

15-12 '010

002 108 287

In Y. Bar-Siman-Tov (Ed.) (2004).

From conflict resolution to

reconciliation (pp 11-38)

New York: Oxford University Press.

I

The Nature of Reconciliation as an Outcome and as a Process

Daniel Bar-Tal

Gemma H. Bennink

A true and lasting peace also requires a *culture for peace*, that is, a comprehensive, society-wide system of values, beliefs and attitudes, the interplay and impact of which in and on the civil society would lead citizens of the Middle East—Arabs, Israelis, Palestinians—in their daily lives, *on the ground*, to put a premium on peace, to desire peace, to seek peace and to stand for peace.

—Proceedings of the United Nations Department
of Public Information's International Encounter
for European Journalists on the Question of
Palestine, June 9–11, 1993, London

Although the concept of reconciliation has long been known and used in the social sciences, only over the past decade has the study of reconciliation emerged as a defined area of interest in political science and political psychology (for example, Krepon and Sevak, 1995; Asmal, Asmal, and Roberts, 1997; Lederach, 1997; Arnson, 1999a; Rothstein, 1999a). It evolved out of the recognition that there is a need to go beyond the traditional focus on conflict resolution, to expand the study of peacemaking to a macrosocietal perspective, which concerns reconciliation between society members. The study of conflict resolution reveals the mechanisms, methods, and conditions that the rival parties use in order to resolve their conflict peacefully. It refers mainly to the processes of negotiation, bargain-

ing, mediation, and arbitration that sometimes result in an agreement on a mutually acceptable solution, signed by the parties. Such an agreement symbolizes the formal ending of the conflict (for example, Smith, 1971; Deutsch, 1973; Mitchell, 1981; Burton, 1987; Kriesberg, 1992; Ross, 1993a; Rubín, Pruitt, and Kim, 1994; Bercovitch, 1995).

However, in recent years it has become evident that formal peace agreements fall far short of establishing genuine peaceful relations between the former adversaries (for example, Lederach, 1997; Simpson, 1997; Lipschutz, 1998; Wilmer, 1998; Knox and Quirk, 2000). Formal conflict resolution sometimes involves only the leaders who negotiated the agreement or narrow strata around them or but a small part of the society. In these cases, the majority of society members may not accept the negotiated compromises, or even if they do they may still hold worldviews that have fueled the conflict. As a result, formal resolutions of conflicts may be unstable; they may collapse as in the case of Angola, or turn into cold peace as in the case of Israeli-Egyptian relations. In these and similar cases, hopes of turning the conflictive relations of the past into peaceful societal relations have not materialized because the reconciliation process either never actually started, was stalled, or has progressed very slowly.

We suggest that it is the process of reconciliation itself that builds stable and lasting peace. Reconciliation goes beyond the agenda of formal conflict resolution to changing the motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and emotions of the great majority of the society members regarding the conflict, the nature of the relationship between the parties, and the parties themselves. These changes take shape via the reconciliation process, promote the peace as a new form of intergroup relations, and serve as stable foundations for cooperative and friendly acts that symbolize these relations.

In this chapter we will examine the nature of reconciliation as an outcome of peacemaking and as a process in which the parties in conflict embark on the long path of forming a genuine and stable peaceful relationship, relying much on recently published work in this area. We will first describe the characteristics of conflicts, which have bearing on the analysis of reconciliation. Second, we will discuss reconciliation as an outcome. Third, we will elaborate on the process of reconciliation, describing its different methods and facilitating factors. Finally, we will present several conclusions.

The Nature of Conflicts and Reconciliation

Intergroup conflicts are pervasive and permanent features of social life. They occur on every level of intergroup relations when the goals of one group con-

tradict those of another (Mitchell, 1981; Brown, 1988; Fisher, 1990; Kriesberg, 1998a). In this chapter we focus mainly on large-scale societal conflicts involving nations and ethnic, religious, or ideological groups. Such conflicts differ with respect to causes, contradictory goals, intensity, involvement, actions, and other characteristics. Some last for a short period, involve mainly leaders, and are hardly noticed by society members. These conflicts, considered as tractable, are eventually resolved peacefully through negotiation. They do not require reconciliation, since they do not involve psychological investment on the part of society members, no societal beliefs about them are formed, and they do not penetrate the cultural infrastructure of the societies involved. In contrast, there are other types of conflict, labeled as deeply rooted, protracted, intractable, or of enduring rivalry, that last at least a few decades, concern existential issues for the rivaling parties, involve violence, extensively preoccupy members of the implicated societies, and are perceived as of zero-sum nature and irreconcilable (Azar, 1990; Goertz and Diehl, 1993; Bar-Tal, 1998; Kriesberg, 1998a). Resolution of this second type of conflict is a complex challenge, often requiring many years, and some of them remain unresolved. But even when these conflicts are resolved peacefully and formal, mutually accepted agreements are signed, they still require a reconciliation process for rebuilding the relations between the societies (for example, the Northern Ireland and Middle East conflicts). The distinction between the types of conflict points to the fact that not all of them require reconciliation. What kinds of conflict, then, call for reconciliation?

