

TOWARDS SUGGESTIONS FOR SOCIAL REINTEGRATION

9.1 INTRODUCTION

At this stage of reflecting on the outcomes of our research, it would have been usual to be making recommendations and drawing conclusions from our findings and analysis. However, this study, having employed an action research model, aimed to give something back to the community and ultimately contribute ideas on how to improve intervention practices. Also, the final research question of this study is directed at understanding how to use the findings related to the previous research questions to formulate suggestions that could inform practice. This chapter therefore addresses this final research question.

Other characteristics of action research, such as collaborative research and knowledge generation (Bray *et al.*, 2000), can already be recognized in our reflections thus far. In line with our action research methodology, we will now go a step further and determine an inductive, collaborative set of suggestions to improve intervention practices. In chapter 4, we showed that not every study can perform all of the elements of action research. The inductive, collaborative set of suggestions presented here come at the completion of what we consider to be only the half-way point of the cycle of research and are based on our NCPO analysis of the research findings described in chapter 8. The analyses were brought to a participants' workshop both to validate the research findings and to search for the above-mentioned set of suggestions to improve reintegration practices. The difference between our approach to developing these and that of most studies is that we make our suggestions on the basis of a bottom-up, inductive approach, relying on the voices of the participants in the study. Because of this, the data here looks like a 'presentation of findings'. Consequently, in this chapter we will first present the steps in the validation process before discussing the strategy for improving intervention practice, consisting of the suggestions to improve existing programmes, the suggested components of reintegration and the suggested stakeholders. Finally, we present the three elements of our suggested model for reintegration, which includes existing problems, the types of programmes needed to address the problems and who addresses the problems.

9.2 THE VALIDATION PROCESS

In accordance with the methodology described in chapter 4, the validation process for this study was carried out through a workshop. The participants in the workshop were the formerly abducted children (now youths), elders, teachers, NGO workers and members of the feedback group. All were representative of the participant categories of this study. In chapter 4 we also saw that in the workshop, preliminary findings and an analysis of the research – the NCPO discussed in the previous chapter – would be presented. The NCPO provided the material on which the validation process was based. After the presentation, the participants were asked to give their views on the issues raised, and whether they agreed with our findings and analyses. Their responses were the core of the validation exercise.

Most who responded to the presentation agreed that the content, facts and interpretation were correct. For example, a participant giving his view on the responsibility of NGOs to provide follow-up assistance to the children and the role of teachers in the provision of psychosocial support to formerly abducted children affirmed that:

“The presentation is true. The NGOs are not following up the formerly abducted children. The teachers are not trained to give psychosocial support, they should therefore be trained.” (*Male participant in the workshop*)

9.2.1 *New issues that emerged*

In addition to affirming our findings and analyses, the participants also mentioned other issues such as the land problem. Specifically referring to the plight of the returning children in relation to land, a participant observed:

“What is happening is that the children who are returning home are not aware of the boundary of their land because their parents or elders are not there. Sometimes people who return home early ask the children where they have been when people were returning home. This has brought in conflict because people are being denied their rights of land-ownership.” (*NGOs report in the workshop*)

Other issues mentioned were the lack of services in the satellite camps near the villages and the problems associated with the return to their villages, such as the break-up of families, which was particularly apparent, with parents having to leave children in the camps to go and prepare their new home in the original village, as well as leaving behind the aged and the maimed.

9.2.2 Inadequate skills training and rural areas

In relation to skills training, the workshop participants in general, as well as the work group of the formerly abducted children in particular, told us openly that while they appreciated the basic training given to them, the training period was too short and the training itself too basic to accomplish anything significant:

“We appreciate the skills training but we think it is inadequate. After three months we are not able to produce products that can compete in quality to the products in the market. So we need more skills training.” (*Male, formerly abducted child in the workshop*).

To explain in more detail, most of these training programmes only ran for three months and were not provided by formal polytechnic schools. According to the participants in the workshop, they worked in the following way: the clients (formerly abducted children) would be sent to a local garage or carpentry and joinery workshop to take up an apprenticeship, but without any associated organized learning. For people who had had their proper life pattern disorganized through years of abuse in captivity, this type of arrangement for learning could be very demanding.

