

Outside the Box:

Amplifying youth voices and
views on YPS policy and practice



Youth, Peace and Security: Psychosocial Support and Societal Transformation

Brandon Hamber, Denis Martinez, David Taylor,
Marlies Stappers, and Thomas Unger

The views are those of the author and don't necessarily reflect the view of Interpeace or of the Government of Ireland.

Youth, Peace and Security: Psychosocial Support and Societal Transformation

Brandon Hamber, Denis Martinez, David Taylor, Marlies Stappers,
and Thomas Unger¹

Introduction

In 2018, mandated by UN Security Council Resolution 2250, the UN published *The Missing Peace: Independent Progress Study on Youth, Peace and Security* (hereafter *The Missing Peace*), completed in 2015. One area discussed in this wide-ranging report is the psychosocial well-being of young people who live in societies that are experiencing or recently experienced high levels of political violence. It observes that, for young people living in the shadow of political violence, violence is not an occurrence but built into the fabric of society, and as a result has long-term and insidious effects.

Young people's exposure to protracted violence has a detrimental impact on their psychosocial health and well-being. Historically, much of the research in this area has focused on the impact of exposure to violence in a single "life domain". However, increasing attention is being paid to the cumulative effects of multiple and overlapping forms of violence and trauma across different dimensions of young people's lives (*The Missing Peace*, p. 104).

The report goes on to note that these effects are transgenerational:

Violence, uncertainty and instability discourage young people from investing in their future. Unless addressed, they can lead to self-destructive coping mechanisms that undermine young people's positive resilience. Exposure to violence, especially at a young age and at the hands of the very institutions that are supposed to protect young people, is a key factor in escalating cycles of violence across generations (*The Missing Peace*, p. 104).

The report also highlights that the well-being and prospects of young people are affected by their social context: direct violence, but also poverty, injustice, exclusion, and colonial legacies. *The Missing Peace* argues that young people exposed to violence need support. It calls for social change and transformation of the root causes of violence, and specifically says that young people should be leaders in this change, building on their own resilience in a transformative manner. Taking that recom-

¹ Professor Brandon Hamber is John Hume and Thomas P. O'Neill Chair in Peace based at the International Conflict Research Institute (INCORE) and the Transitional Justice Institute, Ulster University, and a Board Member of Impunity Watch. Correspondence to b.hamber@ulster.ac.uk. Denis Martinez is Director of the Impunity Watch office in Guatemala. Marlies Stappers is Executive Director of Impunity Watch. David Taylor is Director of the Impunity Watch office in Burundi. Thomas Unger is Strategic Advisor at Impunity Watch and also based at the Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights. We thank Graeme Simpson and Ali Altiok for their constructive comments on earlier versions of this paper.



mendation forward, this Brief explores the value of a psychosocial approach.

The Brief argues that a psychosocial approach can facilitate context-specific interventions that address the impacts of protracted violence and illuminate their nature. It can enhance youth participation in social, economic and political life, and improve mental health. At the same time, where underlying issues such as poverty, exclusion, racism, and sexism persist, they will continue to undermine young people's mental health. Building on *The Missing Peace*, the Brief therefore argues that it is necessary to adopt a transformative approach that extends well beyond limited mental health and psychosocial interventions. The objective should be to change the underlying causes of harm, drawing on the transformative resilience of young people to make and maintain change over time.

The Brief begins by showing that the psychosocial approach accords with the findings of *The Missing Peace*. It goes on to argue that, to improve psychosocial well-being, it will be necessary to introduce community-based psychosocial support initiatives but also change the contexts (of impunity, unemployment, inequality, etc.) in which violence and human rights violations occur. The Brief then outlines a range of pathways to improve psychosocial practice and applies these to case studies in Burundi and Guatemala. It concludes by making several recommendations. Overall, it argues that it is as important to increase mental health and psychosocial support for young people as it is to increase their meaningful participation, which can extend to mobilisation and resistance. Both processes can positively change and enhance their well-being.



The psychosocial lens

At the most basic level, the psychosocial is concerned with the interconnections between psychological and social processes and how these influence one another in continuous, sometimes inseparable ways. It provides a lens through which political conflict can be viewed and understood. Psychosocial analysis uses well-being (broadly defined in social, material, psychological, environmental, cultural and spiritual terms) to understand the impact of political violence and how to address it.

Underpinning the psychosocial approach is an understanding that political violence not only inflicts physical and psychological harm on individuals, but destroys ways of life, social institutions, norms, the sense of belonging, and systems of meaning (Beristain, 2006; Bracken and Petty 1998; Hamber, 2009b; Lykes, 2000). In addition, this generally occurs in a wider context, in which other (often related) social issues impact on well-being, such as

poverty, unemployment, social exclusion, poor education, inadequate housing, crime, environmental degradation, corruption, lack of opportunities for political participation, gender violence and exclusion, and a general lack of personal and human security (World Bank, 2018).

Within these dynamic environments, at the same time, the psychosocial approach recognizes that individuals and communities are resourceful and active agents. They cope, adapt to, deal with and resist what happens to them. This resilience is not simply a personal characteristic but is embedded in the social fabric, culture and institutions of communities.

The psychosocial approach should be based on a comprehensive and systemic analysis of conflict and its consequences, and a rounded understanding of the complex relationship between individual (and sometimes collective) well-being and broad-

er social, material, environmental, cultural and political factors that influence it. The issue of well-being, broadly defined, is positioned at the centre of analysis. The approach also identifies individual, family, community and social resources, resiliencies, capacities and opportunities that people can draw on to manage their environment and enhance their well-being. It holds that strengthening resilience is critical to maintaining peace, well-being, addressing the causes of harm and preventing future violence.

At the same time, the approach recognizes that, because violence is deeply rooted or extensive in some contexts, local and sometimes external assistance may be necessary to animate or bolster a community's coping resources or to repair and heal the psychological and physical effects of violence. Identifying and tackling threats, stressors, and risks that can impact or undermine well-being are vital elements of the approach.²

It should be underlined that use of the binary word 'psychosocial' does not imply that the 'psycho' and the 'social' are separate entities. In reality, they are inseparable: well-being is not achieved by projects and interventions that target one or the other (Stephen Frosh, 2014; Stephen Frosh, 2019; Hamber and Gallagher, 2015; Hamber, Gallagher, and Ventevogel, 2014; Williamson and Robinson, 2006). It follows that individual interventions on their own (such as counselling, or initiatives to build personal

resiliency by psycho-education) will not adequately address the impacts of political violence on individuals, because they are unlikely to rebuild the social fabric or change the larger social and political environment.

Furthermore, although 'psychosocial' is often associated with community and individual interventions that can enhance well-being (as discussed below), the approach conceives well-being in broader terms. For example, acts of resistance that change the social context have psychosocial dimensions, as do institutional interventions (such as transitional justice mechanisms), actions that increase security, create political stability or guarantee the protection of rights, and processes of wider social reconstruction or political change. Some scholars argue that wide-ranging political and social processes of change *are* psychosocial interventions (Hamber, 2009a; Hamber and Gallagher, 2015; Palmary, Hamber, and Nunez, 2014). At the same time, it must be recognised that interventions to address broader social needs or meet material concerns (by investing in development or job creation, etc.) will not necessarily address causes of psychological harm (such as exclusion, discrimination, the impact of colonialism, etc.), misperceptions of those perceived as 'other', or identity-related conflict. In consequence, psychosocial interventions must adopt a holistic framework and include a comprehensive array of inter-related activities.

