

MAKERERE UNIVERSITY

Faculty of Law



STAKEHOLDERS' DIALOGUE

BEYOND JUBA: BUILDING CONSENSUS ON A SUSTAINABLE PEACE PROCESS FOR UGANDA

DECEMBER 1-3, 2006 HOTEL AFRICANA, KAMPALA

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
INTRODUCTION	6
AIMS & OBJECTIVES.....	6
METHODOLOGY.....	6
DAY 1: BUILDING CONSENSUS ON A SUSTAINABLE PEACE PROCESS FOR UGANDA	8
<i>Keynote Address: Beyond Juba – is there a need for a national truth and reconciliation process in Uganda?</i>	8
<i>Remarks by Mr. Mao</i>	9
FACILITATED GROUP WORK: REFLECTING ON THE PAST: LOCAL AND NATIONAL CHALLENGES	10
DAY II: IDENTIFYING POSSIBLE MECHANISMS FOR A NATIONAL PROCESS	12
PANEL DISCUSSION OF COMPARATIVE EXPERIENCES.....	12
FACILITATED GROUP WORK: MAPPING OUT A NATIONAL PROCESS.....	13
SELECTED COMMENTS BY PANEL OF EXPERTS	15
CLOSING REMARKS BY HON. BETTY AMONGI	16
DAY III: THE ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY IN RESPONDING TO THE JUBA TALKS	19
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MOSES C. OKELLO: RESOLVING THE CONFLICT IN NORTHERN UGANDA: IS THE JUBA PEACE TALK THE JEWEL IN THE GROUND OR MERE GOLD DUST?	19
CHALLENGES FOR CIVIL SOCIETY	20

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank our donors, the Swedish International Development Agency, Ford Foundation, the Norwegian Embassy Kampala and Christian Aid Uganda who facilitated this initiative.

Special thanks go to Drs Sylvia Tamale and Joe Oloka-Onyango of the Faculty of Law and Human Rights and Peace Centre respectively, for their central role in the conceptualization, preparation, and facilitation of the stakeholders' dialogue. Emily Broyles, Patrick Otim, Walter Alier and Grace Nakulira of the Refugee Law Project all played invaluable roles in the logistical preparations.

This report was produced on the basis of detailed notes taken by Simone Dornbach of the Civil Peace Project, Makerere University, as well as Joel Ng, Noah Gottschalk and Patrick Otim of the Refugee Law Project. The initial draft was prepared by Simone Dornbach, completed and edited by Chris Dolan and Moses Chrispus Okello.

And finally, all thanks to the presenters and participants from around the country and indeed the continent who contributed their thoughts and time to catalyzing this dialogue.

@ February 2007

List of Acronyms

ADF	Allied Democratic Forces
CPA	Comprehensive Peace Accord
CS	Civil Society
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
FOL	Faculty of Law
GoDRC	Government of Democratic Republic of Congo
GoS	Government of Sudan
GoU	Government of Uganda
HURIPPEC	Human Rights and Peace Center
ICC	International Criminal Court
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
LC	Local Council
LRA	Lord's Resistance Army
MP	Member of Parliament
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRM	National Resistance Movement
OPM	Office of the Prime Minister
PRA	Peoples' Redemption Army
PRDP	National Peace, Reconstruction and Development Plan
RLP	Refugee Law Project
SPLA	Sudanese People's Liberation Army
TRC	Truth and Reconciliation Commission
UNRF II	Uganda National Rescue Front II
UPDA	Uganda Peoples' Democratic Army
UPDF	Uganda Peoples' Defense Front
WFP	World Food Program

Executive Summary

With the objective of encouraging participants to think ‘Beyond Juba’, the stakeholders’ dialogue was structured to address three broad concerns; Firstly, is there a consensus within Ugandan civil society, on the need for a national process to address tensions, divisions and conflicts which have affected Uganda, either in the past or present. Secondly, if there is a broad consensus, what sort of shape should such a process take? And thirdly, what are the immediate steps civil society could take to input into or influence the Juba peace talks. One day was allocated to each of these broad areas of concern. On each day international participants were first invited to share comparative perspectives. Participants were then divided into five working groups. Each group addressed the same set of issues: reflecting on the past, local and national challenges: mapping out a national process. It was thus possible, by comparing the findings of each group, to establish the degree to which there was truly a consensus amongst participants.

