conflict in northern Uganda calls for a re-examination of the management of the entire return process, particularly considering how increased attention to fundamental aspects relating to security, such as land ownership, could reduce the potential for new or repeated displacement. The government and all organisations involved in return need to consider questions such as: What is the impact of land-related conflicts on the potential for a return to conflict? What implication may land-related conflict have for a re-displacement of returnees? Who is responsible for ensuring the safety of returnees as well as the return of their property and land?

Article 11, Clause 1 of The African Union Convention for Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa (Kampala Convention, 2009), under Obligations of States Parties relating to Sustainable Return, Local Integration or Relocation, requires States Parties to “seek lasting solutions to the problem of displacement by promoting and creating satisfactory conditions for voluntary return, local integration or relocation on a sustainable basis and circumstances of safety and dignity.” However, since the start of the transition to peace, parts of northern Uganda have experienced considerable loss of life through violence, and much destruction of homes and property; property has also been lost through evictions by government agencies, private individuals and investors. This has inevitably undermined confidence and trust – much-needed ingredients in the post-conflict recovery process – among the returnees. In essence, the neglect of land and property issues has threatened the central tenet of post-conflict recovery and reconstruction processes that it is necessary to nurture an environment conducive to reintegration and development in safety.

It is vital that post-conflict land reforms focus attention on reducing tensions and conflicts and promote socially and economically productive land uses; this includes focusing on issues of land access, land ownership and land use so as to help prevent future re-displacement. Most importantly, the displaced populations themselves should be involved in all aspects of the return processes.

Levis Onegi levisonegi@gmail.com is Graduate Research Associate at the African Centre for Migration and Society, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa. This article is based largely on research conducted by the Refugee Law Project Project at Makerere University, Uganda, where the author was the research team leader. However, the article is written in a personal capacity. See also: Refugee Law Project Why being able to return home should be part of transitional justice, School of Law, Makerere University, Working Paper No 2, March 2010 www.beyondjuba.org/BJP1/working_papers/BJP.WP2.pdf UNDP Returning to uncertainty: Addressing vulnerabilities in northern Uganda www.fafo.no/nyhet/return2uncertainty.pdf
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**Education as an essential component of prevention of youth re-displacement**

Marina L Anselme and Barbara Zeus

Given that education is seen as a factor that keeps refugees in camps or host communities rather than encouraging them to go back home, it is ironic that it is not systematically included as part of return. Our experience in Burundi is that access to education is not only a right but also essential to the sustainability of return for younger people and thus to preventing their re-displacement. Consistent access to appropriate education underpins social reintegration of young returnees and thus the prevention of displacement in the longer term. Education should thus be a core part of repatriation plans.

Lack of structural planning for young people especially in terms of continuity of education once they crossed back to Burundi from Tanzania has had a detrimental effect on their ability to integrate into schools there. In Tanzania secondary school enrolment was 23% lower than for those who remained in Burundi. Paradoxically after their return the level was 55% lower than for those who had never left.

We found that the difficulties faced by young returnees included poverty, leading to families’ inability to pay for their children’s education-related costs (uniforms, books, etc); limited capacity of the Burundian education system to absorb the returnees in the public schools; lack of school certificates showing their level of educational attainment in exile, which prevented them from being admitted to Burundian schools; unfamiliarity with the language of instruction (language instruction not only helps young people in their achievements at school but also in attaining a sense of belonging and shared common identity); and the need to catch up with subjects that were missing from the curriculum in Tanzania.

Young returnees interviewed who were not going to school found it harder to re-integrate in general, to the point where they would recommend to refugees still in Mtibila, the one remaining camp for Burundian refugees in Tanzania, to remain in Tanzania while those who were going to school had more solid plans for their own future and easily envision staying in their home country. On the whole girls found it harder to integrate than boys, mostly because of the hostile school environment, they reported.

Finally, to ensure the successful repatriation of young people, cross-border commitment and continuity of support are needed for education activities that are shown to contribute to social integration, peace, stability, poverty reduction and therefore permanent return.

Marina L Anselme anselme@theret.org is Chief, Education Programme and Development Officer at The Refugee Education Trust http://theret.org/en/home Barbara Zeus zeus@theret.org is Head of Mission for RET in Burundi. http://theret.org/en/where-we-work/L/burundi
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