

Global Peace Services USA

...an idea whose time has come

Vol. 17, No. 1

May 2016

Greetings from John Eriksson, President, GPS USA

This Spring 2016 issue of the GPS Newsletter opens with a summary by GPS Board Member Dr. Ronald Ridker of a discussion led by a panel of experts on the topic, “The Paris United Nations Conference on Climate Change: Accomplishments and Future Challenges.” The event was developed by GPS and with the collaboration of the Global Environmental Politics Program of the School of International Service of American University was held at the University on April 5, 2016. Dr. Ridker moderated the event, having recruited as panelists an outstanding group of leaders in the field. His summary conveys the high caliber of the speakers and their relevant observations and conclusions.

The second article is by GPS Board Member Dr. Sovan Tun, “Buddhist-Catholic Dialogue on ‘Suffering, Liberation, and Fraternity.’” This unique dialogue was initiated by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops in conjunction with the Vatican and was inspired by Pope Francis. Dr. Tun led a group of Buddhists from the Washington area who joined Washington Catholic participants, who in turn joined Buddhist and Catholic participants from four other major U.S. cities for a week-long dialogue in June 2015 in Rome and the Vatican. The dialogue was convened to counter the view that emerging religious-cultural pluralism in the U.S. is a threat to national security, but rather embodies openness by two of the world’s great religious traditions towards one another in friendship and peace. A highlight of the week was an audience with the Pope. The dialogue continues in the U.S. through identification of joint social actions in each of the city focal points.

The last article is the second of two installments of GPS Board Member Dr. Robert J. Muscat’s pioneering paper, “Apology: A Cement for Peace?” In this installment, Dr. Muscat deals with some specific aspects of apology as an instrument for peace. Drawing from actual examples, he addresses the pros and cons of apology, apology as compensation, missed opportunities for apology, and lessons learned from reflecting on the history and impact of apologies. Dr. Muscat’s analysis is exceptionally carefully researched, which leads to thoughtful, balanced and useful conclusions.

We trust that all recipients of the GPS Newsletter who are also on email have by now received the new monthly GPS “Peace Dispatch.” However, if you are on email but have not yet received the Peace Dispatch, please let us know by sending your email address to globalpeaceservicesusa@gmail.com or by sending a note to P.O. Box 27922 in Washington, DC 20038-7922. Several expressions of appreciation from readers indicate that the Peace Dispatch is a valued monthly e-mail that highlights current books, articles, films, conferences and other events with a focus on the varied dimensions of peacemaking and peacebuilding. We welcome your feedback on this initiative.

In order to continue and expand our current work, such as the GPS Newsletter, the expert panel described above, and the Peace Dispatch, we do need greater resources. Please consider making as generous a tax-deductible contribution as you can to GPS. This may be done by mailing a check to the postal address shown above or through our website www.globalpeaceservices.org. Please note that GPS has a new phone number: 301-681-6968.

Reflections on the UN's Paris Climate Change Conference

In December of last year, the United Nations Conference on Climate Change took place in Paris. It was an impressive event whose concluding document was unanimously agreed to by all 195 country representatives. There had been 20 previous Conferences of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (this conference officially known as COP21) over more than two decades, none of which had achieved this much agreement on significant measures aimed at controlling climate change. The importance of this event induced Global Peace Services USA to develop a panel discussion to review the conference's conclusions and significance. With the collaboration and assistance of the Global Environmental Politics Program of the School of International Service at American University, this discussion was held on April 5.

The speakers were excellent. They presented strong, clear, answers to four important questions: What did the 195 delegates accomplish and why is it so significant; what role was played by the vast number — over 40,000 non-delegates — who came to this conference; to what extent were the concerns of the developing countries taken into account; and, given the inevitable sea level rise the world faces, what are the adaptation challenges that were not addressed by this conference?