We propose that *reconciliation is required when the societies involved in a conflict evolve widely shared beliefs, attitudes, motivations, and emotions that support adherence to the conflictive goals, maintain the conflict, de-legitimize the opponent, and thus negate the possibility of peaceful resolution and prevent the development of peaceful relations*. Of special importance in this repertoire are widely shared beliefs (called societal beliefs),¹ which often foster the emergence of collective emotional orientations (for example, fear, anger, and hatred) and sometimes even become a central part of societal ethos. They are formed in the course of the conflict, disseminated to society members, maintained by societal institutions, and supported by collective memory. They fuel the continuation of the conflictive relations and constitute obstacles to the progress of peacemaking (Bar-Tal, 1998, 2001). These beliefs, attitudes, and emotions do not change overnight even when the groups' leaders resolve the conflict peacefully and sign a peace agreement. They continue to inhibit the development of peaceful relations until they change slowly via a reconciliation process, should one take place. The latter point implies that reconciliation is not a naturally occurring process, but one that requires active efforts to overcome obstacles.

Discussions of reconciliation require two important classifications of conflict. The first concerns the outcome of the conflict and the status of the groups after conflict resolution. That is, whereas in some conflicts the two groups will live in two separate political entities (that is, states) following the conflict resolution, as in the case of the German-French and Israeli-Egyptian conflicts, in other instances, despite the vicious conflict, the two rival groups will have to continue to live together in one entity (a state), as in the case of South Africa, Guatemala, El Salvador, or Spain. This classification is important for deciding on the type of reconciliation process that is needed, as well as what form the final outcome must take. In general, rival groups that will be living together as a single peaceful society will need to construct mechanisms that foster integration. In contrast, in the other cases, the rival societies will need to construct mechanisms of intergroup relations in two different systems, which involve different processes and outcomes. In both categories, however, both of the opposing sides must undergo a similar psychological change so as to form new motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and emotions.

The second classification is more complicated. It refers to the attributed responsibility for the outbreak of the conflict and especially for the negative acts committed during the conflict (see Asmal et al., 1997; Kriesberg, 1998a). Although each party involved in a conflict usually perceives itself as the victim and the other side as being responsible for the outbreak of the conflict and the negative acts committed, the international community, according to defined international criteria of justice, sometimes blames one side more than the other (Asmal et al., 1997). Such international judgment can affect the reconciliation process. When one side is attributed more responsibility than the other for injustice (as in the interstate conflict between Japan and Korea or Germany and Poland, and in the intrastate conflict in South Africa or Chile), then this side is often required to take special steps in the of reconciliation process (for example, paying reparations, stating an apology).

Having made these clarifications, we can now begin to explore more deeply the notion of reconciliation as an outcome and as a process.

Reconciliation as an Outcome

All students of reconciliation in the present decade agree that it concerns the formation or restoration of a genuine peaceful relationship between societies that have been involved in an intractable conflict, after its formal resolution is achieved (Ackermann, 1994; Chadha, 1995; Asmal et al., 1997; Kopstein, 1997; Lederach, 1997; Kriesberg, 1998a; Lipschutz, 1998; Wilmer, 1998; Arthur,

1999; Gardner-Feldman, 1999; Keilman, 1999a; Murray and Greer, 1999; Norval, 1999; Bar-Tal, 2000b). The focus is on peaceful relations between societies, since reconciliation requires more than friendly relations between leaders, which sometimes develop in the course of the conflict resolution process. Reconciliation, then, requires the support of the entire society or at least the majority of it; only then can peace be stable and lasting. A peace that is not supported by society as a whole will always be at risk of breaking down.