In contention during the workshop was also the fact that most NGOs, in addition to being based in the urban areas, did not provide training programmes and other services in rural areas. It was argued that if NGOs went into rural areas at all, they would stop at the trading centres. At the end of our workshop, there was a call for the NGOs to professionalize the training programmes offered in addition to making them more accessible to formerly abducted children in rural areas and those who had not passed through the reception centres. It was actually mentioned that children who came home without passing through the formal institutions (reception centres and the Amnesty Commission) were not being supported by any of the NGO-based programmes:

“There are those among us who were abducted and managed to escape and return home but never passed through the rehabilitation centres. Some of them have the letters from the Amnesty Commission and some of them have letters that are questionable. Some came back through the barracks and others through the LC, such categories are not being supported. When they returned they simply wanted to be back and some don't have the letter from the Amnesty Commission. We are not happy that these categories are not being supported too. Such groups should be attended to by giving the psychosocial support.” (*Male participant in the workshop*)

9.2.3 *Problems with schooling*

There were also views expressed about problems with schooling. During the workshop, one of the participants, a teacher, questioned our finding that schools did not have the necessary background information concerning formerly abducted children, which was required to help them. This led to a debate in which one of the elders, who was a chairman of one of the primary schools, said the following:

“It is very true that parents who bring their children to register in schools do not give the children’s background information as abducted persons to be handled with care. I am talking as a PTA chairman of ... I am requesting that head teachers, when enrolling children, should take detailed information on each child so that the children who have problems can be helped according to their needs. There is a way to help them.” (*An elder in the workshop*)

Witnessing this interactive debate, we realized that the workshop had provided a conversational space for representatives of the teachers, parents and school management – among our participants – to discuss and criticize their own practices of reintegration at the school level. This was another success for participatory, experience-based action research.

9.2.4 *The uncertain status of child mothers*

Concern for the uncertain social status of the child mothers was clear in the workshop and the need for sustained support for them was expressed. It was said that NGOs had built grass-thatched houses for this group on their return home. According to the submissions of the formerly abducted children who attended the workshop, the houses are now crumbling as they were made of mud and wattle:

“The grass-thatched huts that are built for us are good but they are not built with strong materials. After a short period of time we begin repairing them. It is better if you can build for us permanent houses.” (*Formerly abducted children’s report in the workshop*)

It was also said in the workshop that the government policy of returning and resettling everyone from the internally displaced people’s camps to their original villages was posing another challenge for the child mothers, who now need new houses. With their ‘husbands’ either dead or still in the bush, these women have to face the reality of heading households as single and child mothers.

9.2.5 Agriculture

Our findings had revealed that the reintegration practices had neglected agriculture and yet we saw this as important for the social reintegration of formerly abducted children. Our reflections were affirmed by the formerly abducted children who participated in the workshop. They indicated that those who are now adults and could not go to school should be given the agricultural tools such as hoes promised by both the government and some NGOs in order to encourage them to engage in meaningful agriculture.

Issues such as the land-ownership problem and assisting those who had been maimed did not feature in our findings, while the problems of child mothers, skills training and schooling had taken on new dimensions. I took note of these 'omissions' or 'new issues', which were not part of the original research questions and at the time of the fieldwork had not arisen. That they have arisen, however, shows the changing nature of the social problem under study which ultimately confirms the intricate and long-term nature of the reintegration of the formerly abducted children and the need to rehabilitate the community to which they return. That new issues arise supports our thesis that reintegration is a long-term community-based process which also needs to address the problems facing the community into which the children reintegrate.

9.3 TOWARDS IMPROVING REINTEGRATION PRACTICES

After the validation process, we wanted a strategy with which, together with the participants, suggestions could be made in relation to the problems discussed, and which would lead to improvements in social reintegration practices and the enhancement of citizenship. To achieve this, as mentioned in chapter 4, a set of questions (see table below) were given to the work groups for discussion. The questions had been derived from the NCPO analysis and the fluidity of the problem under study. The questions aimed at improving the present reintegration practices and determining who should be responsible for each practice. The main ideas discussed by the various work groups are presented in the table below.