Elliot Diringer, Executive Vice President of the Center for Climate and Energy Solutions (C2ES) handled the first question by comparing the accomplishments of this conference with previous ones. For one thing, the goals were more ambitious. In addition to reiterating a collective commitment to keep average global temperature from rising more than 2 degrees Celsius (3.7 degrees Fahrenheit) above the pre-industrial level, this conference added an aspirational goal to do everything possible to limit the increase to 1.5 degrees, a target that many scientists believe to be impossible. More remarkable yet, in addition to the temperature goals, the final

document added an emissions goal, to achieve zero net emissions of carbon dioxide before the end of this century. According to scientists, this goal is not a surprising goal: it is just a condition that must be achieved if global temperature is to be kept within the 2 degree limit. But it is very remarkable from a different point of view: 195 countries knowingly agreed that to achieve the goal of this treaty, the fossil fuel era would have to come to an end (unless ways are found and deployed to pull carbon out of the atmosphere as fast as we put it in) within the lifetime of a child born today.

These goals are to be achieved by each country deciding independently how much of a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions it is willing and able to make. When it became clear that countries' commitments, while a substantial cumulative total, were insufficient to achieve the 2 degree target, the delegates added a clause committing countries to review and upgrade their commitments every five years until the goals could be achieved.

Is all this feasible and likely to occur? Listen to what Diringer has to say about these goals and the other features of this remarkable agreement before making up your mind (see link to webcast recording below).

Also, listen to what **Helen Mountford, Director of Economics at the World Resources Institute**, says about the understandings and commitments made by non-state actors: mayors of major cities and governors of large states like California, executives of international corporations and financial institutions, and a "Breakthrough Energy Coalition" composed of the 10 wealthiest individuals on earth. Most of these people have little incentive to make commitments beyond what they believe they can achieve. Most of their commitments have been registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) just as those of the country delegates.

Another impressive result of this conference is the extent to which the concerns of developing countries have been taken into account. Of all the problems that the world faces today, the most serious and difficult to solve are those of poverty and climate change, and they are interconnected. Reducing poverty requires the spread of electricity, estimated to at least double by 2050. If that is not handled well, it could result in a massive increase in greenhouse gas emissions. And it will be impossible to achieve emission reduction commitments if they can only be achieved at the expense of poverty reduction targets. The only way out of this conundrum is for the developed countries to provide financial and technical assistance to ensure that progress can be made along both fronts simultaneously. That is not impossible given the dramatic declines that have occurred in the price of renewables and the renewed emphasis on taking into account co-benefits (like reduced deaths due to air pollution) in deciding on development projects.

Naoko Ishii, Executive Director and Chairperson of the Global Environment Fund (GEF), which among other things, collaborates with the World Bank on many of its development projects, spoke to these issues by describing the funding arrangements built into the Paris agreement and the activities of international development agencies like the GEF.

The last speaker, **William A Nitze, Chairman of Oceana Energy Company & Clear Path Technologies Inc.** came close to upending this promising picture by suggesting that the focus of the Paris Conference was wrong, or at least incomplete. While he made it clear that he agrees that substantial progress towards a meaningful program to control the rise of global temperature was made, it will do little or nothing to limit sea level rise during this century. That rise is already baked into the system from the temperature rise that has occurred so far. And there is growing evidence and concern among scientists, that the extent of this rise during the next 50 to 80 years may be sufficient to make large portions of major cities throughout the world uninhabitable. This in turn would result in massive migrations of population and animals, huge

economic losses, and continuous conflicts with those living at higher elevations. It is a picture that can be characterized by saying that the Conference did the equivalent of carefully rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic.

What it should have done, in addition, was start the process of planning ways to cope with this eventuality. Some work is in fact being undertaken in vulnerable cities; it should have been made an integral part of the Conference. This is not a unique point of view; there are a number of well-respected scientists who hold similar views about what is likely to happen to sea levels during the remainder of this century, and there are some city planners who are already drawing up contingency plans for moving vital infrastructure and services to higher ground. There are also some responsible scientists who disagree about the speed and extent of the sea level rise during the remainder of this century. But we can't ignore the problem as the UN conference came close to doing, according to Nitze.

The response by the other panelists was that concerns of this kind explain why the delegates agreed to build in a five year cycle of reviews and upgrading of commitments. Whether this will be enough, and come quickly enough, is an open question.