2 We specifically thank Ruth Marsden and Ananda Galappatti for helping us to conceptualize the psychosocial approach.

Mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS)

Policy circles, and particularly the UN, often speak of ‘mental health and psychosocial support’ (MHPSS) rather than psychosocial support. The concept of MHPSS was originally used in emergency settings and humanitarian crises (IASC, 2007). More recently, its importance has increasingly been acknowledged in the peacebuilding field. Its recognition, not least in the UN Secretary General’s (UNSG) *Report on Building and Sustaining Peace 2020*, is an important development:

The further development of the integration of mental health and psychosocial support into peacebuilding is envisaged with a view to increasing the resilience and agency of people and communities (United Nations, 2020, p. 11).

MHPSS has been used “to describe any type of local or outside support that aims to protect or promote psychosocial well-being and/or prevent or treat mental disorder” (IASC, 2010). It can include support to strengthen community and family, focused (person-to-person) non-specialized support, and clinical interventions by psychologists, psychiatrists and nurses (IASC, 2007). Importantly, MHPSS does not valorise or focus unduly on professional interventions; it recognises that communities have capacities to deal with humanitarian crises (and arguably political violence), and that these, alongside coping and resilience, should be strengthened using participatory processes (IASC, 2010). Efforts to enable and empower community social support, through teachers, civic leaders, and religious officials, rather than relying on external professionals, are at the heart of the MHPSS approach (Rehberg, 2014). MHPSS in war-affected populations, therefore, “explores resilience-oriented and community-driven (bottom-up), rather than deficit-oriented (trauma-focused) and expert-driven (top-down) approaches” (Otake, 2018, p. 2, cited in Hassan et al., 2016; Wessells, 2015).

In a review of its MHPSS work with young people, UNICEF listed the following kinds of psychosocial intervention (UNICEF, 2020):

- Individual therapeutic interventions to address symptoms associated with witnessing conflict.
- Programmes to strengthen skills that help young people who had been affected by or had participated in political conflict to enter the labour market.
- Participatory activities, such as role-play and active learning, to reinforce the social and emotional coping skills of young people in the aftermath of armed conflict.
- Recreational activities, life skills sessions, and parenting circles to disseminate best parenting practices and provide support to refugee families.
- Psycho-educational work with youth to strengthen their resilience and coping capacities by identifying issues they prioritise and working on creative problem-solving.
- Group-based skill-building sessions, in vocational skills, technical skills, fitness, and arts and crafts.
- Activities to increase social connectedness among youth displaced by conflict.
- Educational initiatives to reduce gender-based violence and alcoholism among offenders.
- Activities to increase parenting skills and emotional management in the home.

The range of MHPSS interventions is wide. As a result, MHPSS practitioners tend to define psychosocial interventions in terms of outcome rather

than in terms of their nature or the type of intervention. Outcomes are often equated with well-being, broadly defined in social, material, psychological, environmental, cultural and spiritual terms (Hamber and Gallagher, 2015). For other practitioners, psychosocial interventions enable people to reach their potential and lead productive and peaceful lives (Bubenzer and Tankink, 2017; Christensen and Edward, 2015; Gutlove and Thompson, 2003).

A psychosocial initiative can therefore be understood as any intervention or practice³ that enhances well-being:

...ranging from informal community practices (e.g. rituals, informal support networks) in the midst of conflict to structured externally-driven psychosocial projects or interventions (e.g. youth projects, education programmes, counselling). Such practices can take place ... with a range of constituencies (e.g. victims groups, IDPs, young people) that operate in different spaces (e.g. the courtroom, indigenous healing rituals, the therapy room, churches, etc.) and are driven by different practitioners (e.g. mental health workers, local community, activists).⁴

That said, there is often a mismatch between the holistic conception of the psychosocial approach outlined earlier and the practice of MHPSS. Most notably, much work billed as MHPSS tends to focus on improving mental health through external interventions, which often undermine existing resources. Due to shrinking humanitarian budgets, programmes rely heavily on biomedical tools and approaches (counselling for trauma) even though it is recognised that these do not address the more profound psychosocial consequences and causes of war (Rehberg, 2014; Rokhideh, 2017).

The Missing Peace criticises a narrow biomedical description of trauma (that focuses on issues such as anxiety, depression, post-traumatic stress disorder) because it narrows understanding of distress and does not consider its links to social institutions, exclusion, historical injustices, poor living conditions, etc. Palliative solutions are inadequate to address the psychosocial needs of young people because they do not take account of the role of the wider context in creating psychological harm and limiting social and political prospects. Notably in the way it frames transformative resilience, *The Missing Peace* sets out to challenge a narrow conception of MHPSS and to fully implement a holistic psychosocial approach. It is to this we now turn.

3 Use of the word 'practice' flowed from the project described in the note below. In summary, terms such as 'programme' and 'intervention' refer to formal activities that are usually funded. Many communities affected by armed conflict engage in activities that are psychosocial in character but are not run as projects and are integrated in community life (healing rituals, grieving processes, use of churches, ceremonies, commemorations). 'Practices' captures these better than 'interventions' (See Hamber and Gallagher, 2015).

4 This definition was developed as part of a multi-year study supported by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), led by Brandon Hamber in collaboration with Inger Agger, Saliha Bava, Glynis Clacherty, Alison Crosby, Sumona DasGupta, Mauricio Gaborit, Elizabeth Gallagher, Igreja, M. Brinton Lykes, R. Srinivasa Murthy, Lorena Núñez, Duduzile Ndlovu, Ingrid Palmay, Gameela Samarasinghe, Jack Saul, Shobna Sonpar, Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian, Stevan M. Weine, and Mike Wessells. Their inputs were critical to this conceptualisation. For the complete text, see Hamber and Gallagher (2015, p. 290).

The Missing Peace and the psychosocial approach

The argument of *The Missing Peace* accords with the psychosocial approach in many respects. Both acknowledge, for example, that violence has multi-generational impacts in many societies and is often embedded in the social fabric. Its effects go well beyond harm to individuals and are responsible for systematic violations linked to poverty, exclusion, racism, ethnic discrimination, etc. Unfortunately, recognising that violence can have social, political and institutional impacts on young people, and that its effects are multi-generational, cumulative, and overlap with other forms of violence, does not make it easier to respond effectively.

Like this Brief, *The Missing Peace* notes that it is not adequate to treat the psychological impact of conflict on young people as a narrow service-delivery issue. *The Missing Peace* strikes a note of caution on programmatic responses that conceptualise and operationalise trauma too narrowly “in favour of trauma management and curative psychosocial intervention models, in lieu of approaches to livelihoods, education and civic/political empowerment rights for young people” (p. 100). It argues that young people’s psychosocial well-being should be supported by culturally-relevant and context-specific community interventions, but also warns that culture-as-treatment can distract from the continuing economic and political disenfranchisement of young people (p. 105).