The keynote address which followed the Prime Minister’s opening remarks was written by Professor Makau Mutua and presented by Gulu district LC5 Norbert Mao, who also supplemented the address with some comments of his own. The subsequent group discussions showed an overall consensus on the need for a national process which focuses primarily on the post-independence era, while not ignoring pre-independence dynamics. Most groups agreed that the Juba talks have created a moment – and momentum - of transition insofar as they signal a change in the priorities of the Government and possibly also of the LRA. As such there was considerable consensus that preparations for a national process should start now rather than waiting for a change in government which is the usual indicator of political transition. The government’s role in this should be to facilitate (e.g. through enacting enabling legislation), not to control.

It was further agreed that truth and reconciliation should be addressed through cross-cutting themes. This would allow people from different parts of the country would realise the extent to which they share similar experiences. In considering whom the process should be focused on, there was agreement that victims, collaborators, perpetrators and by-standers should *all* be involved.

It was also agreed that currently ethnicity takes precedence over nationalism as an organising political framework. If this is to change and a sense of national reconciliation and unity is to be achieved, then ethnic identities need to be incorporated into national ones, but without creating ethnic hierarchies. Equally, the entrenched subordination of women needs to be highlighted throughout these processes.

When looking at possible mechanisms and structures for a national truth and reconciliation process, there was agreement that while comparative experiences and perspectives should be drawn on, Uganda *must* develop its own context-specific process. There was considerable consensus that a national process should start from the local level, including the use of traditional mechanisms, and that these would then feed into a national level independent body.

Lastly, civil society actors felt that, despite having a considerable stake in the outcome of the Juba talks, they were not as yet fully included in the Juba process. The participants, who came from organisations throughout Uganda, felt that alternatives to the ICC should be actively promoted, civil society monitors should be included in the process on the basis of improved civil-military relations. They also called for the adoption by government of a language of equals rather than triumphalism, and for civil society to support alternative information (including an assessment of the costs and benefits of the talks) and independent media. It was strongly noted that the questions of IDPs and their resettlement, the reconstruction of the North, the Karamoja question and the Buganda question, should all be tackled in a national framework.

Introduction

Aims & Objectives

The Juba peace talks, although focused on the LRA and northern Uganda, should be regarded as the beginning rather than the end of a national peace process. With this in mind, and concerned that the Juba talks would be regarded as a comprehensive solution to Uganda's problems unless the discussion around national needs was opened up, the Refugee Law Project, the Faculty of Law and the Human Rights and Peace Center together released a press statement to coincide with Uganda's Constitution Day, October 2006.

Under the title "To Look Forward We Must First Look Back", this statement encouraged the Government of Uganda, Civil Society Actors, Religious Leaders and political Parties to look beyond the northern Uganda conflict and to consider options for establishing a *national* truth and reconciliation process.

The stakeholders' dialogue "Beyond Juba: Building Consensus on a Sustainable Peace Process for Uganda" was the logical next step. Its overall aims were to explore the extent to which civil society in Uganda sees a need for a national process of truth and reconciliation towards sustainable peace, and, if so, to begin to think about what shape such a process might take.

Within this overall aim, objectives included to:

1. Move the debate around conflict and peace-building beyond Northern Uganda and into the national arena
2. Review the main points of contention around peace and reconciliation in Uganda today.
3. Evaluate the successes and failures of earlier peace and reconciliation processes undertaken.
4. Lay out and examine the scope and scale of different possibilities that can be pursued in Uganda's conditions but drawing on experiences elsewhere.
5. Plot the different strategies towards a comprehensive peace and reconciliation process.