You will obtain a better and more nuanced picture of these issues by listening to a webcast recording of the four speakers on this panel, which you can do by entering the address, <http://www.ustream.tv/recorded/85317523> into your web browser. Even that will be inadequate because of the complexity of this subject, but far better than relying on this brief review.

☞ Ronald Ridker

Buddhist-Catholic Dialogue on “Suffering, Liberation, and Fraternity”

In a response to the call by Pope Francis for a “Dialogue of Fraternity,” forty five Buddhists and Catholics from five US cities (Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, San Francisco, and Washington, DC) assembled in Rome, Italy, from June 23 to 27, 2015. Buddhist participants included leaders representing the traditions of Cambodia, China, Korea, Japan, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Tibet, and Vietnam, as well as participants who self-identify with growing Western forms of Buddhism. The delegation was composed of religious and lay leaders from both religions.

The dialogue was entitled “Suffering, Liberation, and Fraternity” and was sponsored by the Bishops’ Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops in collaboration with the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue. Under the impact of globalization and immigration, the religious landscape in the United States has undergone rapid and profound changes, with the growing presence within the US of the world’s religions, including Buddhism. Thus, the United States is facing an emerging religious-cultural pluralism, which to some is seen as a threat to US national security. The Buddhist-Catholic dialogue in Rome was specifically convened to counter this viewpoint and, by example, show openness by two of the world’s great religious traditions towards one another in friendship and peace.

The objective of the dialogue is to seek mutual understanding and appreciation and build fraternity and a sense of brotherhood/sisterhood among people of different religions in order to jointly solve social problems. The dialogue is based on the message of Pope Francis for the World Day of Peace 2014 entitled “Fraternity: the Foundation and Pathway to Peace.” It is also based on the Pope’s Message for the Feast of Vesak 2014, namely “Buddhists and Christians Fostering Fraternity.” In offering

reflections on the occasion of the Feast of Vesak, Pope Francis chose to join the world’s Buddhists in one of their most important days, commemorating the birth, enlightenment and death of the Buddha, Siddhartha Gautama.

In his World Day of Peace observations, Pope Francis stated that “Fraternity is an essential human quality, for we are all relational beings, A lively awareness of our relatedness helps us to look upon and treat each person as a true sister or brother; without fraternity, it is impossible to build a just society and a solid and long lasting peace.”

Dialogue, the Pope underscored, was fundamental in building fraternity as a “respectful and harmonious exchange of views leads to attitudes of kindness and love which in turn generate authentic and fraternal relationships.” Expanding on this theme, the Pope’s 2014 Vesak Message stated that “we live in a world all too often torn apart by oppression, selfishness, tribalism, ethnic rivalry, violence, and religious fundamentalism, a world where the ‘other’ is treated as an inferior, a non-person, or someone to be feared and eliminated if possible.”

The four days of discussion between the Buddhist and Catholic delegations assembled in Rome in June 2015 entailed dialogue about the following topics:

1. *Relational Suffering and its Causes*
Relational suffering is defined as suffering or pain that comes about within relations between persons and other living beings. Buddhism and Christianity seek to identify causes of relational suffering.
2. *Liberation from Relational Suffering*
Buddhism and Christianity seek to find ways to liberate persons from relational suffering or to alleviate suffering between persons and other living beings.
3. *Fraternity as the Way Forward*
The discussion was devoted to what Pope Francis calls the “Dialogue of Fraternity.”

In its 1984 document entitled “The Attitude of the Church Towards the Followers of Other Religions,” the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue defined four kinds of dialogue: dialogue of life, dialogue of action, dialogue of theological exchange, and dialogue of religious experience. Pope Francis expanded the dialogue further by emphasizing the need to develop a sense of “fraternity” as a foundation for the dialogue of action that addresses the social ills of our world.

4. *Post-Dialogue Planning: Fraternal Interreligious Cooperation*

The dialogue was devoted to exploring the social issues in the United States that Buddhist-Catholic collaborations could address.