Overall, *The Missing Peace* recommends that psychosocial services should adopt a positive youth development approach that builds on existing capacities and resilience. As we have seen, this idea is a core principle of the psychosocial approach and MHPSS practice. However, *The Missing Peace* makes a specific contribution by developing the meaning of ‘resilience’. It states that resilience is not defined or determined by individual attri-

butes and experiences but by the relationship between young people and the broader capacities of their communities (p. 31). In other words, especially when faced with violent turmoil, resilience is developed and sustained by institutions and their relationships, including the assets, capabilities, and leadership that are embedded more broadly in communities and society (p. 31). Resilience therefore has a transformative element when it acts to drive political change, alter institutions, rebuild damaged relationships or address the underlying causes of conflict (p. 31).

This same understanding is present in the wider field of resilience studies, which identifies pathways to creating what can be called ‘resilient systems’. Mitchell identifies several capacities that facilitate resilience (Mitchell, 2013, p. 7):⁵

- **Absorptive capacity** preserves the stability and structure of the system, otherwise termed ‘resistance’. This is most commonly reflected in traditional disaster risk reduction, and is a common (mis)understanding of what resilience means.
- **Adaptive capacity** introduces flexibility in the system leading to incremental changes, otherwise termed ‘persistence’. This is commonly associated with climate change adaptation.
- **Transformative capacity** promotes significant changes that often challenge and alter the values and power structures of the system, otherwise termed ‘transformation’. These can include a combination of technological innovations, institutional reforms, behavioural shifts and cultural changes (Foresight, 2012a). It is often used in peacebuilding and post-conflict programming.

5 Others have explored these concepts. See, for example: Bene, Godfrey-Wood, Newsham, and Davies, 2012; Cutter et al., 2008; McCandless and Simpson, 2015; Walker, Holling, Carpenter, and Kinzig, 2004.

Drawing on these ideas and its own research, Interpeace has outlined what it calls a “resilience approach for peace”. Its starting point is:

...the identification of capacities that exist at different levels of social organization in any society: in individuals, at the household level, in communities, within institutions, or at the wider society level. These capacities manifest in various forms and are very specific to a given context. They may exist as physical assets that people possess, norms by which social relations are ordered, or networks through which information is disseminated. People have recourse to these capacities when they are under stress or threat, whether from sudden shocks such as an earthquake, or from the enduring stress in protracted situations of oppression and conflict ... resilience capacities exist and are being used to survive, or get by or to transform situations of conflict and promote durable peace (in resilience terminology: ‘absorb’, ‘adapt’ or ‘transform’) ... A resilience approach therefore focusses on a society’s or a community’s endogenous capacities⁶ for peace, as opposed to its fault-lines for fragility and in doing so, affirms its endogenous assets, capacities and strengths (Interpeace, 2016, pp. 1-2).

Interpeace also defines forms of resilience that are adaptive, absorptive and transformative:

[At the] absorptive and adaptive end of the spectrum are strategies and capacities that enable systems to survive despite shocks and stressors, without necessarily excising the threat or addressing its underlying causes. On the other hand, transformative forms of resilience refer to those strategies and capacities that look to address the stressors and shocks through change processes, which in turn, address not just the symptoms, but the causes (Simpson et al., 2016, p. 15).

The notion of transformative resilience is at the heart of *The Missing Peace* and directly parallels the transformative elements of a psychosocial approach. To make a simple comparison, a psychosocial approach that seeks to address symptoms associated with suffering that results from political violence resembles an absorptive approach to resilience. It is typified by counselling that improves and consolidates personal attributes, enabling individuals to cope with stress and absorb external shocks without addressing underlying causes (for example, political violence).

Adaptive resilience is closer to much of the psychosocial work seen in peacebuilding contexts. This moves beyond simply coping with a situation but adapts to the contexts seeking to make a more sustainable difference. Examples might include: creative social and recreational programmes that build community cohesion, such as sports initiatives that bring divided young people together; or shared school programmes that bring children of different ethnic groups together in co-operative ventures; or capacity-building programmes that promote social change by training young leaders. These approaches have elements of what is sometimes called adaptive peacebuilding: they facilitate processes, increase the capacity of social institutions, sustain community engagement, promote constant learning, and encourage community participation and ownership (de Coning, 2018). This form of action certainly has a role, like the direct intervention work often associated with MHPSS.

Transformative resilience moves beyond this. It seeks to change the underlying causes of conflict by animating the society’s capacities to challenge and change a context, not merely sustain or maintain peace. Young people across the globe are frustrated by their exclusion from meaningful civic and political participation, and they mistrust systems of patronage and corrupt governance that are unwilling or incapable of reform (*The Missing Peace*, 2015). An adaptive approach may try to increase youth participation, for example by explaining political systems, or teaching community engagement skills, or community organizing and leadership. A

⁶ Interpeace defines ‘endogenous resilience’ as capacities that are already “embedded within individuals, communities and societies and the relationships among them, as opposed to capacities that are cultivated or ‘built’” (Simpson, Makoond, Vinck, Pham, with Argueta, 2016, p. 19).

transformative approach will try to challenge the structures that create their exclusion. Such an approach is more likely to promote community mobilisation, political organizing, and social activism. Resilience of this kind more closely resembles resistance strategies that transform the social context in “alternative ways that are perceived to be more just” (Juncos and Joseph, 2020, p. 298). Young people have an essential role in such processes. As *The Missing Peace* notes:

Young people can be powerful challengers of the status quo through peaceful protest, social critique, cultural expression, and on-line mobilization and organization (p. 57).

This is not to say that adaptive processes (and MH-PSS interventions) cannot include adaptive and transformative elements. Some adaptive MH-PSS interventions (such as youth leadership programmes) can arguably generate transformative capacity and change the broader social and political environment.

Transformative resilience is not always straightforward and can have positive and negative dimensions. This is evident in many societies, for example when young people respond to problems by resorting to substance abuse, participating in war-based sub-economies, joining gangs and other criminal activities, or engaging in violent social protest (*The Missing Peace*, p. 33). The idea of positive and negative resilience is helpful because, when youth engage in criminal activity for economic benefit or join armed groups, those actions also highlight their creativity and capacity to adapt and survive in dire circumstances or a hostile environment. The critical question is how we respond to manifestations of resilience and whether we co-opt and convert their negative expression into positive outcomes.

That said, *The Missing Peace* notes that most young people are not involved, and are not in danger of participating, in violence. On the contrary, youth resilience emerges in numerous arenas of civic life and many innovative endeavours that have little to do with formal politics. Resilience can be adaptive and transformative at the same time, as noted. Choosing non-violence, especially in deeply divided and unequal societies, is evidence of a profound resilience capacity in and of itself. This emerges powerfully in a quote from one of the focus groups in *The Missing Peace*:

Despite living in very difficult situations, the young people consulted have not turned to violence, even if so many in their community have. This resistance to violence is a strength in which to invest (p. 31).