Methodology

To ensure that the discussion reflected national concerns, stakeholders were invited from five different conflict affected parts of the country, as well as from the capital, Kampala. There were thus participants from West Nile, Northern Uganda, Teso and Langi region, ADF affected areas of the South West, Karamoja, and Kampala. To help to inform the debate, a number of external participants were invited to bring their comparative experiences to bear. These included individuals from South Africa, Ghana, Kenya, and Ecuador. The discussions also enjoyed the full participation of members of the Government.

Our approach was to use external participants to share their experiences, but to spend the majority of time in group discussions followed by feedback to plenary. This allowed sufficient time for in-depth exchange of ideas. Five working groups with twenty participants in each were given a standard set of questions to discuss (see Annex). The plenary feedback sessions were facilitated by two accomplished media personalities, Robert Kabushenga and Robert Kalundi-Serumaga.

Day 1: Building consensus on a sustainable peace process for Uganda

The Prime Minister, Prof. Apollo Nsibambi, opened proceedings by stressing the importance of the process, and by reassuring participants that the GoU regards the building of a framework for sustained peace and security as a priority. In this regard the Juba Peace Talks should be considered *a first step* in a comprehensive peace and reconciliation strategy. He proposed the Peace Recovery and Development Plan for Northern Uganda 2006-2009 (PRDP), which includes peace building and reconciliation as one of its four strategic objectives, as evidence of government commitment. He warmly welcomed this initiative from RLP, HURIPED and the Faculty of Law, noting that the GoU needs support, wisdom and advice from civil society (CS), religious and traditional leaders, and academia.



The Rt Hon. Prime Minister, Professor Apollo Nsibambi, with Dr Joe Oloka-Onyango

Keynote Address: Beyond Juba – is there a need for a national truth and reconciliation process in Uganda?

Prof. Makau Mutua, State University of New York, Buffalo Law School, Chairman Kenya Human Rights Commission (read by Mr. Norbert Mao, Local Council V, Gulu District)

Uganda will not recover as a state if it does not confront the demons that have tortured it for decades. To do this effectively:

1. Uganda must have the courage to objectively and without fear or favor identify those demons. The process for the identification must be national, inclusive, transformational and cathartic.

2. The GoU should bless this process but not seek to control it: An independent and truly representative body of all stakeholders must be empowered to define and lead the process of national recovery.
3. The process must be open and participatory. It must include especially those who have been aggrieved.
4. National reconciliation process needs functioning democratic structures. To achieve this requires:
 - a. Rewriting the constitutions
 - b. Open multiparty elections
 - c. A system of checks and balances
 - d. A set of cultural norms and values subscribed to by a democratic society
5. Civil Society is central to the reconstruction and democratization of the Ugandan state.
6. The relationship between state power and ethnic groups requires close attention.
7. It is necessary to forge a national identity which absorbs pre-colonial identities into the whole without establishing an informal hierarchy of ethnicities
8. The state should create a constitutional and legislative framework to govern political parties so that they can become driven by ideology, become internally democratic, mainstream gender, and assume a national identity
9. The Juba talks offer a unique moment to nationalize a truth, peace, justice and reconciliation process.
10. There is no truth commission model or peace process anywhere that Uganda can simply mimic or copy. Uganda, having already had a truth commission needs to look beyond such an institution and think about a holistic approach to peace and reconciliation.
11. National truth and reconciliation processes can serve multiple objectives, which are all interrelated: national catharsis, truth telling, etc. Some truth commissions processes seek the truth, others justice or reconciliation, and some all three.
12. Implementation of the national truth and reconciliation process:
 - Inclusivity and open participation i.e. the proceedings must be carried live on radio and television nationwide
 - The final report of the process must be made public in full
 - The process should not last for more than two years

For the full text of Professor Makau Mutua's speech, please go to www.refugeelawproject.org

Remarks by Mr. Mao

It is important that the President hears these things, and there are a few things which need to be added:

- Juba: Southern Sudan cannot implement its peace accord if the LRA is still marauding in the South. Riek Machar said to the Sudanese Parliament when they wanted to pull out: we are doing this for ourselves not for Uganda.

