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“Little Soldiers with Big Guns”: The Language of Child-Soldiering in Africa

Abstract
This project examines the language of child-soldiering in Africa, specifically in Sierra Leone, Rwanda, and Uganda, comparing its use between Western observers and the Africans who experienced the conflict first hand. It concludes that Westerners unilaterally display ethnocentric conceptions of the sanctity of childhood in their admonitions of child-soldiering, while former child-soldiers, perpetrators, victims and local aid workers exhibit more diverse perspectives that more accurately reflect the complexity of the conflicts. Furthermore, it concludes that the use of rhetorical, monolithic language regarding child-soldiering perpetuates stereotypes about African conflict and state-failure while diverting attention from underlying root causes of conflict, and overlooks government corruption and human rights abuses that have gone largely unchecked by Western nations despite their condemnation of the violence.
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From a Western perspective, the atrocity of child soldiering that occurred in Sierra Leone, Uganda, and Rwanda in the 1990s sparked moral outrage at the victimization of children. Western military commanders, NGO leaders, and journalists universally condemn any and all violence towards children including their indoctrination as ruthless killers, and frequently use dramatic language to express their disgust. Their language reflects prevalent views in the West about the sanctity of childhood and, to a certain extent, the stereotypes and underlying cultural imperialism of Western-African relations. In contrast, the victims, perpetrators, former child soldiers, and local African aid workers display a much more diverse use of language that more accurately reflects the range of emotions and perspectives of these conflicts. Africans that were directly involved in the violence are either withdrawn and clinical in their discussion of the violence, subtly valorize the child-soldiers or recall having done so, or they exhibit the same victimization that Western interveners expect to encounter in a conflict zone.

The conflicts in Uganda, Rwanda, and Sierra Leone were caused by social divisions and political rivalries, and exacerbated by post-colonial issues, particularly poverty. In Uganda, the northern region of Acholiland was the site inter-rebel and intrastate violence. Three rebel groups fought for public support until only the Lord’s Resistance Army remained to fight the national government’s forces and their civilian deputies. Recruitment of civilians was a common practice on both sides, but only the LRA targeted civilians in their attacks, often kidnapping children in their raids. In Rwanda, a history of social tension between the Hutus and Tutsis, a class distinction originally introduced by Belgian colonists, erupted when a plane carrying the Hutu presidents of Rwanda and Burundi was shot down in 1994. The conflict engulfed the
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entire nation and, as a result of a simultaneously slowing economy, many young people answered the call of both the Tutsi rebels and the Hutu groups, including the Interhamwe.5 Similarly, in the impoverished nation of Sierra Leone, political tensions between local Mende chiefdoms and the Sierra Leonean All People’s Congress sparked a conflict in 1991 that lasted nearly ten years. Children, men, and women alike had been routinely pressed into slave labor, particularly diamond mining, since 1961 in Sierra Leone; as a result, joining the conflict as a soldier was a viable alternative for many of these young people.6

Western perspectives of the violence and the use of child-soldiers in Rwanda, Uganda, and Sierra Leone have been provided by peacekeepers, non-governmental aid volunteers, and journalists in memoirs, documentaries, and published articles. Roméo Dallaire, a Canadian military commander in charge of the UN Peacekeeping Mission to Rwanda, and John Rheinstein, a Danish crisis counselor in Uganda, experienced the conflicts first-hand and interacted with their subjects during the crisis. Peter Eichstaedt, an American journalist reporting in Uganda, and Jan Egeland, a world-renowned humanitarian observing the effects of the violence on children, also in Uganda, both reported after the worst of the violence had passed. In these accounts, a unilateral tone of moral outrage and disbelief is pervasive in their descriptions of child-soldering. All four use dramatic rhetoric to characterize child soldiers as victims, lament their loss of childhood, and emphasize the tragedy of their circumstances.