On each of their four days in Rome, the entire group met together in the morning until late afternoon to engage in dialogue on each of the four topics. At the end of the dialogue session, each Buddhist-Catholic city group met separately to engage in joint discussion of their region-specific set of problems and challenges. On the second day of their stay in Rome, the Buddhist-Catholic participants were special guests at a General Audience with Pope Francis and received a VIP tour of the Vatican.

At the conclusion of their dialogue in Rome, the participants agreed that upon their return to the US they would come together in their respective cities to explore the following kinds of joint interfaith social action initiatives:

- Addressing global climate change on the local level
- Creating outreach programs for youth in the cities
- Collaborating in prison/jail ministries and restorative justice matters
- Developing resources for the homeless such as affordable housing
- Educating and providing resources to address the issue of immigration

- Collaborating to create projects with local Catholic parishes and Buddhist communities to address neighborhood social issues
- Developing social outreach programs to families on values education.
- Witnessing our shared commitment as brothers and sisters, our religious values and spiritual practices, and our social collaboration with our religious communities and others in our cities.

Upon return to their cities, Buddhist-Catholic participants are expected to meet and discuss how their communities might organize fraternal dialogue action groups to work together in addressing social ills in their locales, based on the kinds of initiatives identified during the dialogue at the Vatican. In the Washington, DC area, several meetings of the Buddhist and Catholic Rome dialogue participants have now taken place. Many Buddhists and Catholics have volunteered to participate in the formation of action groups to decide on certain projects that can be achieved to solve social issues in their respective city or region. Coordinators have been elected, who serve as contact persons with the Vatican coordinator. (The Vatican coordinator, currently based in Indiana, reports on the work of the action groups to the Vatican.) Washington area Catholic coordinators are Father Charles Cortinovic, Father Don Rooney, and Mrs. Alice Garvey, whereas Buddhist coordinators are Bhante Uparatana, Professor B. N. Hebbar, and Dr. Sovan Tun. The six coordinators seek to identify viable actions.

☞ Sovan Tun

Apology: A Cement for Peace – Part II

Efficacy of Apology: Pros and Cons

Our main category of interest, for its potential impact on conflict resolution and cementing a peace, is apology by nations or other large institutions or groups. There have been a raft of these in recent decades. In some cases, government admissions of culpability for violent episodes have taken the form of expressions of regret without explicit apology. The distinctions between acknowledgment, regret, apology, and offers of material restitution or compensation are important. Mere acknowledgment or even regret, but stopping short of apology which admits responsibility, may not lead to satisfaction, let alone reconciliation. In the country offering such expressions, debate over whether the offer goes too far or not far enough may actually increase friction rather than assuage guilt. Expressions falling short of outright apology may incense opinion in the aggrieved country, keeping historic open sores running. The many Japanese government iterations of regret for WW II aggression have ranged between weak acknowledgment and strong apology (such as Prime Minister Hosokawa's unequivocal apology South Korea in 1993), without consistent acknowledgment from among all the country's prime ministers or from right-wing parliamentarians. Japan's relations with China and South Korea continue to be roiled by these ambiguities.

A clear apology by thoroughly legitimate representatives may still not speak for all the citizenry, since some groups in the apologizing society may assert disagreement. This was the case with Britain's apology for the slave trade. In the U.S., some prominent Republicans have criticized apologies offered by President Obama. Dissenters may insist the offending acts were justifiable and do not warrant apology; or, casting morality and history aside, they may reject an apology they view as weakening their country's international standing. When Serbia's parliament in 2010 apologized for the Srebrenica massacre, some MPs opposed, arguing that the apology would "stain" the name of

Serbia; others opposed because the apology did not go far enough and was not explicit on the genocidal character of the massacre. If rejectionists are not marginal in the apologizing country, they may serve to dilute the legitimacy of the apology in the eyes of the country or group to which the apology has been offered.

Some apology skeptics also object that an apology by the present generation for injustices by earlier generations is neither historically credible nor morally valid; sons cannot be held responsible for the sins of their fathers. Further, earlier generations of forebears were living in periods when different standards of morality or inter-cultural justice may have prevailed.