- Resources: Northern Uganda is rich in resources such as fertile land, oil and other minerals. In fact, Northern Uganda is the richest part of the country.
- President Museveni can no longer pretend that this conflict is some little nuisance. The international media is capturing the peace talks, the world is aware. President Museveni is asked one simple question: “How can you not protect your people? And when you fail to protect them, can you label them terrorists?” President Museveni can no longer deny the conflict. There should be a peaceful settlement.
 - Northern Uganda has been consistent in calling for peace talks—it is therefore important to begin a parallel process of dialogue in Juba
 - Ugandans as a whole risk being left out of Juba. That is why this debate and forum about a national process is important.
 - Peace comes first, other issues come later.
 - The LRA has shielded President Museveni from many things: for example:
 - no one can accuse him of crimes because the LRA are worse
 - no one can question government’s military expenditures
- There is now an opportunity for a national peace and reconciliation process.

Facilitated Group Work: Reflecting on the Past: Local and National Challenges

1. What period and issues should be covered by a truth and reconciliation process?

There was a general consensus that a national process should focus on the 1962 post-independence period, yet be informed by pre-independence experiences. A variety of issues were identified such as presidential and ethnic power struggles, disappearances at the hands of state institutions, unequal distribution of national resources, and the role of the Diaspora and the international community and donors in perpetuating conflict situations.

The overall consensus was that while hearings and other processes would necessarily be administered by region, they would approach the subject through a focus on cross-cutting issues (e.g. expropriation of property, forcible recruitment, gender-based violence) which are pertinent across different regions and regimes.

2. How should perpetrators, bystanders, collaborators and victims be defined?

The participants agreed that the definitions are not mutually exclusive. A person who is a perpetrator today might be a victim, collaborator, or by-stander tomorrow.

Definitions:

- Perpetrators are persons or institutions which bear responsibility for atrocities and conflict.

- By-standers are persons or institutions which have the capacity and the opportunity to intervene in a conflict/abusive situation but choose not to do so.
- Collaborators are persons or institutions which aid and abet perpetrators in committing atrocities.
- Victims are individuals or groups which experience injustice.
- Profiteers or beneficiaries are persons or institutions which gain from an atrocity/conflict but are not active belligerents.

3. Which people have the most need to be heard? E.g. women? Youth? Men? Children?

The groups identified many different people who have the need to be heard. Most often named were victims including women, children, youth, men and the elderly, but also perpetrators, collaborators and by-standers to better understand their view.

4. How important are issues of ethnicity?

All groups agreed that ethnicity is an important issue in the national reconciliation process, as ethnicity has the power to unite and divide people depending on how it is used or abused.

5. How entrenched is the subordination of women in different parts of the country? Can this be overcome without subordinating men?

There was consensus that the subordination of women is an important issue which needs to be addressed, though there was insufficient discussion of how this subordination contributes to the perpetuation of conflict.

6. How strong is a sense of national unity in different parts of the country? The key-note spoke of the need to 'forge a common national psyche and destiny'; Is national identity the primary one? Or ethnic? Can a national identity absorb and include ethnic ones?

The participants agreed that there is no strong sense of national unity and in some cases it is lacking altogether. This is an important issue which needs to be addressed.

