who the enemy was and how he/she was identified?
4. What was your experience with revenge attacks during the war?
5. What purpose did revenge attacks serve and what was the impact then and today?
6. Could you name some of the harms you suffered, caused, or some that you personally witnessed during the Mau Mau war?
7. Could these harms be repaired and how?
8. What was your experience with trauma during the Mau Mau war?
9. What were the indigenous trauma healing resources available then and could they work today?
10. What was your understanding of the justice process during the conflict then and today?
11. What is your definition of forgiveness? Were you able to accept it or extend it to others?
12. What is the value of forgiveness in reciprocal revenge violent conflict?
13. What else do you wish to add about your story?
Appendix C 2 – Narrative Thematic Analysis Matrix

Interview questions
Focused on the research question

Research participant responses (audio recording made) & field notes

Member checking - onsite verification of field notes emerging themes for accuracy

1st audio transcription
2nd transcript review cross checking with field notes to add non-verbal additions
3rd transcript review with a 2nd full audio listening
Combine all emerging themes

Triangulation
Published data on the research subject, Kenya TJRC report of 2013 and Mau Mau Court Case proceedings in

Data interpreted, condensed and inserted in the results section (through lenses of Justice, forgiveness, trauma healing or absence)

Researcher data interpretive process (validity, bracketing, reliability, confirmability and dependability)
Appendix D – Psychological warfare pamphlet 1

This pamphlet carries a message calling upon the Mau Mau to surrender immediately and not to wait because waiting could only cost them more. It was a tactic to scare the KLFA.

Pamphlet source: Psywar.org Mau Mau
Appendix E Psychological warfare pamphlet II

The message in this pamphlet claims that KLFA was on the run and being defeated by the colonists. The dead body of General Matenjagwo on the left and the wounded captured General China is to the left. There is also a count of how many KLFA members have been killed, hanged and detained. The blue markings on the copy were in the original source document.

Mau Mau General Matenjagwo and wounded General China (Friedman, 2006, p.20)
Appendix F– Field Marshall Dedan Kimathi Wachiuri - Commander in Chief of the Kenya Land and Freedom Army, also known as the Mau Mau

Field Marshall Dedan Kimathi Wachiuri statue – Kimathi Street, Nairobi, Kenya


(Kenya Truth Justice Reconciliation Commission KTJRC)