Table 4: How existing reintegration practices could be improved

	Formerly abducted youth	Elders	Teachers	NGOs
I. What other issues (gaps) have not been represented?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills training • Sponsoring children to go to school • Building mud houses for child mothers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriation of the packages given to the formerly abducted children by parents and guardians 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of follow-up by NGOs • Too much focus of the NGOs in towns rather than villages • Lack of proper guidance and counselling • Lack of communication between NGOs, community and schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land issues have not been addressed • Tools for the skills taught are not being provided • Period of training is not long enough for adequate knowledge • Market for the skills provided has not been addressed • In the return process children are being left in the camps while the elders go to the return site hence children are left to roam • Disability has not been addressed • Children of returned child mothers are being left behind • Rehabilitation /infrastructural services to be provided • Boys are being left out (available projects are gender insensitive)

<p>2. How can what is already being done (by NGOs, communities, schools) be improved?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government should help us • Our children should be helped to reach university and other training • NGOs should follow their promise of providing tools after training • Mud houses being built for the child mothers good but do not last • Help teachers to help the children who have returned from the bush • District should ensure that those who are receiving support are indeed formerly abducted children 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural centres should be built in every sub-county for counselling, education of family norms, values, beliefs and cultural activities • Refresher course is needed for the semi-skilled formerly abducted children to enable them to improve what they were taught so that they can be properly self-reliant. Therefore we are appealing to some of our NGOs to come and organize these refresher courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration (collaboration) between NGOs • By parents involvement in schools • By training counsellors • By strong participation of stakeholders, e.g., Parents Teachers Associations and school management committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By provision of services at the grass-roots level • Networking between NGOs to avoid duplication of services and wastage of resources • Provision of tools after training • Through needs assessment and feasibility study • Restructuring services provided by NGOs to return sites • Following up activities being implemented by NGOs
<p>3. What would the components of a programme designed for the reintegration of formerly abducted children be?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for those who returned home without going through the centres • Training for those who were not abducted but whose education was interrupted by the conflict • Provision of agricultural tools such as hoes and 'twoni' - ox plough? - to motivate people • Follow-up of those who were trained to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both formal and informal education • The children should be taught which roles and duties they are supposed to fulfil in the family and society • Other components could be art and crafts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinforcement of peaceful reconciliation • Reinforcement of various cultural activities • Sensitization of communities • Music, dance and drama • Guidance and counselling • Formation of clubs, e.g., music, peace and debating clubs • Organizing tours and exchange 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livelihood • Community service • Advocacy • Child protection (orphans and vulnerable children) • Psychosocial services • Peace-building, NB: these are based on the departments of GUSCO - one of the participants came from that organization

	<p>assess how they are performing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help for amputees and the sick 		<p>visits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drawing and writing poems and stories 	
<p>4. Who could be the stake-holders of such a programme?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government, District, NGOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents, teachers, NGOs, local leaders, LCs, elders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers, elders, Parent-teacher associations, elders, NGOs, government, school foundation bodies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The government should play a leading role in improvement of infrastructure development • NGOs should come up with a comprehensive plan (grass-roots) • Local leaders should monitor activities being implemented • Parents should be vigilant • Youths should actively participate in the activities implemented • Teachers should be involved • Religious leaders in spiritual healing • Teachers develop a curriculum on peace, land, culture, human rights, etc.

<p>5. How could such a programme be implemented?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through sensitization of parents • Through use of the cultural centres (see above) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By creating data information about the children • Through writing project proposal for training counsellors, tours • Opening projects for IGAs • Fund-raising from traditional dances • Radio talk shows on peace • Sensitization of the community • Promoting practical skills, e.g., agriculture • Vocational-skills training • Life-skills training 	
--	--	---	--	--

The information presented in the table shows that the suggestions made in relation to better reintegration practices are not abstract. They derive from the existing practices and the people’s experience of those practices in relation to the widespread social problems in a society that cannot be said to have peace and yet no active conflict is apparent (two years from the beginning of our research). The information presented above is discussed below according to the major themes of the questions asked.

9.3.1 Suggestions to improve existing programmes

The formerly abducted children, now youths, suggest that their own children need to be assisted to attain the maximum level of education:

“We think that they should continue supporting us until our children study up to university level.” (*Formerly abducted children’s report in the workshop*)

They also suggest that NGOs should keep their promises of providing tools after training:

“We are requesting the NGOs to give us the tools to help us put into practice the skills we have acquired. The situation is that we are trained but at the end not given the tools to facilitate us to start.” (*Formerly abducted children’s report in the workshop*).

The suggestions of the elders, representing the actors involved in the community-based reintegration practices, revolved around the benefits of culture. They advocated the establishment of cultural centres in the war-torn region, which would be used to teach Acholi cultural norms, values and responsibilities:

“Due to lack of education which they missed in their young days, cultural centres should be established in each sub-county so that the elders can teach them the cultural values.” (*Elders’ report in the workshop*)

The elders further suggest that there should be refresher courses, what I understand to be further training, for the semi-skilled formerly abducted children. This suggestion emphasizes the short-term nature of the training offered to the formerly abducted children by various NGOs which, as we have already suggested, is not market-oriented.