Day II: Identifying possible mechanisms for a national process

Panel Discussion of Comparative Experiences

In reflecting on the South African experience, Fanie Du Toit, Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (IJR), Cape Town, South Africa, first pointed out that the process had been legislated through the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act No. 34 of 1995. He drew on a survey of South African perceptions of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission conducted by IJR in 2001 which highlighted the following lessons:

- TRC's need to have a realistic mandate.
- Should speak a language that the people understand e.g. Desmond Tutu drew on Christian values which had a broad appeal in South Africa.
- National reconciliation cannot be made dependent on repentance or forgiveness.
- Conditional amnesty is not an abrogation of the rule of law, but rather a step towards it. However, you cannot legislate forgiveness.
- Reparations need to be focused, budgeted for, and speedily implemented.
- Civil society needs to be involved from the start, and allowed to take national processes to local levels.
- Very strong political will and leadership is necessary.
- Government needs to recognise that they too will be criticized but that in the long-term this will count in their favor.
- Timing is crucial.
- Debating national history is inevitable and must be accommodated.

In her remarks, Professor Henrietta Mensa-Bonsu, Technical Advisor for the Ghanaian and Liberian TRCs, noted that:

- National dialogue involves speaking and listening. She urged participants to keep an open mind and listen, to moderate their language, and to tone down righteous anger and seek to compromise instead. She also stressed the need for people to speak **to** each other rather than at or about each other.
- The process is about Uganda and you. Perpetrators can be active or passive – this calls for less finger-pointing and more introspection.
- Appreciate what has been done so far.
- The theme is 'Beyond Juba'. All of Uganda must be involved.
- The process of reconciliation demands that we look at and admit some very unpleasant issues about ourselves.
- There are many reasons why Uganda got into conflict. Look at how you came to be and how you lived together as one nation. This is the only country you have.
- Peace must be nurtured, it does not happen automatically. Each of these conflicts can reoccur if precipitating factors are not addressed.

- Reconciliation does not work one-way only. It is a process and not an event. Expectations must be moderated.
- “Reconciliation” has many meanings which we should bear in mind.
- Period of coverage: keep the historical perspective in mind.

On the question of who must be part of the process, Prof Mensa-Bonsu urged that it be everyone. Within that she argued that the traditional and religious authorities are crucial in carrying the process forward and should be kept involved at all stages. In the end, the process is about forgiveness and establishment of moral values through the development of national consensus. In order to make the discussion sustainable and accountable, Civil Society as a whole must also be included. However, the process should not be hijacked by NGO which tend to be issue-oriented and to move on after a short while. Peace is an activity for the long term and those involved must be in for the long haul. Apart from the various institutions that have a role, we as individuals also have a role! Our attitudes might have been the reason for some of the issues.¹

Facilitated Group Work: Mapping out a National Process

1. Is ‘the moment of transition’ at hand for Uganda?

Most groups agreed that the Juba talks have created a moment of transition insofar as they signal a change in the priorities of the Government and possibly also of the LRA. As such there was considerable consensus that preparations for a national process should start now rather than waiting for a change in government which is the usual indicator of political transition.

2. What do you think of the statement that any process for ‘identification of demons’ must be ‘national, inclusive, transformational and cathartic’?

All groups agreed with the statement. Group One believed that catharsis is too optimistic an objective and that expectations should be more moderate. Group Two did not agree with the term “demon”, arguing that it was strong language which should be avoided because it can cause hatred.

3. What do you think of the statement that ‘Uganda, having had two investigative commissions already, needs to look beyond such an institution and think about a holistic approach to peace and reconciliation’?

All groups agreed that the previous investigative commissions did not fulfil their purpose. Reasons named:

- They were too restricted in periods and violations addressed

¹ For a comparison of the Ghanaian and Liberian TRCs see the full transcript: ??

- They did not publish their findings
- Their recommendations were only very partially implemented
- They paid no attention to national reconciliation
- They were not independent of government

Suggestions for a better commission included that it should:

- be holistic in terms of periods, violations and regions addressed
- publish its findings
- have peace, justice and reconciliation as elements
- include restorative, social and reconciliatory justice
- be comprehensive, not selective
- be effective and workable
- be representative and inclusive
- include culturally sensitive mechanisms
- not be state dominated
- involve a broad range of civil society actors, including traditional and religious leaders

One group proposed a model. This includes a national coordinating body with its seat in Kampala and substructures in the different regions to handle region specific cases. While the national body would have a coordinating function and would deal with those cases which were beyond the scope of local mechanisms, the starting point would be the local mechanisms; only those cases which cannot be dealt with at the local level would be referred back to the national body.