The transformative and psychosocial approaches both look beyond the individual and recognise that well-being is inseparable from the social, cultural, and political context. A response must build on resources, capacities and opportunities in the community that can enhance well-being and also challenge structures that perpetuate harm. To use a phrase in *The Missing Peace*, such an approach to social change stands at the crossroad between risk and resilience, where:

Young people have a unique perspective on the factors that may enable them to address their experiences of marginalization and exclusion through either positive or negative manifestations of resilience ... [T]he positive forms of resilience of young people in relation to peace and conflict are vital to building and sustaining peace: they help societies address the manifestations, causes and legacies of violent conflict, and can be critical to how communities and societies prevent the re-emergence of conflict (p. 31, cited originally in Simpson et al., 2016).

Pathways to improved psychosocial practice

This section explores the implications of the approaches outlined above to identify pathways that will improve psychosocial practice. This is important to do because the mental health needs and broader well-being of young people are often under-emphasized, particularly in societies impacted by violence and division.

The first pathway involves **formal social service**. As *The Missing Peace* points out, societies should provide and deliver equitable social services, including sexual and reproductive health, and psychosocial and other services that are particularly critical for young people. These services promote social cohesion and ensure all young people have an equal start in life. They should be adequately funded, age- and gender-inclusive, non-discriminatory and comprehensive. For states with poor infrastructure, service delivery may be challenging but it should remain a strategic goal.

The Missing Peace notes that, when they are well-delivered, state-supported services to young people can enhance their trust in institutions and the state's legitimacy, which are lacking in many societies. Adequately-funded state services are also more sustainable. Some specialised services will be needed, but these may be required only for a minority of those who need MHPSS.⁷

Direct service provision of individual support (for example, counselling) needs to be complemented by a second pathway, **a more comprehensive array of MHPSS interventions provided through civil society**.

Two examples show why. If a young woman experiences domestic violence in a patriarchal society, she will be stigmatised and made to feel guilty and ashamed, and may not be allowed or may feel unable to seek support, report the crime or claim her rights. Equally, a young man who suffers from the effects of past political violence, but who lives in poverty without sustainable employment, may feel obliged to accommodate the demands of a local gang to engage in criminal activity. Individual mental health support cannot fully resolve such cases.

More broadly-based MHPSS programmes can invite victims of domestic violence to join support groups, offer young men psycho-education on violence against women, or divert young men from crime by using sporting or cultural activities, etc.⁸

However, broader societal interventions may also be necessary: a third pathway enhances well-being by **changing elements in the social environment that cause harm**. Actions relevant to the two cases above might include: a social media campaign to address stigma; a campaign to encourage reporting of domestic or gender violence; a shelter for victims of domestic and gender violence; programmes to meet basic needs; employment programmes that develop long-term skills, etc.

The psychosocial approach recognises that initiatives that change the social environment are a form of MHPSS to the degree that they remove or challenge causes of harm. In moving beyond adaptive and palliative interventions, it accords with the notion of transformative resilience, as noted. This is a controversial approach to mental health, because

⁷ Unspecialized health care providers can clinically manage many mental disorders, for example, via pharmacological management; community workers can also identify and refer cases. Some disorders should be managed by psychiatrists, psychiatric nurses and psychologists working in primary health care, or general health facilities, or mental health facilities. (For more information, see IASC Reference Group for Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Emergency Settings, 2012).

⁸ *The Missing Peace* outlines a range of such interventions. These include: creative interventions to address past violations; sport to build inter-community cohesion; political dialogues to promote inclusion of young people; interventions to build self-esteem, etc.

it adds a political dimension to care. However, it is counterintuitive to recognize the large-scale harms caused by social repression, or exclusion from resources and power on grounds of age, gender, or ethnicity, but to conclude that these harms can be remedied by providing better medical, psychological or social care to individuals who are harmed.

The Missing Peace includes a fourth pathway to improve psychosocial support for young people: **promotion of youth leadership and agency for peace and security, including active support to civil society and youth-led organizations.** Well-being is enhanced, not just by improving services or access to resources, but by providing space and support for young people to exercise agency, enabling them to meet their own needs. Activating young people's agency improves their sense of social belonging, as well as civic trust and self-confidence – effects often associated with broader understandings of health. Characteristic actions might include: funding and supporting youth-led organizations; the inclusion of youth in political decision-making; and youth involvement in social action, resistance and organizing activities.

As *The Missing Peace* notes:

Recognizing young people's direct, peaceful, popular action is important to avoid conceiving young people's contribution to peace as purely institutionalized, organized or taking the form of "projects" (p. 57).

This pathway creates opportunities to harness the transformative resilience of young people: they become not just recipients of support, but can drive political change, help rebuild damaged relationships, and address underlying causes of conflict.

Overall, the psychosocial approach calls for improvements in youth-specific service provision, broader social and community-based interventions, and more comprehensive social change when harms originate outside the individual (for example, are caused by poverty, inequality, political discrimination, gendered exclusion, etc.). At the core, delivering these outcomes depends on seeing young people as skilled and resourceful agents who participate in and often lead processes of change.



Case Studies

Burundi

Hutu collective memory and identity generally highlight 1972, when the Tutsi-dominated army systematically killed educated Hutus. This is considered the first genocide in the Great Lakes Region. Tutsi narratives focus on the genocidal killings of Tutsi civilians in 1993 after the country's first Hutu president was assassinated. More recently, local understandings of past and current violence have been dominated by the political crisis in May 2015, when a series of mass demonstrations against the former president's third term in office culminated in a failed coup. The events of 2015 marked something of a change: though certain political figures aligned to the party in power tried to frame the protests as Tutsi-led, the mainly-youthful protestors were both Hutu and Tutsi.⁹

That said, research conducted by Impunity Watch in 2015 showed that youth often fell back on their ethnicity to understand and explain the political crisis (Impunity Watch, 2015). This indicates how fragile social cohesion and peaceful cohabitation remain in Burundi. During the 2015 violence (and since), political actors weaponised the past, particularly key dates and periods in Burundi's history, to mobilise and manipulate young people.¹⁰ As the past has never been addressed, collective myths have become constitutive elements of identity and powerful drivers of fear and violence.¹¹

The past is used to explain the present, and ethnic identity becomes a tool for relating, rationalising, and understanding events. This can leave youth vulnerable to manipulation (Impunity Watch, 2015). In addition, because of the association between memory and identity, and the presence of impunity and injustice, individual and collective traumas are transmitted from one generation to the next. Young people frequently articulate inherited traumas of which they have little understanding.

We feel the shock of the war through the testimonies of adults, but we have not lived it
.....
Youth, Woman, Buhinyuza,
original in French/Kirundi.

My parents always convinced me that the Tutsi are cruel because they massacred members of my family. Until 8th grade, I thought my parents were telling the truth about this ethnic group. I had to find out the person who taught me mathematics was a Tutsi. At that moment, I understood that I was lied to and that it is simply a baseless globalization. From this experience, I have friends of Tutsi ethnicity who I appreciate very much
.....
Young man, Hutu, Gasorwe,
original in French/Kirundi.

9 During the protests in 2015, certain political actors supportive of the president's bid for a third term in office would refer to particular neighbourhoods of Bujumbura as being the areas from which the protestors originated. These neighbourhoods are those that were traditionally Tutsi-dominated neighbourhoods following the balkanisation of Bujumbura during the civil war. Although these neighbourhoods have become largely mixed, they are still known for their previous (mono-) ethnic composition.