In sum, the effects of official apologies depend on wording, timing, and context, and on the perception of authenticity or of hypocrisy or opportunism. Given all the nuances and variations, it is not surprising that apologies have had varying effects on reconciliation, on the bilateral relations of the countries involved, on their domestic politics, and on the subsequent international behavior of the apologizing perpetrators. Each case has had its unique historical context and contemporary politics. Despite all the caveats, given the frequency and range of this new phenomenon, it arguably constitutes a significant diplomatic and moral advance. The international stage can no longer be understood as a realm solely of *realpolitik*, of interactions on a multi-level chess board. Justice and the moral character of national policies must now also be taken into account.

In many instances, the perpetrator-apologizer was the stronger of the parties to the conflict or injustices. As geopolitical "realists" have always recognized, inter-state relations in particular have been governed largely by Thucydides' famous dictum from the Melian dialogue with imperial Athens: "The strong do what they will; the weak do what they must." In the rise of restorative justice,

war crimes trials, and political apology, the strong face new risks, ameliorative pressures, and incentives for restraining the exercise of their power. This represents a distinct break with the past, new moral and institutionalized constraints on violent impunity.

Clearly, some official apologies are not likely to have any impact on conflict recurrence. One example is the 1998 German apology for the Nazi bombing of Guernica in 1937. This was a terrible event, probably the first time airplanes were used to deliberately bomb civilians in a totally non-military European location. There were over 2,000 casualties. Despite the public outrage in Europe at the time, the bombing had no effect on the appeasement policies of the democracies, a passivity that confirmed the Nazi conviction that they could proceed with aggression with impunity. Since the risk 61 years later of war between Germany and Spain was nil (and remains so), the apology was not intended to have deterrent effect on a recurrence. Neither was it needed (welcome as it was) as a reconfirmation of German determination not to return to a path of military aggression.

In recent years, as we have noted, the Catholic Church (popes, senior prelates, and a Vatican Council) has offered numerous apologies. Some reached far back into history. The Church's numerous apologies to the Jews for nearly 2000 years of injustices must stand as the most extensive historical repentance ever offered. In this case, the apologizing institution is no longer a perpetrator, but the anti-Judaism hostility that was embedded among generations of adherents continues to reappear; thus the historical disavowal could continue to have healing relevance for some time to come. Some Catholic commentators questioned the wisdom or appropriateness of Pope John Paul's numerous apologies, arguing for example that the Pope went too far in claiming to speak for all Catholics, and risked weakening the moral authority of the Church. In another case of historic regret still relevant, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in 1994, issued a declaration rejecting Martin Luther's "anti-Judaic diatribes" and deploring the appropriation of

these words of his by modern anti-Semites. Finally, in another historic case that could have contemporary relevance, the South African bar association apologized in 1999 for having blocked Mohandas Gandhi from practicing law in 1894. The apology was extended to all aspirant lawyers who have encountered restriction on "racial grounds."

Enmity and conflict of interest may be too deep to be lessened by a single-event apology. In 1997, North Korea apologized, "expressing deep regret," for the killing of three South Korean civilians by soldiers who had landed in the South when their submarine ran aground. The soldiers were also killed. Although the incident can be seen as having had a certain mutuality after South Korea returned the soldiers' bodies, the apology did not create a basis for any improvement in North-South relations.

What If? Missed Opportunities

There have been many missed opportunities, cases where apology might have helped move post-settlement dynamics further along the spectrum towards reconciliation. Such "What If?" cases are only speculative, of course, but they can be instructive. I happened on one example in Mozambique in 1997 that illustrates the point. A World Bank team was reviewing the Bank's reconstruction program, a mere five years after the end of Mozambique's 16-year civil war. Each of the two parties to the conflict had an ethnic base and geographic location; Renamo in the center and north, Frelimo in the south. Renamo representatives complained to the team that the Frelimo-dominated government was excluding Renamo areas and supporters from the reconstruction. They cited two examples. First, the bulk of the infrastructure investment (financed mostly by the Bank) had been in the south. Second, the newspaper advertisements informing local contracting firms that projects were open for bidding had been published only in the language spoken in the south; potential bidders from Renamo-majority areas had been simply unaware of these opportunities. The resulting exclusions appeared, in fact, to have been inadvertent. The initial concentration of investment in the south had a