4. Who should control a Truth and Reconciliation Process? E.g. government, civil society?

All groups agreed that civil society should have a say in the process and a major role to play. Some groups suggested that the GoU also take part in it with particular roles such as facilitation of process through funding, passing of enabling legislation etc.

5. How much should retribution play a role?

Most groups expressed considerable resistance/hostility to the ICC, and suggested the need for an emphasis on more restorative forms of justice that reconcile and restore social order.

6. How important is it to re-write the constitution? Review the blanket amnesty?

Some groups suggested rewriting the constitution; some did not want to rewrite it. All agreed that amendments such as the Amnesty Act should be reviewed. All groups agreed that they do not want a blanket amnesty but some suggested conditional amnesty.

7. How much do political parties need development?

Only three groups finished this question. All agreed that parties needed more internal development in terms of leadership and political ideology, but also recognised that external elements such as the current restriction on parties raising money need review.

8. Should there be a statute of limitations on suits that may be brought in the course of reconciliation?

This question was briefly answered by three groups with “yes, there should be some limitations”.

Selected comments by panel of experts

Dr. Fanie Du Toit, South Africa

- Uganda’s civil society speaks up! We all know there is no perfect government. Civil society needs to claim space in order to engage. This conference is a very good sign that this group of people is moving in the right direction. South Africa had several major international conferences before the Truth and Reconciliation process started. There is a remarkable consensus/common ground here in this meeting.
- We all know that a national process is not going to start tomorrow but we can start moving towards one, and this dialogue is part of that movement.
- Insiders/Outsiders: the process needs to be as inclusive as possible. Who are the outsiders? Also think of involving people outside Uganda (e.g. Diaspora).
- Victims: there are victims of personal violence (bodily infliction of harm, torture) and victims of structural violence (systematic neglect based on groups). Both need to be addressed. In Rwanda, for example, victims of personal violence belonged to one group while victims of structural violence belonged to the other group.

Professor Henrietta Mensa-Bonsu, Ghana

- Creating a structure is a very expensive process. We should be aware of the financial aspect. Donors tend not to give money, so the nation needs to be ready.
- We should not create a structure which we cannot control. We need to select carefully those who may be in charge.
- People from all over Uganda came together and agreed there is a national need for reconciliation. This is a good beginning.

Ndung’u Wainaina, Kenya

- Preach the gospel of Truth and Reconciliation and reach out to your fellow Ugandans.
- Get engaged in a very political process. Give the process a face, voice and mantle from Uganda as a whole.

- The state itself can easily capture the initiative and break it. The state can be an ally but also an enemy. You need to understand who you are dealing with in order to be prepared.
- There is no one model which fits all. Ugandans must design a TR process themselves. Let the Ugandan people feel they are part of it.

Nahla Valji, South Africa

- The proposed mechanisms from you have been concrete and positive. The idea to have the TR Process linked to traditional mechanisms is good. The process needs to be locally driven and locally owned.
- I have though some warnings regarding traditional mechanisms. First, the lesson we learnt from the Rwandan Gacaca Courts. These were traditional mechanisms to resolve community disputes. Now it goes far beyond its original meaning. If a link is made between TRC and traditional mechanisms, how will they be adapted? Second, the proposed mechanisms need to be democratic and more inclusive (gender). However, it is a positive proposal. The conversation shows that Ugandan civil society has an enormous amount to offer, not only to Uganda but also to other countries.

Closing remarks by Hon. Betty Amongi

The ongoing Peace Talks in Juba are attempting to solve a conflict which has manifested itself over many years. They are considering a framework for peace and reconciliation; however, it does not look at the national level. Only reconciliation and accountability for the LRA is on the agenda. Considering the history of Uganda, there is a dire need to establish a framework for the entire country so that sustainable peace can be achieved.