The question, then, concerns the nature of stable and lasting peaceful relations subsequent to the reconciliation process (see Bar-Siman-Tov, this volume). Social scientists have offered different answers to this question, some consisting of brief definitions and others more detailed (see, for example, Kacowicz and Bar-Siman-Tov, 2000). In our view, *stable and lasting peace is characterized by mutual recognition and acceptance, invested interests and goals in developing peaceful relations, as well as fully normalized, cooperative political, economic, and cultural relations based on equality and justice, nonviolence, mutual trust, positive attitudes, and sensitivity and consideration for the other party's needs and interests*. These characteristics include both structural and psychological elements. We believe the psychological elements stem directly from the reconciliation process, since we see reconciliation as a psychological process and outcome that takes place between rival groups. We suggest, therefore, that reconciliation as an outcome consists of *mutual recognition and acceptance, invested interests and goals in developing peaceful relations, mutual trust, positive attitudes, as well as sensitivity and consideration for the other party's needs and interests*. All these elements of reconciliation apply to postconflict situations in which the two groups build peaceful relations in two separate political entities—their states, as well as to situations in which the two rival groups continue to live in a single political entity. However, there is a difference with respect to the normalization of political, economic, and cultural relations. Whereas in the former situation this requirement pertains to bilateral relations between two states, in the latter situation it involves the integration of past adversaries into a single political-economic-cultural system.

Peacemaking techniques have traditionally focused on the structural aspects of restoring or forging relations between former rivals (see Charif, 1994; Corn, 1994; Saidi, 1994; Lederach, 1997; Lipschutz, 1998; Wilmer, 1998; Murray and Greer, 1999). This focus was based on the assumption that equal interactions between the parties, together with economic and political restructuring, lead to new, cooperative links that stabilize peaceful relationships (Ackermann, 1994; Elhance and Ahmar, 1995; Weiwen and Deshingkar, 1995; Gardner-Feldman, 1999). The literature focused on such structural elements as exchanging representatives in various political, economic, and cultural

spheres; maintaining formal and regular channels of communication and consultation between the leaders of the states; reducing threats and tensions by such acts as disarmament, demilitarization, reduction of military manpower, and minimization of military manpower close to the borders; developing joint institutions and organizations; developing free and open trade; developing cooperative economic ventures; exchanging information and developing cooperation in different areas; developing free and open tourism; and exchanging cultural products. These structural elements of stable and lasting peace pertain mainly to cases in which the rival parties live in two states.

When the rival groups must live together in one state, the formal acts involved in establishing stable and lasting peaceful relations are different. They aim at internal institutional reforms, mostly in the political and economic systems. The structural outcome of reconciliation requires political integration, meaning the inclusion of all groups in the power system, the establishment of structural equality and justice, and the observance of human and civil rights as well as democratic rules of political governance (Corm, 1994; Corr, 1995; Kriesberg, 1998a; Lederach, 1998; Arnson, 1999b; Murray and Greer, 1999; Zalaquett, 1999). In the economic domain, peacemaking requires the inclusion of all the society's groups in the economic system, the creation of equal opportunity for them, and often the redistribution of wealth (Corr, 1995; Lipschutz, 1998; Wilmer, 1998; Zalaquett, 1999).

All the political and economic acts described are assumed to foster interdependent relations and cooperation and thus to promote peace. Thus, it is of utmost importance to avoid violent acts by both sides. In conflicts between states, the international community provides an array of rules, institutions, and mechanisms to resolve them peacefully through bilateral negotiation, or mediation and arbitration by third parties. In the case of intrastate conflicts, the society has to restructure its institutions so as to provide the mechanisms for peaceful conflict resolution. In all the cases, however, what is essential is to treat the other side with respect, justice, equality, and sensitivity to its needs and goals.

It became clear, however, that creating economic and political mechanisms and institutions to foster interdependence and affinity does not guarantee lasting peaceful relations (Lederach, 1997, 1998; Simpson, 1997; Kriesberg, 1998a; Lipschutz, 1998; Wilmer, 1998; Arnson, 1999b; Arthur, 1999). As Wilmer points out, "[although] structural factors may contribute to precipitating a conflict or to constructing a framework for stable peace, structural factors alone neither cause nor resolve protracted and violent conflict" (1998: 93). Structural elements establish formal relations without necessarily spreading the new message of reconciliation among society members. Such elements are sometimes

perceived as irrelevant to the personal lives of society members and often do not induce a deep change in the public's psychological repertoire. The case of Yugoslavia, in which Tito's communist regime imposed many structural acts of multicultural coexistence, demonstrates the weakness of such measures if they are not accompanied by complementary psychological changes (Wilmer, 1998). *The essence of reconciliation is a psychological process, which consists of changes of the motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and emotions of the majority of society members* (Lederach, 1997; Shonholtz, 1998; Wilmer, 1998; De Soto, 1999; Kelman, 1999a). Psychological change is vital because without it the rival parties do not establish lasting peaceful relations (see Maoz, this volume). *Reconciliation is, then, the necessary condition for stable and lasting peace*. Structural measures alone may facilitate psychological change, but they cannot establish reconciliation. As Lipschutz remarks in regard to intrastate conflicts: "Relationships among people, among individuals, are the fundamental basis of the state; restoring only the institutions of the state (and the economy) will not restore those relationships rent by years of violence and war" (1998: 16). Thus, the next section focuses on the psychological requirements for reconciliation.

