

Amnesty as a Panacea to Conflict: An Assessment of the Contribution of Amnesty to Conflict Resolution and Sustainable Peace in Uganda.

Innocent Muramuzi

Keywords: Amnesty, Conflict, Conflict Resolution, Peace, Sustainable peace

Introduction

Ceteris paribus, cessation of conflict was expected once the amnesty Act was promulgated. However, since the promulgation of the Amnesty Act (2000), there are insurgents still at large that have not taken advantage of the Amnesty Act.

Study Objectives

Determine knowledge of the contribution of amnesty to conflict resolution and sustainable peace in Uganda; examine the effectiveness of the procedures in the Amnesty Act in accessing amnesty in Uganda; assess the limitations of the Amnesty Act to conflict resolution and sustainable peace in Uganda and advance a model of amnesty as a panacea to conflict. The following were the research questions; What is the contribution of the Amnesty Act to conflict resolution and sustainable peace in Uganda? How effective were the procedures in the Amnesty Act in accessing amnesty in Uganda? What were the limitations of the Amnesty Act to conflict resolution and sustainable peace in Uganda? How is amnesty a panacea to conflict?

Methodology

The study used both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. This was done to ensure that enough information is collected. The study used a questionnaire to collect data from all respondents while an interview guide was used to collect

qualitative data from key informants of the study. The study employed a cross-sectional survey study design where several sections of the population were studied through a questionnaire and interviews. A case study design is important when a researcher wants to establish the “whys” and “hows” of a particular research phenomenon.

Key Study Findings

The necessity of amnesty in conflict resolution and attainment of sustainable peace included that amnesty is cheaper than conflict (66.12%). Some of the challenges faced in the implementation of the amnesty Act include ignorance of the amnesty law (87.43%), the inclusion of the transition clause in the amnesty Act (2000), and later exclusion of insurgency leaders from among the beneficiaries of amnesty, limited compensation and limited timeframe. Some of the limitations of amnesty seekers include ignorance of the amnesty law; (63.11%), mistrust against the government and limited information.

The Peace for Peace Model of amnesty was developed which makes Amnesty a Panacea to Conflict. Amnesty was able to achieve a return of 26,390 insurgents who abandoned the rebellion (Amnesty Commission report 2013). However, the number of insurgents still at large is not known to date. Despite the promulgation of the Amnesty Act (2000), LRA leaders have never surrendered or ever been captured.

Recommendations

Use of conflict prevention measures, Resolving causes of conflicts, use of peaceful conflict resolution mechanisms like PEPEMA

Key References:

- Ambos, K., Large, J. & Wierda, M., (2009). *Building a Future on Peace and Justice. Peace and Development Studies on Transitional Justice*. Springer.com
- Amstutz, M. R., (2005). *The healing of nations: The promise and limits of political forgiveness*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Boutros-Ghali, B., (1992). *An Agenda for Peace. Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peacekeeping*. Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the statement adopted by the Summit Meeting of the Security Council on 31 January 1992. New York: United Nations.
- Mallinder, L., (2008). *Hart: Amnesty, Human Rights and Political Transitions: Bridging the Peace and Justice Divide. Volume 21 of Studies in international law*. (No City): Hart.
- Ntoubandi, F. Z., (2007). *Amnesty for Crimes against Humanity under International Law*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Rawls, J., (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- The Amnesty Act (2000). Kampala: Uganda.