The Juba talks follow the process of the SPLA and Government of Sudan which led to a comprehensive peace agreement. There are five items on the agenda:

1. Cessation of Hostilities
2. Discussion of comprehensive economic impact of the war
3. Reconciliation, accountability and justice (including Mato Oput)
4. Ceasefire
5. Demobilization, disarmament and reintegration of the LRA into the society

Two of these items have the potential to address reconciliation. However, it is argued that the agenda item “reconciliation” must not only address northern Uganda but the entire nation. Alternative forms of traditional methods such as Mato Oput should not be narrowed down. It should rather be further developed together with other traditional methods to be used in the whole country. In addition, the LRA has proposed that they want to have a TRC to deal with wider questions.

What are the issues beyond Juba? As a country, Uganda should openly deal with its past. Uganda still doesn’t want to open up, however it is time to open up now. The past cannot be swept under the carpet.

Beyond Juba, there are several issues which have to be dealt with:

- **Ethnic divide**

Ethnicity and tribalism are widespread roots for conflicts. For instance, the conflicts between the Baganda and the Bunyoro or the Baganda versus northern Uganda (the Luweero Crisis). Within northern Uganda, there are tribal differences between the Lango, Acholi and West Nile. The north-south divide needs to be addressed. Many people in northern Uganda perceive that the government is mainly composed of Southerners. Whether it is true or not, it needs to be put on the table. If we want sustainable peace we need to openly talk about it.

- **Equity**

It is widely believed in the North that the GoU has designs to enforce inequality between the North and the South. These might be perceptions only, but perceptions are very real causes of problems. The UN report shows clearly that people from the North have been excluded from resources. The question needs to be tackled. It is no longer an issue of the North alone. A national framework would have the capacities to deal with it.

- **Land**

Land is not only a northern question; it is also a national question. For instance, the Bunyoro question needs to be addressed. It is believed that there are people from the West who are moving with cattle in some parts of the North and East. Whether it is true or not, this issue needs to be addressed.

- **Exclusion and Marginalization**

There is a lot of exclusion and marginalization. For example, the privatization of universities: some people will be left out as they don't have financial resources.

The questions of IDPs and their resettlement, the reconstruction of the North, the Karamoja question and the Buganda question, all these issues should be tackled in a national framework. For example, a national policy on peace building, reconciliation and conflict prevention is non-existent. We need to deal with nationalism and patriotism and should feel as a Ugandan citizen instead of defining ourselves according to our tribe. Maybe this could be addressed in school curriculums. We need to redefine our form of governance that it more inclusive than present day.

Important and critical is real peace and sustainable reconciliation. Keep up the momentum, harmonize efforts and continue with your work for a national framework.



Honorable Betty Amongi gives closing remarks, 2 December 2006

Day III: The role of civil society in responding to the Juba Talks

The third day of the stakeholders' dialogue was devoted to the question of how civil society actors in Uganda should respond to developments in Juba. It involved a subset of participants from the previous two days. The time spent in individual and organizational introductions *demonstrated that what is happening in relationship to northern Uganda is now of shared concern to organizations from throughout the country*. The discussion showed clearly that participants viewed civil society as a crucial stakeholder who should be more involved in the current peace process. However, according to the participants, civil society is not informed enough and needs to be 'woken up'.

Introductory Remarks by Moses C. Okello:

Resolving the Conflict in northern Uganda: Is the Juba Peace Talk the Jewel in the Ground or mere Gold Dust?