10 Ethnicity is not the only source of manipulation. Impunity Watch research has shown that masculinities, particularly violent and hegemonic masculinities, play a key role in mobilising young men to commit violence and violent acts (Niyonzima and Kezimana, 2020).

11 After his 2014 visit to Burundi, the UN Special Rapporteur on Justice noted that "a tradition of impunity over the past decades has not only been further entrenched, it has become a very deliberately used tool of repression and violence". A Truth and Reconciliation Commission was established in 2014 but lacked independence from the government, a budget, and legitimacy. At the end of its four-year mandate, it had achieved little and was largely unknown to victims and communities in Burundi. A new TRC was established in 2018. It has proved to be much more active but has attracted even more significant criticism of its independence. One of its key strategies has been to undertake exhumations of mass graves without expertise or appropriate protocols. According to many observers, these exhumations have almost exclusively focused on violence in 1972, leading to accusations that the TRC is acting to promote a Hutu version of the past.



Working with the Burundian civil society organization THARS (Trauma Healing and Reconciliation Services), Impunity Watch runs several trauma-healing, psychosocial support, and intergenerational initiatives at community level. Youth play a central role in these. One programme supported participatory action research by 140 young people known as ‘peer researchers’ from 70 communities in three provinces (Bujumbura, Cibitoke, Muyinga). The objective was to generate a truth-seeking process that enabled young people to research their community’s history of violence. The histories then informed platforms for dialogue between different generations and facilitated community-driven memory initiatives. The entire process was accompanied by a range of individual and collective psychosocial support measures.

This process has produced a memory book. It compiles the histories to produce a resource, with pedagogical tools, that acts as a memorial for communities while making sure that a variety of narratives of the past are recognised. In this initiative, youth became actively involved in reporting the past rather than merely passive listeners. Young people essentially drove intergenerational discussions and community-based justice/memory processes,

thereby making it possible, both for them and for the wider community, to generate a more holistic understanding of their history.

In 2020 alone, 180 intergenerational dialogues were conducted at community level. Local authorities are periodically participating in capacity-building/advocacy workshops in 70 communities on the Nyubahiriza programme and 60 communities in the Akariho karavugwa programme. More than 900 people have been given psychosocial counselling support, and more than 450 have participated in interactive theatre sessions that promote intergenerational dialogue and memory transmission. Having credible forums for dealing with the past (such as memory platforms, local community transitional justice initiatives, trauma-healing processes) has helped to promote social cohesion. These activities contribute to the longer-term construction of resilience, which in turn hinders political manipulation and helps to prevent future outbreaks of violence.

In addition, two hundred young people have been trained as psychosocial assistants, who refer more complex cases to provincial-level psychologists but are trained to offer basic listening and support services to communities in Bujumbura Rural, Cib-

itoke and Muyinga. In 2019, on the Akariho karavugwa programme alone, psychosocial assistants conducted 295 outreach sessions that reached more than 20,000 Burundians. Demand for support has outstripped capacity, but has also challenged taboos associated with mental health. As this work is framed as psychosocial, it has made it easier to talk with local authorities about dealing with the past.

In early 2021 Impunity Watch commissioned a consultancy team to evaluate the Nyubahiriza programme. It concluded:

Young people, informed about the history of cyclical conflicts and tired of bearing the stigma of conflicts they haven't experienced first-hand, are now ready to break free from the straitjacket into which they have been placed by hidden or biased histories. As a result, they are equipped to make reasoned choices for or against reconciliation and social cohesion. They consequently refuse the violent transmission of the past. To a large extent, this has been achieved through the community work of the youth 'peace brokers' and psychosocial assistants, who are trusted by communities
.....
Mbonyingingo, Kwizera and Habonimana, 2021.

Most important, the participants themselves found the programme beneficial.

Here on our colline [hill], we had a terrible experience in the past with many inter-ethnic killings. But recently, thanks to [the project], a form of dialogue was created between the so-called enemies of the past, and we were able to talk about what happened ... Today some of those who fled after the massacres are coming back so that we can live together on our colline which we all share"

.....
Youth, Male, Muyinga, original in French/Kirundi.

Before [the project] came to our community, it was difficult for us to comment on what happened during the wars in our country. But now, with the teachings of [the project] and the advice of the psychosocial assistants, of which I am a member, we notice a certain ease of the population of our commune in discussions related to the past in general and ethnicity in particular"

.....
Youth, Female, Bujumbura, original in French/Kirundi.

Guatemala

Nearly 25 years after the peace accords that ended Guatemala's civil conflict, the country continues to exclude young people from policy-making and social participation, even though almost one third of the population is aged between 15 and 30 (NIS, Guatemala and UNFPA, 2018). Most young people live in marginalised areas, in rural Indigenous communities or poor urban neighborhoods, with limited access to education and job opportunities. As a result, many of them decide to migrate to the United States or join gangs in impoverished parts of Guatemala City and other cities (Martinez, 2014).

Most young people do not know what happened during the armed conflict that divided the country between 1960 and 1996, because the government has systematically refused to include it in the school curriculum. Parents do not talk to their children about the horrors of that period because they are traumatised by what was one of the most violent conflicts in Latin America. More than 200,000 died, 45,000 disappeared, 660 massacres occurred, hundreds of communities were destroyed, and more than one million people were displaced or became refugees. The majority of the crimes (93%) were committed by the army and Civil Defense Patrols (PAC), paramilitary groups of men and youth forced by the army to carry out surveillance and combat in their communities (CEH, 1999).

Dominated by military members, the government has denied the facts and tried to impose a policy of impunity and forgetting (Impunity Watch, 2017). The 1996 peace accord started a reconstruction process which many people hoped would expand the participation of Indigenous peoples, women, and youth in state institutions and social organizations. After nearly 25 years, however, youth are still largely excluded (Martinez, 2014). Post-conflict governments have not given them attention, even though the National Youth Commission (CONJUVE) was formed in 1997 and a national policy on youth was a peace process commitment. CONJUVE has been ineffective due to the lack of both funding and political will.

Young women face a particularly challenging situation. Most live confined in their homes due to fear of violence and gangs and lack of jobs and educational opportunities. Sexual abuse and violence against girls and adolescents is widespread. In 2020, more than 90,000 girls and adolescents became pregnant, and more than 4,000 girls and adolescents disappeared, many after fleeing domestic violence in the home.

Despite the precarious conditions that youth face, youth-led initiatives have sprung up in certain communities to resist violence and the policy of forgetting. Many of them can be said to have a psychosocial component. These initiatives demonstrate how important youth leadership and agency are for peace and security and why it is vital to support civil society and youth-led organizations, as outlined earlier in this Brief.

In the northeast region of Ixcán, for example, the children of victims who became refugees in Mexico in the 1980s have formed artist collectives that promote historical memory and values of democracy and peace (Martinez, 2014). Youth from Ixcán Creativo use theatre, music and painting to revive historical memories of the war and counter its omission from school curricula. They organize art festivals in their communities, paint murals, and give workshops in rural high schools, during which they talk with young people about their communities' history and promote values of solidarity and peace.¹²

Initiatives that promote resistance to violence have also appeared in marginalized urban communities. In El Mezquital, a large, marginalized community south of Guatemala City, the group Artiss uses street art (rap, graffiti, dance, theatre) to denounce gang violence and police abuse. Many youth are children of victims in Indigenous communities who fled to Guatemala City during the war to avoid military repression. Artiss speaks out against stigmatisation of those who live in a 'red zone' and affirms their rights to participate and have access to jobs and education.