Among other participants, teachers proposed that to improve the ongoing reintegration practices, there is a need to train counsellors who can help formerly abducted children in schools. This suggestion expresses the inadequacy felt by the teachers in relation to the professional counselling skills needed to help the formerly abducted children in schools where the children spend most of their time. It was also suggested that to improve the existing practices of reintegration, NGOs should provide services at the grass-roots level in the villages. Supporting this view, the participants had this to say:

“NGOs are just focusing in the town areas. They are not in the villages. If you find any organized group, then it is CBO. When the NGOs come, you see them almost after two months. The rest of the time we are left to manage on our own. The rest of the time they are in town.” (*Teachers’ report in the workshop*)

Another participant:

“I want to support an earlier point that was mentioned about the presence of the NGOs. It is true the NGOs focus mainly in towns. They don’t reach deep in the villages.” (*Male participant in the workshop*)

As noted in previous chapters, the presence of the NGOs in the towns of the northern region is very visible (cars, offices, signposts), but as the accounts above show their reach into the villages is limited.

9.3.2 Suggested components of a reintegration programme

Perhaps already in the process of reclaiming their citizenship, it is heartening that the formerly abducted children, while asked to suggest components of a programme for their own reintegration, not only thought of themselves but also included other members of their society. They explicitly stated that they did not want to be categorized and isolated from the rest of the community because of their experiences as former abductees. They just wanted to be normal members of their society who happened to have been abducted, while the rest of their society experienced the war as IDPs and lived in camps (see chapter 2). A programme for reintegration according to them should include support for all who were abducted whether they came home through the reception centres or not, as indicated in the section above. The programme would also include skills training for non-abducted children whose education was interrupted due to the conflict, the provision of agricultural tools for all and assistance to amputees and the maimed. The formerly abducted children suggested that:

“We would like training in entrepreneurial skills. We would like [support for] those whose body parts were cut during the war. They should be given wheelchairs to facilitate their movements.” (*Formerly abducted children’s report in the workshop*)

This assessment shows that, much as the subjects of this study realize their own need for assistance, they also have an outward-looking attitude towards their community. They are concerned for the wellbeing of their entire community, suggesting investment in agriculture, help for the maimed and the needs of the non-abducted children. This shows that the formerly abducted children understand that their personal reintegration could not be achieved if the rest of the community in which they have returned remained dysfunctional. This is a practical demonstration of communal citizenship: of belonging to the community by owning and identifying with the social problems that affect it. It expresses the fact that while there may still be problems in the reintegration process, the journey to the long-term citizenship of formerly abducted children has already started in the right direction.

The elders in the workshop simply suggested that a programme for reintegration should be composed of formal and informal education. They emphasized the need to teach the children about their roles and duties within the family and society. For example, one elder made this suggestion:

“[A] programme [for reintegration] should include both formal and informal education. The children should be taught their role or duties in the family by their parents and teachers in schools. Art and craft should also be another component. The children should also be told the duties instead of focusing only on their rights. When they wake up in the morning, they should be told to sweep the house and also the compound. I don’t understand why when I correct my child and point out to him his duties, I am accused of violating the child’s rights. Pointing them to what their duties are and ensuring that they fulfil them is a means of training them to be self-reliant. Rights and duties go hand in hand. I would like to ask these questions: should children be left free to choose to go or not to go to school? Should children be left to choose to work or not to work?”

What seems to be a summary of the components of a programme for reintegration in the above account could be very broad in real terms, especially if ‘informal education’ and roles and duties in the family and society were unpacked in the light of our definition of community (see chapter 2). These could mean the learning of skills such as agriculture, as well as knowledge and practice of norms, values and rules. It could mean engagement in societal and personal reconciliation, and being committed to the wellbeing of society through marriage to ensure its continuity by procreation, among other things. Provision of formal education would build on these foundation blocks of a society. This would lead to the complete citizenship of the formerly abducted children in their communities. Clearly this would take a long time, as we have repeatedly shown in this study.