The Outcome of Reconciliation

The outcome of reconciliation consists of motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and emotions that support the objective of peace, the new nature of peaceful relations, and positive views of the partner. This psychological basis of reconciliation must be reflected in people's subjective experience. As Lederach notes: "To be at all germane to contemporary conflict, peacebuilding must be rooted in and responsive to the experiential and subjective realities shaping people's perspectives and needs" (1997: 21). The fundamental requirement is that the psychological dimension penetrate deep into the societal fabric, so as to be shared by the majority of society members (Asmal et al., 1997; Lederach, 1997; Kriesberg, 1998a; Bar-Tal, 2000b). Only such change can guarantee lasting peaceful relations between rival groups, because then stable foundations are formed that are rooted in the psyche of the people.

The psychological changes may not encompass all society members, since a small section of a society may continue to harbor the wish to maintain the conflict, despite its resolution and the new, peaceful climate. An example is the German irredentist groups, which do not accept the peace agreement and reconciliation between Germany and Poland or between Germany and the Czech Republic (Handl, 1997; Gardner-Feldman, 1999). But if such groups are small and marginal (as in the case of Germany) whereas the great majority

of the society, including its dominant groups, has internalized the psychological basis of reconciliation, then reconciliation is not affected.

Reconciliation also requires a measure of complementarity between the psychological bases of the former rivals (Asmal et al., 1997; Lederach, 1997; Kriesberg, 1998a). That is, both parties must undergo a similar psychological change and a majority of both parties must support the peaceful relations. An imbalance in these changes will impair reconciliation and lead one of the parties to feel betrayed and cheated.

Although most of the researchers agree on the importance of the psychological component of reconciliation, they are vague or disagree about its nature. Most thinkers on reconciliation have recognized the importance of creating a common psychological framework to promote this process (Asmal et al., 1997; Kopstein, 1997; Lederach, 1997; Hayes, 1998; Kriesberg, 1998a; Volkan, 1998a; Hayner, 1999; Whittaker, 1999). They realize that during the conflict the rival parties had different views about the conflict itself, about each other, and about their relationship. To ensure reconciliation, these different views must undergo a dramatic adjustment. What, then, is the nature of the common psychological framework?

There is wide agreement that reconciliation requires forming a new, common outlook on the past. Once there is a shared and acknowledged perception of the past, the parties have taken a significant step toward reconciliation. As Hayner observes, "where fundamentally different versions or continued denials about such important and painful events still exist, reconciliation may be only superficial" (1999: 373). Reconciliation requires that both parties not just become aware of but truly acknowledge what happened in the past (Asmal et al., 1997; Chirwa, 1997; Hayes, 1998; Lederach, 1998; Norval, 1998, 1999; Gardner Feldman, 1999; Hayner, 1999). Acknowledgment of the past entails at least recognizing that there are two narratives of the conflict (Kopstein, 1997; Hayner, 1999; Norval, 1999). This is an important factor in reconciliation, since the parties' collective memories of their own past sustain the conflict and obstruct peacemaking (Bar-Tal, 2003). Reconciliation necessitates changing these societal beliefs (that is, collective memories) about the past by learning about the rival group's collective memory and admitting one's own past misdeeds and responsibility for the outbreak and maintenance of the conflict. Through the negotiation process, in which one's own past is critically revised and synchronized with that of the other group, a new narrative emerges (Asmal et al., 1997; Hayes, 1998; Norval, 1998). With time, this new historical account of events should come to replace the previous version.

Often, however, preoccupation with the past requires more than that. During the conflict, each party accumulates many grievances toward the other.

Years of violence leave deep scars of anger, grief, a sense of victimhood, a will to revenge, and so on. These grievances must not only be known, but also truly acknowledged by the rival society (Ross, 1995; Asmal et al., 1997; Kriesberg, 1998a; Lederach, 1998; Wilmer, 1998; Norval, 1999). Some researchers have gone a step further by asserting that collective acknowledgment of the past is not enough to promote a process of reconciliation. Instead, they argue, the process of reconciliation should ultimately lead to collective healing and forgiveness for the adversary's misdeeds (Shriver, 1995; Lederach, 1998; Arthur, 1999; Hayner, 1999; Staub, 2000). Lederach has referred to this element as the spiritual dimension: "Spiritual for me signifies moving beyond the issues and toward an encounter. It is a journey toward an encounter with self and the other. The purpose of the reconciliation journey is healing" (1998: 244).