12 For more information about this work, see: <https://www.facebook.com/Ixcán-creativo-680463178651569/>.



IMPUNITY WATCH

Other approaches seek to change harmful features of the social environment. Advocates of change argue that ‘new’ violations of human rights are the continuation of past political violence in a different form. For many years, Guatemala was a key priority country for the UN and the international community. It was called ‘a poster child’ for comprehensive transitional justice (Naomi Roht-Arriaza, 2017). Today, however, the country has slid back and future conflict cannot be excluded. This trend seriously affects young people: they are harmed directly, and more pervasively their life opportunities are eroded.

Violence and extortion by powerful criminal organizations, gang-related violence, media repression (including the assassination of journalists), and attacks against human rights defenders and social leaders increased in early 2020 (Human Rights Watch, 2020). The government has appeared unable or unwilling to control such criminality, leading observers to conclude that past impunity continues to influence prevailing practices and conduct (Human Rights Watch, 2020). Recently, under the guise of COVID-19, the government imposed a state of siege in various parts of the country, no-

tably in areas where Indigenous communities suffered genocide in the past. These areas have been rapidly militarised, using similar forms of repression and evoking memories of the war. Victims speak about reliving the fears and the traumas of that time. Another consequence is that many young people, including unaccompanied minors, have fled the country or attempted to do so (Human Rights Watch, 2020). All this is occurring even though the international community has invested for years in peace, the rule of law, disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration, and security sector reform.

Systematic impunity is both a cause of psychological harm and suffering and one of the main obstacles to adequate psychosocial support that can make a lasting change to the lives of those affected. The case of Guatemala shows that it is necessary to integrate efforts to end impunity more closely with efforts to protect and promote psychosocial well-being. Some civil organizations in Guatemala conceive MHPSS support in this broad way, and their work aligns with the more transformative model of resilience discussed earlier.

Such approaches to MHPSS identify and challenge causes of harm and do not merely provide individual and community-based MHPSS. They empower young victims to control their own lives, using creative MHPSS practices like those employed by Ixcan Creativo and Artiss. They address issues such

as impunity, poverty and violence. The El Mezquit- al programme not only uses psychosocial cultural interventions (such as street art) but gives communities a voice to demand respect for their rights to participate in society, obtain jobs and education, and claim a stake in the economy.

Future strategies and approaches

Psychosocial analysis and MHPSS services can help to address youth, peace, and security questions at various levels.

At the most basic, MHPSS services are required to address the psychological needs of young people after conflict. This Brief has argued that states should provide a range of services that young people need, covering mental health, awareness, medication, substance abuse, sexual and reproductive health, counselling, gender violence, etc., and that these should be supported by and additional to civil society psychosocial initiatives. Services should be youth-focused and context-specific; and adequately funded, age- and gender-inclusive, non-discriminatory and comprehensive. This may present enormous challenges for states that have poor infrastructure, but they should remain strategic objectives. As *The Missing Peace* notes, it is critical to give every person an equal start in life.

In addition, many forms of psychosocial support are required at community level to build on existing resilience. They are needed to address an enormous diversity of youth-specific concerns, including suicide, self-harm, gender identity, social exclusion and anti-social behaviour, ethnic or minority discrimination, marital breakdown or violence in the home, homelessness, unemployment, underachievement at school, crime, teenage motherhood and fatherhood, abuse of drugs and alcohol, behavioural problems, mental and sexual health problems, and marginalisation in communities influenced by paramilitarism, sectarianism, and political violence (Harland, Morgan, &

Muldoon, 2005, referring primarily to Northern Ireland). Demographic and developmental factors and age are considerations, as are locations that can offer support (informal youth spaces, schools, tertiary education facilities, etc.).

Political conflict has been a primary focus of this Brief. We noted earlier that resilience can be used positively (for example, to create belonging and meaning), and negatively (for example, by joining a gang or armed group). In Guatemala, Ixcan Creativo and Artiss offer young people a creative escape from gangs and violence that challenges impunity, poverty and violence. The Burundi programme shows that MHPSS methods can train young people to use and develop the community's resources to achieve long-term benefits. *The Missing Peace* outlines many youth-specific psychosocial initiatives of this kind. Much can be learned from work that has been done, including experience of discovery, design, evaluation, and documentation. Many societies have also found ways to create incentives for youth-specific MHPSS service-delivery interventions.

Successful approaches need at least to recognize that state MHPSS services should complement those run by civil society, because state-led services will never fill all gaps. Research on psychosocial programmes has shown that the most effective civil society and community organizations build on existing resiliencies and resources. Harnessing these requires an ability to manage change on multiple levels.

In Guatemalan society, for example, the dominant paradigm is adult-centred: this must change before youth participation can be genuine and optimal. It must also be recognised that terms such as service-delivery and MHPSS carry risks: they can nourish a ‘product driven’ culture that measures success by counting programmes and projects rather than evaluating their effects on the participation, engagement, and relationships of young people (Harland et al., 2005). A process-driven approach is at the heart of the initiatives we have described in Burundi and Guatemala.

Efforts to address the psychosocial issues of youth in societies that experience conflict inevitably straddle past and present. Ixcán and El Mezquital are good examples of projects that enable young people to preserve historical memories of a conflict and simultaneously build peace and a new future. In Guatemala, such initiatives play a vital role in preventing youth violence and migration. In Burundi, they challenge political behaviours that manipulate youth by misrepresenting the past – “building more resilience among youth to resist political manipulation and, according to the communities, ... building greater societal cohesion” (Impunity Watch, 2019, p.12). Arguably, the resilience such programmes create is more transformative, because they embed in communities new understandings of the past and capacities that address proximate causes of violence, such as misinformation and misrepresentation of history. Resilience of this sort can prevent violence over the long term, increase social interaction and cohesion, and improve livelihood outcomes.

Sustainable funding for youth-based and youth-led peacebuilding work is nevertheless insufficient across the globe (Lucas, Brendan, and Jarman, 2019; *The Missing Peace*, 2015). In Guatemala, all the projects mentioned are financially fragile and lack resources to expand or promote peace in other marginalized areas (Martinez, 2014). In Burundi, the demand for psychological support and trauma-healing has far outstripped THARS’ capacity to fund the programme.

Nor do psychosocial interventions take place in a political vacuum. The Brief has argued that narrow individualised mental health provision is in-

sufficient, because it does not address the underlying causes of conflict and harm. Transformative resilience offers a way to use societies’ resources, capacities and resistances to challenge and sometimes change these. It also increases youth participation, sometimes on their terms, as we saw in Guatemala. Many NGOs and social movements are led by young people: harnessing their transformative capacities, they protest, raise awareness, build coalitions to advance human rights concerns and social justice, contribute to peace by direct action.