In their turn, teachers indicated that the components of a programme for reintegration should include the reinforcement of reconciliation and various cultural activities in addition to guidance and counselling for formerly abducted children. The teachers point out that:

“There should be reinforcement of the various Acholi cultural peace processes to help us reconcile and live in peace.” (*Teachers’ report in the workshop*)

At schools, the teachers also underscored the importance of the arts in general and particularly music, dance and drama:

“Children should be involved in recreational activities like music, dance and drama, and football. We believe that in these activities, they are able to socialize, relieve their emotions and eventually get healing.” (*Teachers’ report in the workshop*)

This suggestion is interesting in that teachers, as the custodians of formal education, seem to suggest that education cannot take place in a vacuum but must be built upon the first and basic experiences of the people who undergo it. On this basis, they make the point that there is a need for the reinforcement of various cultural activities. This is a call for a well-rounded education system that is rooted in people's experience of their own communities and society. However, at a more 'professional' level, the teachers also suggest the need for guidance and counselling in a programme that would support the long-term reintegration of the war-affected youth. This concern might be a reflection of their increased sense of responsibility towards the psychosocial needs of the formerly abducted children who have now returned to school. Although in teachers' training colleges in Uganda, guidance and counselling is taught as a subject, the extent of the war experiences of the children is such that there is a need for professional counselling.

The NGO representatives, having come from the 'practitioners' world, opted for a programme for reintegration such as the GUSCO programme, with its established set of targets such as livelihood, community service, advocacy, child protection, psychosocial services and peace-building. Although the GUSCO programme seems to accommodate most of the suggestions made by the other work groups, it still has the tendency to adopt a blanket approach to the specific issues. This study would prefer that the suggested components of a programme for reintegration addressed very specific areas, such as agricultural support, income generation, health and education.

9.3.3 Suggested stakeholders of a programme for reintegration

As can be seen from Table 4 above, all of the work groups in the workshop mentioned the same stakeholders in relation to establishing a programme for reintegration. The central government, the district, NGOs or civil society in general and the community, including elders, the youth, parent-teacher associations and religious leaders were all mentioned as stakeholders. Again this reveals an awareness that the re-creation of citizenship after conflict and as an act of peace-building is a collective responsibility. Several participants, in different ways, discussed the role of the community, government and civil society/NGOs. For example, a female participant said:

"We want to restart the sitting at the fireplace (*wang oo*) so that we can teach our cultural values to the young members of the community. During the day we should take our children to the field and train them to work. We should begin digging big fields so that the surplus we get can be sold to earn us some income. This is a process of teaching children to be self-reliant."

One elder emphasized the role of the community:

“Before this insurgency, the elders of our community were not taken care of by the NGOs, but when the NGOs came we left the responsibility of taking care of our elders with them. We must restart supporting our elders and the disadvantaged of our community. This care should also extend to the youth or the returnees. We should help them to start anew by teaching the cultural values. We should look at the formerly abducted children as our own people.”

Another male participant pointed out the complementary role of the government as a stakeholder:

“Yes, it is true we need to involve government. It is our role to encourage our children to study. In the camps, the schools were near so the children did not have to walk long distances. But when we go back home, the schools are far and this could be discouraging for the children. The government then set measures to ensure that the children continue to go to school. Government should enforce the policy of UPE.”

It should be noted that all of the suggestions made concerning a programme of reintegration recognized what was already being done by various actors in the region. However, the suggestions also recognize that there are still gaps that need attention before the long-term re-creation of citizenship after the effects of the long war can be sustained. In addition, the suggestions for reintegration are forward-looking, seeking to re-establish the structures – social and economic – that were broken down during the conflict. The workshop participants, representative of the Acholi community, refused to be backward-looking and dwell on the negative effects of war and violence such as bitterness, apathy and general helplessness. The community is taking the reintegration of their war-affected children into their own hands.

At another level, the suggested paths for reintegration show that the community tends to relate more to the pressing social problems occurring at a specific time. For example, at the commencement of this study, the most daunting war-time social problem was the abduction and return of the children. It was the single most important issue at hand even though the population was already living in displacement camps. Today, however, issues of land, children being left behind in the camps as parents attempt to rebuild their original homes, lack of infrastructure and social services in the villages are considered most important.

Meanwhile, the urgency of the plight of the returned children is diminishing in importance. This scenario may make those involved appear to be reactive in relation to the social problems they face, but it is, however, an indication that the social problems created as consequences of conflict are extremely complex and constantly require reassessment. In the history of this

conflict, various social problems have come to the fore. For example, the process of displacement, the lack of physical security coupled with abductions, the lack of property security, land mines, physical maiming and amputations, and night commuting as a result of the massive abductions, have all at one time or another been most important. As mentioned, at another time, the return of the children was the main issue, and now the key issue is the uncertainty of the ownership of ancestral land as people begin the further dislocating return from the camps to their villages.