The spiritual dimension signifies the importance of healing and forgiveness. Reconciliation, in this view, consists of restoration and healing. It allows the emergence of a common frame of reference that permits and encourages societies to acknowledge the past, confess former wrongs, relieve the experiences under safe conditions, mourn the losses, validate the experienced pain and grief, receive empathy and support, and restore a broken relationship (Montville, 1993; Lederach, 1998; Minow, 1998; Staub, 1998, 2000). It creates a space where forgiveness can be offered and accepted. The element of forgiveness as an outcome of reconciliation is of special importance in cases of unequal responsibility, where one party is attributed responsibility either for the outbreak and maintenance of the conflict, or for misdeeds committed during the conflict (see also Auerbach, this volume) or both. It is forgiveness that then makes the reconciliation possible (Staub, 2000). It symbolizes psychologically departing from the past for new, peaceful relations (Lederach, 1998; Norval, 1999). As Montville puts it: "healing and reconciliation in violent ethnic and religious conflicts depend on a process of transactional contrition and forgiveness between aggressors and victims which is indispensable to the establishment of a new relationship based on mutual acceptance and reasonable trust" (1993: 112).

It should be noted, however, that not all the thinkers on the subject of reconciliation agree with this view. Some seriously question whether forgiveness and healing are possible, or even necessary (Horowitz, 1993; Hayes, 1998; Gardner-Feldman, 1999). They agree that a collective reconstruction of the past is a necessary element in any reconciliation process, but are skeptical as to whether this can lead to healing and forgiveness. Especially in severely divided societies, such as South Africa and Northern Ireland, this is a difficult if not impossible objective to obtain. Hayes, for example, argues that "reconciliation is not about the [individualism of] forgiveness of the dreadful and vile acts

societal beliefs about goals must be formed. The new beliefs must present new goals for the society that have been shaped by the conflict resolution agreement, and that center on maintaining peaceful relations with the former enemy. In addition, these beliefs must provide rationalization and justification for the new goals, including new symbols and myths.

SOCIETAL BELIEFS ABOUT THE RIVAL GROUP. Another determining condition for reconciliation is a change of the images of the adversary group. In times of conflict, the opposing group is delegitimized in order to explain its aberrant behavior, the outbreak and continuation of the conflict, and to justify actions taken against the adversary (Bar-Tal and Teichman, in preparation). To promote a process of reconciliation, perceptions of the rival group need to be changed. It is important to legitimize and personalize its members; legitimization grants humanity to members of the adversary group, after years of its denial. It allows viewing the opponent as belonging to the category of acceptable groups, with which it is desired to maintain peaceful relations. Personalization enables seeing members of the rival group as human individuals who can be trusted and have legitimate needs and goals. The new beliefs should also contain a balanced stereotype consisting of positive and negative characteristics and a differentiating perception of the group that acknowledges its heterogeneous composition. Finally, the new beliefs should permit seeing the other group as a victim of the conflict as well, since its members also suffered in its course (Kelman, 1999a; Bar-Tal, 2000b).

SOCIETAL BELIEFS ABOUT ONE'S OWN GROUP. Reconciliation requires changing societal beliefs about one's own group. During the conflict, groups tend to view themselves in a one-sided way involving self-glorification and self-praise, ignoring and censoring any information that might shed negative light on the group. But in the reconciliation process, the group must take responsibility for its involvement in the outbreak of the conflict, if that was the case, as well as its contribution to the violence, including immoral acts, and refusal to engage in a peaceful resolution. Thus, the new societal beliefs present one's own group in a more "objective," critical light, especially regarding its past behavior.

SOCIETAL BELIEFS ABOUT THE RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PAST OPPONENT. Reconciliation requires the formation of new societal beliefs about the relations between the two groups that were engaged in conflict. During conflict, the societal beliefs support confrontation and animosity (Bar-Tal, 1998). To promote reconciliation, these beliefs need to change into beliefs that stress the importance of cooperation and friendly relations. Of special importance is the

committed in the name of apartheid, but how all of us are going to act to build a new society" (1998: 33).