Psychosocially-informed transformative action is not, of course, risk-free. Even if its intent is peaceful, repressive states and societies are likely to respond violently. State repression may be explicitly violent or may be bureaucratic and regulatory, designed to shackle NGO activity or block access to finance. In Burundi, many national NGOs were forced into exile in 2015; the government also imposed strict administrative controls over international NGOs, and in late 2018 suspended them. Only a handful of NGOs remain (Impunity Watch, 2019).

As *The Missing Peace* points out, politically-engaged young people also face specific risks because they are frequently considered to be a threat that requires a security response. This can endanger young people physically and psychologically; and may also exacerbate cycles of violence and counter-violence. Decisions to engage in direct forms of action therefore require careful consideration and stewardship is sometimes necessary when young people elect to be protagonists for change.

In many political contexts, it is easier to frame psychosocial interventions as ‘neutral’. This can have benefits. Framing the Burundi programme as psychosocial helped local authorities to embark on the difficult issue of dealing with the past. As noted, however, a wilfully apolitical approach to MHPSS is problematic. In contexts characterized by systemic poverty, intolerance or violence, an MHPSS strategy that relies entirely on counselling (useful as this may be) will not adequately address the psychological needs of society.

Civil society should not therefore be treated as a MHPSS ‘service provider’. This Brief recommends more ambitious objectives for psychosocial support. Investment in the core functions of civil society and youth organizations should enhance their capacity to make political demands for accountability, reconstruction and peace, and become agents of change. MHPSS programmes should aim to use existing resiliences to promote transformation.

An example is the programme highlighted in El Mezquital in Guatemala, where psychosocial street art initiatives have helped to voice transformative demands for rights, education and employment. Through these programmes, young victims of conflict (Indigenous children in particular) shaped their own lives and did not merely benefit from assistance and support.

To be effective, MHPSS programmes also need to be long-term. Short-term gains can be lost quickly, especially in societies in which histories of conflict transcend generations. Guatemala illustrates the dangers of withdrawing international funding and support too soon. The effect has been to put peace at risk and harm psychosocial well-being and social stability. In Burundi (and in countries such as Bosnia), the retreat of the international community left holes that were rapidly filled by an ‘old guard’ with no interest in changing the status quo. In these societies, there is a standing risk that the harms of the past will continue to be transferred to the next generation, perpetuating impunity.

In such contexts, *The Missing Peace* argues that young people should be supported when they take peaceful direct action to reclaim peace and human rights. This position is consistent with other recommendations of the study, that treating young people as a security threat is usually inappropriate because it prevents them from contributing positively to change. The security paradigm dismisses rather than encourages positive resilience in contexts of inequality, oppression and repression.

For example, a study in Northern Ireland found that officials and the security services employed confrontational and judgmental language to describe young people and their ‘radicalisation’ (Byrne, Hamber, Morrow, Dougherty, and Gallagher, 2016). Youth workers in Northern Ireland refuse to

conflate ‘radical’ with ‘violent’. Indeed, many youth workers consider that it is their job to encourage young people to think independently and hold radical thoughts, and distinguish behaviour that is radical or dissenting or resisting from behaviour that is violent.

The idea of it being extreme is only extreme because it’s not what we do, or it’s not what we like to think we do. What’s it like for radicals to be called radicals? What do they then call us? Does the other person find this word helpful? We shouldn’t impose our definition of their behaviour on them? (A community activist cited in Byrne et al., 2016.)

The same study found that the majority of respondents also rejected blanket use of the term ‘dissident’ to describe young people who did not support the political peace process in Northern Ireland:

If you’re labelled a dissident, it can be a negative when you are simply a dissenting voice ... It can have its own complexities and cause you problems, because it’s fed down from the top. It can have political connotations. But we would love to see more people becoming dissenting voices (A community activist cited in Byrne et al., 2016).

Of course, this is not risk-free either: it highlights the tension between risk and resilience that was mentioned earlier. *The Missing Peace* warns that it must also be “acknowledged that youth involvement in popular protest and social movements is not inherently inclusive, necessarily benevolent or inevitably peaceful” (p. 58). Others have pointed out that young leaders may be co-opted or claimed by older leaders (Berents and McEvoy-Levy, 2015), a risk that was realized in the 2015 demonstrations in Burundi. Nevertheless, as the psychosocial initiatives in both Guatemala and Burundi showed, young people can be protagonists of change in many non-violent ways and avoid being manipulated by those in power.

To be effective, finally, youth engagement must be placed in a multi-generational timeframe. This does not suit the short-term ‘service-driven’ funding priorities that donors and governments tend to favour; such funding cannot be said to take the

psychosocial well-being of young people seriously, because it cannot address social and political factors that entrench systemic harm. A psychosocial approach asserts that explicit political violence always has structural elements that are embedded in the fabric of society. These will not be altered by stopgap MHPSS interventions, in the form of counselling services, psychosocial projects or time-limited employment schemes. As *The Missing Peace* notes, “although employment and vocational training opportunities may help in the short term, they cannot substitute for longer-term psychosocial and economic support” (p. 109).

Young people and those who support MHPSS therefore need to challenge short-term models and press for services that deliver long-term and context-specific outcomes. They should support young people to become transformative agents of change. They should cultivate in young people the qualities of agency, ownership and leadership that are essential to genuinely develop the youth, peace and security agenda. MHPSS is not an adjunct or addition to this agenda but makes an essential contribution to efforts to develop, embed and harness sustainable transformative resilience. ●

References

- Bene, C., Godfrey-Wood, R., Newsham, A., and Davies, M. (2012). *Resilience: New Utopia or New Tyranny? Reflection about the Potentials and Limits of the Concept of Resilience in Relation to Vulnerability-Reduction Programmes*, IDS Working Paper 405. London: Institute of Development Studies.
- Berents, H., and McEvoy-Levy, S. (2015). Theorizing youth and everyday peace(building). *Peacebuilding*, 3(2), 115–125.
- Beristain, C. M. (2006). *Humanitarian Aid Work: A Critical Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bracken, P. J., and Petty, C. (1998). *Rethinking the Trauma of War*. London: Free Association Books.
- Bubenzer, F., and Tankink, M. (2017). Building sustainable peace through an integrated approach to peacebuilding and mental health and psychosocial support: A literature review. *Intervention*, 15(3), 199-214.
- Byrne, J., Hamber, B., Morrow, D., Dougherty, B., and Gallagher, E. (2016). *Political Violence and Young People: Exploring levels of risk, motivations and targeted preventative work*. Belfast: Ulster University, Transitional Justice Institute, INCORE and School of Criminology, Politics and Social Policy.
- CEH. (1999). *Guatemala: Memory of Silence. Report of the Commission for Historical Clarification, Conclusions and Recommendations (CEH)*. Guatemala: Commission for Historical Clarification (CEH).
- Christensen, C., and Edward, A. (2015). Peace-building and reconciliation dividends of integrated health services delivery in post-conflict Burundi: qualitative assessments of providers and community members. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival*, 31(1), 33-56.
- Cutter, S. L., Barnes, L., Berry, M., Burton, C., Evans, E., Tate, E., and Webb, J. (2008). A place-based model for understanding community resilience to natural disasters. *Global Environmental Change*, 18(4), 598-606.
- de Coning, C. (2018). Adaptive peacebuilding. *International Affairs*, 94(2), 301-317.
- Frosh, S. (2014). The Nature of the Psychosocial: Debates from Studies in the Psychosocial. *Journal of Psycho-Social Studies*, 8(1), 159-169.
- Frosh, S. (2019). Psychosocial studies with psychoanalysis. *Journal of Psychosocial Studies*, 12(1), 101-114.
- Gutlove, P., and Thompson, G., T. (Eds.) (2003). *Psychosocial Healing: A Guide for Practitioners*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Institute for Resource and Security Studies.
- Hamber, B. (2009a). Miracles, Trauma and the Truth Commission (Chapter 2). In *Transforming Societies after Political Violence: Truth, Reconciliation, and Mental Health* (pp. 11-36). New York: Springer.
- Hamber, B. (2009b). A Place for Healing (Chapter 4). In *Transforming Societies after Political Violence: Truth, Reconciliation, and Mental Health* (pp. 53-71). New York: Springer.