Roméo Dallaire’s heart-wrenching memoir of his experiences with child-soldering in Rwanda, They Fight Like Soldiers, They Die Like Children, perfectly exemplifies the use of rhetoric by a Western observer to frame the phenomenon of child-soldering as an evil, tragic
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practice conducted on innocents. Beginning with the title, and chapter headings “Warrior Boy” and “Little Soldiers, Little Killers”, Dallaire presents the child-soldiers as just that: children. Adhering to the Western conception of childhood as eighteen years or younger, he continually refers to these young soldiers as “[unequal] in age, strength, training, and understanding”, a “sea of innocents”, “youths” in “ill-fitting uniforms”, or simply “children.” In contrast, he refers to older soldiers as “cocky, gun-happy and arrogant… punks in uniform.” In his description of child-soldiers, he frequently emphasizes the sacrosanct nature of childhood that is corrupted upon recruitment, and laments the loss of their “child’s soul.” Believing that “children are naturally resilient and predisposed to happiness,” Dallaire unquestionably views these young people as victims of manipulation, if not coercion. Though Eichstaedt, Egeland, and Rheinstein are less creative with their terminology, they also emphasize the youth and powerlessness of their subjects, primarily to absolve them from responsibility for their crimes.

Concurring with Dallaire’s assertion that soldiering destroys children’s inherent “consciences, their compassion, [and] their capacity for empathy,” Rheinstein exonerates these “victimized perpetrators” as “children who have been abducted, coerced and brainwashed…” Similarly, Egeland frames them as victims of violence and coercion who have been “brutalized, tortured, and raped while being forced to join [a] self-styled army and attack their own villages and families…” Like “minnows in a pond,” these authors argue that the soldiers are
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manipulated through fear, indoctrination, and drugs, and “intoxicated by overwhelming power…” cementing their position as passive victims of external violence.¹³

Having introduced child-soldiers as victims, Western speakers are particularly adept at reinforcing the tragedy of their circumstances, even in rehabilitation, with the presentation of dramatic accounts, emotional responses, and rhetorical narrative. Not only have the young soldiers endured a “horrible abuse,” but, if they managed to escape, they face “a living nightmare,” and a “future of alienation and distrust,” from their own communities.¹⁴ Should they be admitted into rehabilitation and reintegration programs, they are presented with the “difficult task of coming to grips with the horrors of their past.”¹⁵ It is often a painful undertaking because, as Rheinstein notes, though they can burn all physical evidence from their time in armed forces, “flames cannot erase their memories.”¹⁶

In addition to dramatic presentation, these Western authors describe their own emotional responses to the devastating stories they are told by recovering children. Jan Egeland wrote, after hearing a former soldier-girl recount her experience of biting another girl to death for desertion, that he felt “as though [he] was going to be sick.”¹⁷ Dallaire speaks of the internal conflict he felt when first confronted by a child soldier, whose eyes were “wide and brilliant, screaming of pain and anguish and fear and hatred.”¹⁸ “Is a child still a child when pressing the barrel of a gun to your chest?” he asks rhetorically of himself and his audience.¹⁹ Eichstaedt also expressed his astonishment at the bravery that former soldiers displayed when escaping service, since a common form of initiation for young soldiers is to kill other children who have tried to desert,
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often in particularly gruesome ways. He concluded that, given the risk of leaving, they must have “risked death because it was preferable to life with the rebels.”

Egeland, in turn, concludes his heartbreaking account with this rhetorical question: “How does one respond to such pure evil?”

“What do I tell the weeping mothers in northern Uganda and southern Sudan who have asked me to bring back their beloved children?” Egeland asked Joseph Kony, the leader of the Lord’s Resistance Army, in an exclusive interview. Kony simply responded that there are no children in the LRA, “only combatants.” This response is indicative of Kony’s history of lying about LRA human rights violations since many experts believe 80% of Kony’s forces are below the age of 18, but also demonstrates a clinical, realistic approach to describing conflict. Sierra Leoneans, Rwandans, and Ugandans use a wider variety of language to describe the violence occurring in their countries than Western observers, which more accurately reflects the complexity of the conflicts, and the diversity of perspectives among Africans actually experiencing war. Generally speaking, the accounts of former child-soldiers, perpetrators of violence, victims, and local aid workers display very factual, clinical language, valorize child-soldiering, or in some cases exhibit the same sense of victimhood that Western narratives do.