Returning to the general issue of reconciliation, a number of definitions have been proposed by different writers (see also the chapters by Kelman, Kriesberg, and Ross in this volume). Asmal et al. suggest that reconciliation is "the facing of unwelcome truths in order to harmonize incommensurable world views so that inevitable and continuing conflicts and differences stand at least within a single universe of comprehensibility" (1997: 46). Marrow proposes that reconciliation "is reestablishment of friendship that can inspire sufficient trust across the traditional split" (1999: 132). In emphasizing trust, he asserts that the basic thrust of reconciliation is to be sensitive to others' needs, the principal question being not what *they* have to do, but what *we* have to do to promote the reconciliation process. Lederach (1997) focuses mainly on intrasocietal reconciliation and posits four elements of it: *truth*, which requires open expression of the past; *mercy*, which requires forgiveness to enable building new relations; *justice*, which requires restitution and social restructuring; and *peace*, which entails a common future, wellbeing, and security for all the parties. Kelman (1999a) presents elaborated components of reconciliation in what he calls a "positive peace." In this view, reconciliation consists of the following components: (a) resolution of the conflict, which satisfies the parties' fundamental needs and fulfills their national aspirations; (b) mutual acceptance and respect for the other group's life and welfare; (c) development of a sense of security and dignity for each group; (d) establishment of patterns of cooperative interaction in different spheres; and (e) the institutionalization of conflict resolution mechanisms.

In a recent article Bar-Tal (2000b), focusing on the cognitive aspect, elaborates on the types of psychological change that are necessary for reconciliation. He proposes that achieving reconciliation requires changes in five themes of societal beliefs that were formed during the conflict: societal beliefs about the group's goals, about the rival group, about one's own group, about relations with the past opponent, and about peace.

SOCIETAL BELIEFS ABOUT THE GROUP'S GOALS. An important change concerns the societal beliefs about the justness of the goals that underlie the outbreak and maintenance of the conflict. Groups involved in conflict construct beliefs about their own goals that provide an epistemic basis for the conflict. They present these goals as supremely important and accord them justifications and rationale. Reconciliation requires changing these beliefs—in essence, abolishing them or at least indefinitely postponing the societal aspirations expressed in goals, which caused the intergroup conflict. Instead, new

accent on equality of relations and mutual sensitivity to each other's needs, goals, and general well-being. These new beliefs about the relationship should also concern the past. As discussed earlier, the new beliefs should present the past relations within a new framework that revises the collective memory and forms an outlook on the past that is synchronized with that of the former rival.

SOCIETAL BELIEFS ABOUT PEACE. During the intractable conflict, the parties yearn for peace but view it in general, amorphous, and utopian terms, without specifying its concrete nature or realistic ways to achieve it. Reconciliation requires forming new societal beliefs that describe the multidimensional nature of peace, realistically outline the costs and benefits of achieving it, connote the meaning of living in peace, and specify the conditions and mechanisms for achieving (for example, negotiation with the rival and compromises) and especially maintaining it. Of special importance is the recognition that for lasting peace, the well-being of the two sides is in the interest of both parties and hence peace also requires ongoing sensitivity and attention to the needs and goals of the other group.

The above psychological framework focuses almost entirely on the change of beliefs and attitudes of both parties. Nevertheless, the outcome of reconciliation also requires positive emotions about the peaceful relations with the past opponent. Positive affects should accompany the described beliefs and indicate good feelings that the parties have toward each other and toward the new relations. The good feelings should be reflected in mutual acceptance, recognition, trust, and caring about the other side's well-being. This kind of caring does not develop out of altruistic considerations but as a response to interdependence and common goals. Reconciliation requires that past rivals develop and disseminate a psychology of cooperation among society members. In regard to emotions, reconciliation requires a change in the collective emotional orientations of fear, anger, and hatred, which often dominate societies in intractable conflict. Instead, societies in peace should develop an emotional orientation of hope, which reflects the desire to maintain peaceful, cooperative relations with the other party. This emotional orientation involves a positive outlook for the future and expectations of pleasant events, without violence and hostilities (Averill, Catlin, and Chon, 1990; Bar-Tal, 2001).

Reconciliation as a Process

The concept of reconciliation is not only used in reference to an outcome, but also to connote a process. Genuine and stable peaceful relations are achieved

through a long process of reconciliation, lasting many years. It encompasses psychological changes of motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and emotions, which are reflected in structural changes; these, in turn, facilitate the process of reconciliation. Although some of the structural changes can be decided and implemented relatively quickly, the psychological changes do not occur in the same way. They take place via the slow psychological processes of information processing, unfreezing, persuasion, learning, reframing, re-categorization, and formation of new psychological repertoire. These processes are slow because the psychological repertoire formed during the conflict is central and held with high confidence. Therefore its change, which must encompass the majority of society members, is a complex, arduous, prolonged, and many-faceted task that needs to overcome many inhibiting factors. First, however, we will note a few points regarding the process of structural change, which, on the one hand, facilitates the process of reconciliation and, on the other, often provides criteria about its success.