Hamber, B., and Gallagher, E. (Eds.) (2015). *Psychosocial Perspectives on Peacebuilding*. New York: Springer.

Hamber, B., Gallagher, E., and Ventevogel, P. (2014). Narrowing the gap between psychosocial practice, peacebuilding and wider social change: An introduction to the Special Section in this issue. *Intervention: Journal of Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Conflict-Affected Area*, 12(1), 7-15.

Harland, K., Morgan, T., and Muldoon, O. (2005). *The Nature of Youth Work in Northern Ireland: Purpose, Contribution and Challenges*. Belfast: Commissioned by the Department of Education.

Hassan, G., Ventevogel, P., Jefee-Bahloul, H., Barkil-Oteo, A., and Kirmayer, L. J. (2016). Mental health and psychosocial well-being of Syrians affected by armed conflict. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*, 25(2), 129-141.

Human Rights Watch (2020). *Guatemala: Events of 2020. World Report 2021*. New York: Human Rights Watch.

IASC (2007). *IASC Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Emergency Settings*. Geneva: Inter-Agency Standing Committee.

IASC (2010). *Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Humanitarian Emergencies: What Should Humanitarian Health Actors Know?* Geneva: Inter-Agency Standing Committee Reference Group for Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Emergency Settings.

IASC Reference Group for Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Emergency Settings (2012). *Who is Where, When, doing What (4Ws) in Mental Health and Psychosocial Support: Manual with Activity Codes (field test-version)*. Geneva: Inter-Agency Standing Committee.

Impunity Watch (2015). *Burundi : La citoyenneté en crise, Great Lakes Dispatches, Numéro 1, 2015*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: Impunity Watch.

Impunity Watch (2017). *Avances y obstáculos de la justicia transicional en Guatemala Informe de monitoreo 2014-2017*. Guatemala: Impunity Watch.

Impunity Watch (2019). *Annual Report 2019*. The Hague: Impunity Watch.

Interpeace (2016). Brief: Resilience and the SDGs Strengthening Peace Through 'Resilience' in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Geneva: InterPeace.

Juncos, A. E., & Joseph, J. (2020). Resilient Peace: Exploring the Theory and Practice of Resilience in Peacebuilding Interventions. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 14(3), 289-302.

Lucas, O., Brendan, S., & Jarman, N. (2019). *Barriers to Participation and Progression in Education and Employment for those at risk of becoming involved with Paramilitary Organisations in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: Institute for Conflict Research.

Lykes, M. B. (2000). Possible Contributions of a Psychology of Liberation: Whither Health and Human Rights? *Journal of Health Psychology*, 5(3), 383-397.

Martinez, D. (2014). *Youth under the gun: violence, fear, and resistance in urban Guatemala. Doctoral Dissertation*. Texas: University of Texas in Austin.

Mbonyingingo, C., Kwizera, Z., and Habonimana, R. B. (2021). *Etude évaluative du programme Nyubahiriza mis en oeuvre par Impunity Watch dans les provinces de Bujumbura, Cibitoke et Muyinga*. Unpublished evaluation document: Impunity Watch.

McCandless, E., and Simpson, G. (2015). *Executive Summary of Assessing Resilience for Peacebuilding*. Geneva: Interpeace.

Mitchell, A. (2013). *Risk and Resilience: From Good Idea to Good Practice. A scoping study for the Experts Group on Risk and Resilience. Working Paper WP 13/2013*. France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

NIS (Guatemala) and UNFPA (2018). *Guatemala Population and Housing Census 2018*. Guatemala: National Institute of Statistics (Guatemala) and United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA).

Niyonzima, C., and Kezimana, L. (2020). *Entre guerre et paix: Masculinités violentes et mobilisation politique des jeunes*. The Hague: Impunity Watch.

Otake, Y. (2018). Community Resilience and Long-Term Impacts of Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Northern Rwanda. *Medical Sciences*, 6(4), 94.

Palmary, I., Hamber, B., and Nunez, L. (Eds.) (2014). *Healing and Change in the City of Gold: Case studies of coping and support in Johannesburg*. New York: Springer.

Rehberg, K. (2014). Revisiting therapeutic governance. The politics of mental health and psychosocial programmes in humanitarian settings. Working Paper Series Number 98. University of Oxford: Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford Department of International Development.

Roht-Arriaza, N. (2017). Research Handbook on Transitional Justice. In C. Lawther, L. Moffett, & D. Jacobs (Eds.), *Guatemala: Lessons for Transitional Justice* (pp. 445–465). United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Rokhideh, M. (2017). Peacebuilding and psychosocial intervention: the critical need to address everyday post-conflict experiences in northern Uganda. *Intervention*, 15(3), 215–229.

Simpson, G., Makoond, A., Vinck, P., and Pham, P. N., with Otto Argueta, J. B., Hoff, M., Larivière, R., Leahy, C., McCann, J., Roure, M., Suah Shilue J., and Tager A. G. (2016). *Assessing resilience for peace: Guidance note*. Geneva: Interpeace.

UNICEF (2020). *Mental Health and Psychosocial Support for Children in Humanitarian Settings: An Updated Review of Evidence and Practice*. New York: UNICEF.

United Nations (2020). *Peacebuilding and sustaining peace: Report of the Secretary-General, A/74/976–S/2020/773*. New York: UN.

UNFPA (2015). *The Missing Peace: Independent Progress Study on Youth, Peace and Security*. New York: UN.

Walker, B., Holling, C. S., Carpenter, S. R., and Kinzig, A. (2004). Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social-ecological systems. *Ecology and Society*, 9(2), 5.

Wessells, M. G. (2015). Bottom-up approaches to strengthening child protection systems: Placing children, families, and communities at the center. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 43, 8-21.

Williamson, J., and Robinson, M. (2006). Psychosocial interventions, or integrated programming for well-being? *Intervention*, 4(1), 4-25.

World Bank (2018). *Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict*. Washington, DC: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank.



Interpeace

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION
FOR PEACEBUILDING

Interpeace Headquarters

Maison de la Paix
2E Chemin Eugène-Rigot
Petal 5 (Building 5)
CH-1202 Geneva
Switzerland