Valorization of the use of child-soldiers is exclusive to the perpetrators of the violence, specifically the Hutu killers in Rwanda, former rebel commanders in Uganda, and the older soldiers in the national Sierra Leone Army. In the aftermath of the Rwandan genocide, former Hutu killers in a series of interviews referred to the young men and boys in their units as “those fierce young fellows” or “hothead boys” as if commending their vibrant, youthful aggression.
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Far from reflecting on the morality of working with children, they refer to them as they would any other soldier, and speak of children only in the context of eliminating Tutsi bloodlines.26

Ishmael Beah, in his memoir about his experiences as a child-soldier in Sierra Leone, recalls the support and encouragement he received from his elders. He was addressed as a soldier, instead of a boy, and referred to as a “strong young man.”27 Similarly, one former rebel commander recalled recruiting boys and young men because they are the most “militant” and “rebellious,” valuable qualities in a resistance movement.28

At the opposite end of the language spectrum is the victimization of young combatants. Several former soldiers and local aid workers express similar views to Western observers, though their language is less dramatic. One Ugandan woman named Grace, a former soldier, referred to the 30,000 children abducted by the LRA as the “lost generation,” and attested that they were innocent of any war crimes because they were as much victims as those they killed.29 Remembering her own experiences, she lamented that she was “very young”, only nine, when she was first married to a LRA commander.30 Also in post-conflict Uganda, the mayor of Gulu, the epicenter of child abductions, declared that “[there] is nobody who has suffered more than our children,” suggesting that recovery efforts should focus on reintegration of young amputees and former soldiers in order to rebuild.31 Ishmael Beah recalls aid workers assuring him that “none of this is [his] fault” because he was “just a little boy.”32 When a suspicious Sierra Leonean man accused Beah and his friends of being “little devils,” a woman interceded to defend

26 Ibid., 131
28 Krakower
29 Krakower; Provencher
30 Ibid.
32 Beah, 160
their innocence, suggesting that, though fearful of child soldiers, even locals embroiled in the conflict view them as victims rather than perpetrators. Beah also considered himself and his peers to be children, as demonstrated by his recollection that he was “just a twelve-year old boy” when he became a refugee. He was recruited into service one year later, along with boys ranging from ages seven to seventeen, whom he later referred to as children in a conference in New York City.

A third common tone used to describe these conflicts, and perhaps the most disturbing to Westerners, is very clinical, emotionless, and factual in its delivery. Perpetrators, victims, and desensitized witnesses display a certain emotional detachment from the violence around them and, as a result, remove all ethical allegations from their language. For instance, instead of victimizing or valorizing the young soldiers in the Interhamwe, a violent Hutu death squad in Rwanda, one former killer simply referred to them as “teams of youth.” While describing a vicious attack by the Interhamwe on local women and girls, Emmanuel Murangira referred to the perpetrators simply as “the killers,” without elaborating on their description or adding any subjective moral judgments to his language. Another Tutsi named Kwibuka describes the young Interhamwe soldiers that she encountered as “strong boys,” and explains that she refers to them in such a way simply because “they were not married yet…” This stark, clinical use of language to recount events is found rather frequently among victims or perpetrators who had been desensitized by the violence and had acclimated to their situation.

Interestingly, it has come to the attention both Peter Eichstaedt and Jan Egeland that many participants and victims of these conflicts use “sanitized” language, and strongly criticize
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it. For instance, Eichstaedt observes that young girls given as prizes to LRA commanders are referred to only as “child brides,” which he believes underplays their roles as “sex slaves.” Similarly, Egeland expresses his cynicism of clinical language through the use of sarcastic quotes. For example, he explains that the term “so-called ‘night commuters’” refers to children who gather each night at improvised “‘safe’ meeting points in local towns and villages.” He is equally skeptical of the concept of “‘recruits’” which he also quotes with a great deal of sarcasm. Both these men express their disproval of clinical, emotionless language because they believe it fails to convey the reality behind the words.

The dichotomy of language usage between locals and outsiders demonstrates the prevalence of Western ethnocentrism in modern conflict. The use of language by peacekeepers, aid workers, and journalists projects traditional Western conceptions of childhood, supports preconceptions about violence in Africa, reduces the children to passive victims, and ignores the complex causes and consequences of war. Ultimately, by dramatizing the plight of African children involved in conflict, Western voices reinforce counterproductive stereotypes about the continent, overlook the history of child-soldiering around the world, and ignore the complicity of Western nations in the structural violence and corruption that lies at the heart of these wars.