Structural Changes as Facilitators and Reflections of Reconciliation

The literature on the process of reconciliation specifies certain policies and acts that are considered necessary to this process. One important prerequisite is the cessation of violent acts. The parties in conflict must adopt the principle of peaceful conflict resolution and stop using violence. This requires, first of all, the establishment of mutually accepted structural mechanisms that can resolve any possible conflict and disagreement that may erupt after the documents of peaceful conflict resolution are signed. In the postconflict era, when both parties lack trust and are insensitive to each other's needs, establishing structural mechanisms to prevent violence represents a major challenge in their peace efforts. These may include not only the mechanisms to resolve conflicts but also many measures to reduce the perception of threat and feelings of fear that often underlie the eruptions of violence. Such measures may include demobilization of military forces, disarmament, demilitarization of territories, and so on. All these steps facilitate the development of trust and positive perceptions (Ball, 1996; Canas and Dada, 1999; Spalding, 1999). An example of such acts can be seen in the reconciliation process in Nicaragua, which involved disarmament and demobilization of the Contras military forces, successfully supervised by the International Commission for Support and Verification (CIAV) set up by the Organization of American States (Sereseres, 1996). Another example is the confidence-building measures to improve the Israeli-Egyptian relations, which consisted of restricting military

movements close to the borders and creating a multinational force (MFO) to supervise the disengaged parties.

When the rival parties will have to live under the same political system (as, for example, in South Africa, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Chile, Argentina, or Northern Ireland), the focus is on long-term reconstruction, restructuring, restabilization, and rehabilitation. The reconciliation process depends on the development of policies that aim to create linkages, which foster inclusion and integration of all the groups in the society. This can be achieved by setting subordinate goals that are agreed on by all the parties, constructing inclusive identities, and abolishing all forms of discrimination (Horowitz, 1993; Charif, 1994; Saidi, 1994; Corr, 1995; Kriesberg, 1998a; Murray and Greer, 1999).

Many analysts suggest that democratization is the first condition for reconciliation in situations of intrastate conflict (Charif, 1994; Corr, 1995; Arnson, 1999b; Zalaquett, 1999). Democratization consists of establishing democratic rules and realizing formal democratic procedures that include freedom of expression and the right to political organization and political activity (Charif, 1994; El-Hoss, 1994; Corr, 1995; Lipschutz, 1998; Arnson, 1999b; Azburu, 1999). The electoral system should be perceived by all parties as free and fair and should create incentives to moderation (Horowitz, 1993; Canas and Dada, 1999). Democratization should lead to new distribution of political power, restoration of civil and human rights, emergence of new democratic political institutions and organizations, enforcement of democratic principles and rules of governance, and wide political participation. Moreover, it should be possible to replace the political and military leaders who were associated with the abuses perpetrated during the conflict. In this regard, it is also important to establish a legal system that is independent of the political, economic, and military bases of power. This system should be managed according to the principles of justice, equality, and fairness (Azburu, 1999). In essence, the reconciliation process requires the involvement of civil society, whose values, laws, and norms support peaceful and democratic life (Azburu, 1999; Spalding, 1999).

Political restructuring may require the creation of new structures of governance. An example is participatory governance, which means a reduction in state activity and increased responsibility at the local level. Participatory governance is a way of involving the civil society in the reconciliation process. This type of governance is promoted in some regions in Northern Ireland in the form of partnerships—local interest groups of elected community representatives and representatives of business, trade unions, and statutory agencies. The goal of these partnerships is to reinforce a peaceful and stable society and to encourage reconciliation by increasing economic development and employ-

ment, promoting urban and rural regeneration, developing cross-border cooperation, and extending social inclusion (Murray and Greer, 1999).

In addition to political processes, economic processes are an important condition for reconciliation. Economic processes are necessary to foster economic interdependence, to include all groups in economic development, and to remove past discrimination and inequalities (Charif, 1994; Corm, 1994; El-Hoss, 1994; Elhance and Ahmar, 1995; Weiwen and Deshingkar, 1995). They can include redistributing land, wealth, and economic power, allowing equal opportunity for economic participation, and providing compensation to groups that have suffered systematic discrimination.