solid economic rationale. The bidding language was apparently an oversight, an exclusion that Bank staff at least, had simply never thought about. By 2013, resentment over (political and other) exclusion resulted in a two-year low-level recurrence of anti-Frelimo insurgency. A government (and Bank) public explanation and apology in 1997 for these lapses should have been easy, and might have set a tone more enhancing for reconciliation than has been the case. While we cannot know how a different future might have unfolded, it was clearly a missed opportunity.

Apology and Compensation

Some of the most prominent cases of official apology have been linked with financial payments as material restitution or compensation. In such cases, apology has stronger prospects for initiating reconciliation. One of the important distinctions between apology and restitution/compensation is the relevance of the time frame. There is no statute of limitations, so to speak, on apology. Nor is there any limit on the numbers of peoples or groups to which an apology can coherently be offered. As noted, for example, the Catholic Church has apologized (in effect, to hundreds of millions of people) for actions centuries in the past. Material compensation would be utterly infeasible and has not been proposed by the descendants. Reparations would be similarly infeasible following European apologies for the slave trade; the apologies came long after cessation of the trade which involved millions of persons from different parts of Africa. By contrast, apologies for recent injustices have commonly been associated with claims and/or offers of compensation; the damages have been calculable and financial compensation has been both feasible and helpful to the survivors or their descendants. In most such cases, the victims have accepted it as just and as a validation that the apology was genuine, not merely opportunistic tokenism.

The details matter. If the aggrieved judge the compensation severely inadequate, the moral value of the apology may be undermined. Or the aggrieved may view even a large compensation offer as

unacceptable “blood money;” accepting would dishonor the dead and give the perpetrators a fig leaf of moral cleansing. This was the initial view of some Israelis who opposed accepting German Holocaust reparations. For the majority of Jews, however, and for Germany as a whole, and for the world, the combination of German Holocaust apologies and reparations stands as the foremost example of credible apology and atonement, with positive effects for the relations between Germany, Israel, and world Jewry, and for Germany’s stature on the world stage. The decision of over 6,000 German companies, including many of the largest and most well-known, to pay \$4.5 billion in reparations to surviving people they had used as forced labor during the Nazi years, along with the apologies of the German churches (both Catholic and Protestant) for their complicity or silence, has added to the perception that regret and repentance have largely permeated through German society. An important Protestant example was the apology in 1945 of the German Protestant Evangelical Church for suffering German warfare had imposed on “many peoples and countries.” Germany also paid reparations to European countries it had invaded during WW II.

The Canadian experience provides another example of credible examination of the injustices involved, of thorough-going acknowledgment by the government and by the Canadian churches that were implementers of the policies, and of the need for, and appropriateness of, substantial reparations. According to the 2015 Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Canada had pursued a policy of “cultural genocide,” designed to “gain control over the land and resources of the aboriginal peoples by rendering the treaties irrelevant. A just reconciliation requires more than simply talking about the need to heal the deep wounds of history. Words of apology alone are insufficient; concrete actions on both symbolic and material fronts are required.” The intra-state atonement cases differ from the external and inter-state cases in one important dimension in particular: intra-state atonement can take the form of eliminating current legal and social injustices that remain as lamentable

legacies of the past. Affirmative action, rigorous enforcement of legal equality, investments in human capital to achieve a “level playing field,” and other social programs, can serve as reparations equivalence. However, attempts to get restitution for specific land and other assets, not to speak of lives, lost over generations, are not likely to be feasible. The debate over restitution and general reparations for slavery in U.S. history has shown the difficulties involved. (See Coates, in the bibliography.)