With the exception of Roméo Dallaire, Western observers tend to view the children recruited into the conflict as victims with no agency over their service. However, in impoverished countries, children often display self-reliance skills and agency, particularly for employment purposes, at a much younger age than in Western cultures. In Sierra Leone in particular, children are often relegated to slave labor in diamond pits, either by forced
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recruitment or economic necessity. While children were certainly recruited into armed military service against their will, especially in Uganda, many others joined voluntarily. Dallaire noted in his time in Rwanda that in an environment “where there seem to be no rules except self-preservation,” disenfranchised young people, especially young men, are “enticed by power, by the machismo of weapons, by the idea of belonging to an organization that was feared by all.”

Whether escaping slave labor in diamond mines or finding employment and a sense of belonging, many children participated in these conflicts of their own volition.

In developing nations in Africa, South America, Asia, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe, children experience childhood very differently than the youth of wealthy Western countries. They tend to be self-reliant from a much younger age, whether as a result of poverty or intimate violence, and they are significantly less sheltered than Western children. The danger of a “hegemonic notion of childhood” is that it neglects geographical, economic, and cultural realities, and conveniently ignores the use of children in warfare in history. While the notion of childhood as “innocence and vulnerability” is an underlying theme in modern humanitarianism, it is difficult to apply to children who are raised in conflict zones or chronically impoverished nations where their innocence is stripped from them by hunger, disease, or domestic abuse from a young age.
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Modern Western thought about the sanctity of childhood also fails to account for the use of children in war throughout history, who were frequently recruited upon adolescence. During the American Civil War, for instance, boys in auxiliary roles were routinely promoted into the ranks when they reached fourteen, if they appeared mature enough. In more recent Western history, the youngest combat casualties in World War I were a fourteen-year-old Australian and a fifteen-year-old American who had enlisted when he was thirteen. Though in the twentieth century combat deaths of children were, indeed, rare exceptions, boys as young as eleven have been receiving educations and job skills through military service programs for over one hundred years in the US and Great Britain which, while significantly less traumatizing than abduction, must be taken into consideration when comparing Western and non-Western practices.

The implications of simplifying and villainizing the presence of young people in modern African conflicts are potentially very harmful. Western reporters often focus solely on the most egregious manifestations of conflict, such as violence committed by and against young children, the use of primitive weapons, or the prevalence of amputations. These perspectives of long-standing conflicts reinforce counterproductive stereotypes about Africa, particularly regarding state failure and savagery, thereby justifying self-interested “paternalistic action” by Western powers. While there is no question that the conflicts in Sierra Leone, Uganda, and Rwanda, particularly the involvement of young children, are tragedies, the dangers of victimizing child-soldiers involved in the conflict outweigh the immediate benefits. Not only does it reinforce stereotypes about the savagery of violence in Africa, it denies agency to the children involved, ultimately harming them.
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Rather than using rhetoric to portray children as passive victims, Western observers would do well to analyze local cultural perspectives on the conflict, uncover the root causes of the violence that makes child-soldiering possible, and encourage universal reintegration programs for all affected combatants, not just children. As demonstrated by the language used by Sierra Leoneans, Rwandans, and Ugandans, people participating in civil war and ethnic conflict harbor a diverse range of perspectives, that can be easily overlooked by outside observers. In contrast, Western rhetoric paints a very monolithic, ethnocentric view of violence in which children are universally victimized by the unscrupulous, savage adults around them. Ironically, the root causes of these conflicts are catalyzed by structural violence caused by colonial heritage and facilitated by complicit Western nations that consistently fail to confront government corruption and human rights abuses. By addressing poverty, weak government infrastructures, and corruption, Western powers could further prevent violence, and by extension child soldiering, and provide sustainable economic growth and political security, rather than simply expressing outrage at the atrocities of the conflict. While humanitarian efforts to expose human rights abuses are commendable, Western interventions have rarely, if ever, successfully addressed foreign conflicts or rights violations unless it was in their own self-interest. As heartbreaking as child-soldiering can be, the underlying implications of framing child combatants as victims of savage African conflicts while overlooking Western nations’ complicity in the underlying causes of the conflicts ultimately doing more harm than good.
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