Two scenarios are likely to emerge from Juba. First, the negotiation teams reach a consensus and a peace agreement is signed. This might lead to a comprehensive national reconciliation process. Secondly, if mismanaged, the peace talks fail and massive violence resumes. This is more likely if the government continues to negotiate in Juba while simultaneously engaging the LRA military wing by telephone and on the ground by armed force. This creates multiple processes, which are, to say the least, uncoordinated. The ICC arrest warrants may be withdrawn or remain in place. The impact of this on talks is all too clear. If withdrawn, post Juba tensions might be avoided altogether but victim reparations might take centre stage.

While the process remains complex and convoluted, there is growing though cautious consensus that the first scenario may come about. For the rebels this suggests acceding to the calls by various Ugandans to express their grievances more realistically, particularly as they approach the more complicated phase of the negotiations – the phase for discussing issues of accountability, marginalisation and national reconciliation. Equally, the government involvement needs to go beyond the presence of a negotiating team in Juba.

The active involvement of principles drawn from traditional and cultural institutions in the mediation of the conflict, and the impact of this for legal developments in Uganda, is likely to upset international law and therefore continue to stir debate on the conflict. It is likely that the focus will shift towards the role of the Ugandan judiciary in dealing with both actors in the conflict.

Whatever the outcomes of the process, Ugandans and organisations working in northern Uganda should brace themselves for a new wave of international focus on Uganda.

Challenges for civil society

The challenges identified included:

1. Governance in Uganda and poor conflict management in the past
2. The need to get security and political issues discussed
3. Past/present/potential conflicts, and a pattern of militarization
4. The need to link Juba to a national reconciliation process
5. Favorable/unfavorable International involvement
6. ICC problematic
7. Weakness of civil society

During the discussion, the participants focused mainly on the question of civil society's stake in the peace process. There was consensus that civil society has a very important role in the current events. However, it is not well coordinated, not well informed and has little impact on the Government of Uganda.

The question was raised of how to wake up civil society. The group brainstormed about existing networks and which organization could have the potential to take a lead role. CSOPNU (Civil Society for Peace in Northern Uganda) was identified to be most active, but still in need of more dedication towards political advocacy. The idea came up to have a loose coalition called the Juba Action Group which makes suggestions to CSOPNU in order to push forward the process.

It was agreed that the participants needed

- a) to establish which civil society representatives have been to Juba and what agenda items they have pushed forward
- b) to agree on key agenda items for civil society and to seek bodies to lobby on these: NGO forum, CSOPNU.

Hence, the participants brainstormed about people who had had an opportunity to go to Juba. A number of participants volunteered to draft an agenda with action points after the ending of the dialogue.

- We do not want a 'Savimbi solution'.
- We seek a strong role for cultural leaders.
- We promote alternatives to ICC.
- We wish to lobby the ICC to substantially enhance trust fund and to work on investigating GoU side. Also noted the need to expand understanding of the ICC – agreed that we could invite ICC to talk to representatives of the Juba Action Group.
- Advocate for improved composition of Cessation of Hostilities monitoring team.
- Advocate for civil society monitors on basis of Civic-Military Relations.
- Advocate for African forces to be on the team. Noted that Ri-Kwangba can support people (boreholes, access roads).

- Action group could put up an action desk, build media relations and generate alternative information. Lobby international media to take more interest in these talks.
- Capacity of media: Get our own journalist placed in Juba to provide independent reporting.
- Re-invigorate confidence in the process.
- Concentrate on language of equals, recognise what is to be gained and to be lost. Recommend a statement about political, social costs (and benefits) Urge single voice from Government.
- Recommend statement reminding about need to adhere to agreements.
- Link up with other networks (e.g. Sudan Times, Churches in Sudan through UJCC, FECCLHA Fellowship for Christian Councils and Churches in Horn of Africa). NB continued silence of Kenya, Tanzanian and Khartoum governments. Look at tourism as an entry point.
- Examine nature and adequacy of humanitarian aid and its sustainability: Link to other networks re small arms etc. Research the different forums of LRA: Organise conference of Diaspora along lines of Kacokke Madit.
- Civil society has responsibility to bring other areas onto the public agenda (e.g. Karamoja, Bunyoro etc).