There is an important distinction between a) compensation (or “restitution”) for the value of specific dispossessed or destroyed property, and b) financial reparations as broad atonement. Restitution can be calculated, and is generally viewed as a legal matter of right. Reparations atonement is a moral act, an admission of wrongdoing, an act of repentance. Still, there may be opposite responses: the perpetrators (or their successors in authority) may see financial amends as settling the matter and cancelling any need for further guilt assuagement; the victims may see the guilt as beyond alleviation, unforgivable. In any case, reparations must be large to be credible.

Individuals in a country offering national atonement may not view the burden as just, nor an apology appropriate, if the blame and any financial compensation for acts of their forebears are made the responsibility of a later generation, or if the general public bears the burden of compensation for acts of entities for which the public bears (and bore) no responsibility. Thus, the tax-paying German public accepted the burden of the reparations for the Nazi regime’s crimes, while the reparations from the slave labor-using German corporations were financed by the companies themselves. Many Japanese are said to view themselves as victims rather than perpetrators; they were deceived and manipulated by the military, and suffered enormously, culminating in the two atomic bomb attacks.

Conclusion

The last seven decades have seen an unprecedented outpouring of apologies from governments, church

leaders, and other non-state collectives, for past actions of injustice, violence or outright warfare. Some reached far back into history; most concerned the recent past. Some apologies made significant contributions to reconciliation between former antagonists, or between perpetrators and victims, especially when accompanied by meaningful reparations. In some important cases, annual remembrance events, physical monuments and dedicated research and teaching institutions, have been established to continue cementing the settlement and peace. Some major cases of government apology for historic injustices have been reinforced by legal and social reforms. Overall, the solid apologies (we have also touched on cases of disappointing and failed apologies having lingering effects) are continuing to affect the dynamics between the states and groups involved. The apology experience has been much richer than I can convey in a summary treatment. Nevertheless, some lessons can be drawn for antagonists seeking peace and for conflict resolution professionals and scholars.

Apologies should be robust, citing the specific injustices at issue; mere “regret,” without acknowledgment of guilt, is inadequate if not counter-productive. Credibility is best achieved if apologies are negotiated to satisfy both sides’ needs. (A forced apology, as the Allies extracted from Germany at the end of WW I, can be dangerously counterproductive. The Versailles Treaty terms contributed to the conditions that fed the rise of Nazism.) The side apologizing can benefit from the admission’s facilitation of moral rehabilitation, restoration of pride in a cleansed identity, and restored international moral credibility. Apology offers the perpetrator a new basis for bilateral relations and international voice. By putting history behind, apology can stop the past injustice from continuing to poison or constrain the ex-perpetrator’s political space. For the aggrieved side, an apology by the perpetrator also has important benefits. It establishes the historical truth, encourages confidence that the peace will hold, helps enable the political leadership to move along

the spectrum of reconciliation, and helps victims accept that they are getting historical justice.

In some situations, apology need not be linked with (more than symbolic or cultural) material compensation: victims may view compensation as demeaning in principle; inadequate compensation demeans an apology; compensation (more than symbolic) from poor countries (or poor non-state groups) may be financially infeasible; compensation for injustices several (or many) generations past is probably infeasible for rational calculation or negotiation. On the other hand, in many cases, the injured may view apology without significant reparations as hypocritical moral posturing, lacking credibility. In the intra-state cases, meaningful apology has been reinforced by current social reforms and affirmative action.

Every case where apology seems called for and potentially beneficial for cementing a peace is unique; the apology (with or without compensation) must be shaped within the specific context. When both sides see compensation appropriate and feasible, the compensation reinforces the credibility and usefulness of the apology. The most credible and effective form between states or between civil war antagonists may be *mutual* apologies – each side apologizing for the unjust and violent acts it inflicted on the other — combined with mutual (even if financially modest) restitutions and memorials (e.g. anniversary ceremonies, gravesite visits and wreath ceremonies, museum installations, prominent plaques marking important injustice sites, dedicated research institutions). Between states, the gravity of an apology is enhanced when enshrined in a parliamentary resolution and debated and understood throughout the society. Recording an apology in school textbooks, and removal of hateful polemics, may be essential to avoid inculcating the next generation with old antagonisms and prejudices.