The Acholi people have not had the luxury of looking backwards in terms of dealing with the various crises associated with the conflict, and express the need to look forward and deal with the future. This explains the present focus on land, schooling necessities for not only formerly abducted children but also for their own children, agricultural and infrastructure development and the need to place skills development in the proper perspective of the market, as well as creating professionalism so they have a long-term value. Perhaps this is appropriate, considering that this study understands social reintegration as the long-term positive participation of the formerly abducted children in their community.

9.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR REINTEGRATION IN NORTHERN UGANDA

On the basis of the discussion above, we can derive a set of suggestions for social reintegration that includes three major elements that can be used as guiding principles in the reintegration of formerly abducted children in northern Uganda. These are set out below.

9.4.1 Existing problems/needs (what?)

First, we find the basis for this set of suggestions in the existing problems and needs that both the formerly abducted children and their communities continue to face. These problems and needs exist in spite of the social reintegration practices we discussed in chapters 6 and 7. Some of the problems and needs are emerging as a result of the escalating nature of war-related social problems (see chapter 8). Drawn from the framework for improving social reintegration practices above, and also represented in Table 4 above, the existing problems and needs include the need to house child mothers, the need for educational sponsorship of all children but especially those born in captivity, and the need for proper guidance and counselling. Other problems are the lack of an NGO presence in the rural areas, the lack of adequate medical and social care for war casualties, the lack of tools for practising the skills in which training is offered, the short time devoted to

skills training programmes and the difficulties concerning land-ownership. In addition to these suggestions for improving reintegration, these continuing problems or needs demand that the next step be taken – the implementation of the following suggested programmes to address these problems or needs.

9.4.2 *Programmes for addressing the problems or needs (how?)*

The need for the programmes arises due to the existing problems and needs which, as explained in the previous section, must be addressed. The programmes are the means through which the problems and needs can be addressed. We arrived at the programmes by looking at the responses to Question 3 in Table 4 above: What might be the components of a programme designed for the social reintegration of formerly abducted children? Different responses were given. Some of the suggested components emerge as improvements on what is already being done. Others are a response to the changing nature of the social problems in war-affected northern Uganda. We found that the suggestions fell into different categories, which are interrelated:

- *Education programme* – we derive the education programme from the suggested components for social reintegration encompassing education that include relevant training for the youth (vocational training), formal education for all children, including children of the formerly abducted children born in captivity.
- *Psychosocial services programme* – this category is derived from the suggested components for social reintegration that include training counsellors in schools, medical and social help for war casualties, inclusive support for all war-affected children in addition to guidance and counselling and child protection. It should be noted that social help for war casualties would include enhancement of social networks as well as the performance of cleansing, healing and reconciliation rituals where the need arises.
- *Culture programme* – this programme derives from the suggested components encompassing informal education, that is, teaching children, values, norms, duties and roles in the family and the community, reinforcement of reconciliation and arts, craft and music.
- *Agriculture programme* – we derive this programme from the suggested components for social reintegration, including the right to land-ownership, provision of agricultural tools and provision of ox ploughs.

- *Peace-building programme* – we derive this programme from the suggested components for reintegration that include advocacy, rehabilitation of infrastructure and all of the above programmes.

9.4.3 Responsibility for the social reintegration programmes (who?)

We draw the last element of our suggested model for the social reintegration of formerly abducted children and the re-creation of their citizenship from the fourth question in Table 4. The question of who the stakeholders should be in relation to the social reintegration of formerly abducted children is important because problems and needs (Element 1) and programmes (Element 2) concern people. The responses to the question identified the central government, the local government, NGOs/civil society and the community, including the elders, the youth, religious leaders, parent-teacher associations and others, as the main stakeholders. In other words, the social reintegration of formerly abducted children is a collective responsibility.

To summarize the elements of the suggested model for improving the social reintegration of formerly abducted children and enhancing their citizenship, the key phrases are ‘What problems?’, ‘How to address the problems?’ and ‘Who is responsible for addressing the problems?’ The suggestions can be understood as a response to these key questions. Furthermore, they are premised on this study and therefore the details are locally applicable in the social reintegration of the formerly abducted children in northern Uganda. However, being the result of action research, the broad elements of the suggestions can be of exemplary value in similar situations, with the general elements being adapted to particular circumstance in other countries or under similar conditions.