I have not discussed modern civil war antagonists until the end of this review. There is a striking dearth of civil war instances in my list of categories of apologies, or in the legal and academic literature on apology and restitution. Virtually all of the

apologies and the scholarly attention have concerned contrition of the strong over injustices they had inflicted on the weak. Apology as an instrument for settling conflicts and cementing peace agreements between relatively equal and weak antagonists, whether inter- or intra-state, does not seem to have emerged yet. Lacking such cases for study, apology analysts have simply ignored this category despite the importance in recent decades of internal conflicts involving roughly evenly matched antagonists. Some of these conflicts were proxy wars for external rival powers. Settlements were reached through different paths of exhaustion, negotiation, outside withdrawal, and international mediation. With injustices committed by all sides, high-level apologies would have been appropriate and could have helped, and still might help, to cement a peace. This group of conflicts included, among others, Serbia vs. Bosnia, Bosniacs vs. Serbs within Bosnia, Serbia vs. Kosovo, Namibia, Mozambique, Angola, and Sri Lanka.

The list of countries currently experiencing violent internal conflict and widespread violation of human rights, and where resolution and reconciliation will be difficult to achieve without mutual contrition, is long. As of this writing, the government of Sri Lanka has said it is committed to establishing a truth and reconciliation process to help heal the wounds of its long, and recently resolved, civil war. Both sides have good reasons for feeling, in various ways, victimized. Mutual contrition, expressed in mutual apologies, could make a significant contribution to the atmosphere for reconciliation. At the same time, mutual apology may face a difficulty that cannot be glossed over: the atrocities committed by one side often far exceed the evils committed by the other, in which case an effort to equate the apologies as moral equivalences would simply add another injustice and make reconciliation more rather than less difficult. This is the apology frontier to which apology theorists and conflict resolution practitioners should now turn their attention.

To sum up: In its widest potential application, the accumulation of apologies for injustice stands as evidence against the cynicism of “might-makes-

right” *realpolitik*. As a new potential international norm, political apology has been on the world stage for a mere half-century. In some cases, skepticism over the motive has been justified. As a norm, we cannot assume its permanency is certain. Nevertheless, while injustice remains an everyday occurrence, each opportunity for apology should be welcomed, carefully crafted, and encouraged as an incremental step toward more moral international

standards and behavior. Given the record thus far, perhaps it is not too soon to take up the idea of an annual day of international atonement, an occasion for each country to acknowledge its own past injustices. It would be an institutionalized reminder of injustices inflicted by virtually all nations and other human collectives, and the need for renewed determination to avoid repeating history’s man-made calamities.

Selected bibliography

- Barkan, Elazar, 2000, *The Guilt of Nations: Restitution and Negotiating Historic Injustices*, New York: Norton.
- Coates, Ta-Nehisi, “The Case for Reparations,” *The Atlantic Magazine*, June, 2014.
- Gibney, Mark, et al, 2008, *The Age of Apology: Facing up to the Past*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- International Theological Commission, 1999, “Memory and Reconciliation: The Church and the Faults of the Past,” www.vatican.va.
- Mihai, Mihaela, & Mathias Thaler, 2014, *On the Uses and Abuses of Political Apologies*, New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Political Apologies: Chronological List, 2003, www.upenn.edu/politicalapologies.
- Porter, Elisabeth, 2015, *Connecting Peace, Justice & Reconciliation*, Boulder: Lynn Rienner.

✍ Robert J. Muscat

Global Peace Services USA

The newsletter of Global Peace Services USA is published regularly. GPS USA is incorporated in the State of Maryland and is tax-exempt. Current board members are: Anna Amato, John Eriksson, Robert Muscat, Mindy Reiser, Ronald Ridker, Kelly Skeith and Sovan Tun. We welcome contributions and comments. To contact us:

Global Peace Services USA
P.O. Box 27922
Washington, DC 20038-7922

Telephone: 301-681-6968
E-mail: globalpeaceservicesusa@gmail.com

Web site: www.GlobalPeaceServices.org

Global Peace Services USA
P.O. Box 27922
Washington, DC 20038-7922
www.GlobalPeaceServices.org