If the rival groups are going to live in different political systems, the focus should be on creating economic and political linkages that foster cooperation (Ackerman, 1994; Barua, 1995; Elhance and Ahmar, 1995; Ganguly, 1995; Weiwen and Deshingkar, 1995; Gardner Feldman, 1999). This can be achieved by stimulating political and economic interdependence. There are numerous structural measures that both groups can take to foster the reconciliation process. Diplomatic relations, visits of leaders, exchanges of delegations, trade, joint economic projects, and cooperation in different areas of common interest are only a few examples from a long list of possibilities. All the structural measures must be implemented on the basis of equality and sensitivity to the parties' needs and goals. A successful example of a structural process was the development of peaceful relations between France and Germany. In 1951, the two countries established an economic union for coal and steel production as one of the first steps in the reconciliation process. In 1963 the Franco-German Treaty was signed, which institutionalized many of the structural measures so as to accelerate the process of reconciliation (for example, regular meetings between foreign, defense, and education ministers). In 1988 the Franco-German Cultural Council was established, and in 1995 even joint military units were formed (Ackermann, 1994). Another example of a structural process is the creation of the extensive economic and political linkages between Germany and Poland. Building on their 1991 treaty, the two states established various cooperative ventures to promote the reconciliation process such as the Fund for German-Polish Cooperation, the German-Polish Economic Promotion Agency, the Committee for Cross-Border Collaboration, and the Committee for Interregional Collaboration (Gardner-Feldman, 1999). On another continent, India and Pakistan have been trying to reconcile their differences for decades. In 1983 the two signed an agreement to establish a joint commission to strengthen relations and to promote cooperation in economics, health, science and technology, sports, travel, tourism, and consular matters (Elhance and Ahmar, 1995).

Whether the rival groups will live in one state or in two, the improvement of the economic situation of all members of the groups is always important (Rothstein, 1999b). Individuals in all the groups must feel that peaceful relations are worthwhile, and will contribute to the reconstruction of the economy after the conflict, the facilitation of economic growth and employment, and the improvement in individuals' standard of living. These economic benefits constitute powerful tools for peace because they mobilize group members to support peace and become an interest group for it. Therefore, special efforts are often made to encourage financial support, investments, and economic planning in the postconflict period by various national and international organizations and institutions. An example can be seen in Bosnia, where the World Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the United Nations Development Program provided the money, plans, and personnel to reconstruct the country for all the groups that accepted and cooperated with the Dayton Agreement (Woodward, 1999).

Finally, one of the most important factors in fostering reconciliation processes in cases of interstate and intrastate conflict is the establishment of policies, institutions, and mechanisms to ensure justice (Shriver, 1999). Conflicts by their nature violate principles of justice, and the reconciliation process requires specific structural acts that signal to the groups involved that justice has been restored (Deutsch, 2000). The restoration of justice depends much on the nature of the particular conflict and the nature of the transgressions perpetrated during it. Examples of such transgressions include systematic and institutionalized discrimination, institutionalized violation of human rights, ethnic cleansing, mass killing, and even genocide. In some conflicts one side is clearly responsible for unjust acts, but in others the sides share the blame. In both situations, however, the structural acts of justice restoration are an inseparable part of the reconciliation process. For example, in the Balkans, the Dayton agreement gave each Bosnian family the right to return to their prewar home if they so desired, or alternatively to receive compensation for their lost property (Woodward, 1999).

The Reconciliation Process

According to the present conception, the reconciliation process begins when psychological changes begin to take place. That is, reconciliation begins when the parties in conflict start to change their beliefs, attitudes, goals, motivations, and emotions about the conflict, each other, and future relations—all in the direction of reconciliation. Such changes usually begin before the conflict is resolved peacefully and in fact can pave the way to its peaceful resolution. In

turn, the peaceful resolution of the conflict, with the initiation of various measures to establish formal relations, serves as a crucial catalyst for the psychological changes. The reconciliation process is by its nature an informal one that lasts for a very long time and, therefore, does not have a formal beginning or ending. It is not a linear process of continuous change in the direction of peaceful relations, but one of regressions and advances.

The process of psychological change almost never begins with a large-scale change by the majority of society members. Instead, the slow process of unfreezing and changing the beliefs and attitudes toward the societal goals, the conflict, the adversary, one's own group, or the resolution of the conflict always begins with a small minority. This minority is often at first perceived by the majority as traitorous, and a long process of persuasion has to occur before psychological change encompasses the majority of society members. Social psychology has devoted much study to this process, which goes beyond the scope of the present chapter (see, for example, Moscovici, Mugny, and Van Avermaet, 1985; Levine and Russo, 1987; De Vries, De Dreu, Gordijn, and Schuurman, 1996).

For our purposes, it is important to recognize that although the reconciliation process may begin either with the leaders or the grass roots, to be effective it must always proceed top-down and bottom-up simultaneously. This means that whereas, on the one hand, the psychological change among leaders, especially mainstream ones, greatly influences the society members, on the other hand, the involvement of a mass movement that embraces the psychological change has an effect on the leaders. In the long process of reconciliation, both phenomena usually take place. Eventually, however, the leaders are of crucial importance, since it is they who negotiate the peaceful resolution of the conflict and are in a position to lead the reconciliation process (for example, Begin and Sadat in the Israeli-Egyptian case, or Mandela and de Klerk in South Africa; see Bargal and Sivan, this volume). But it should be noted that in all the cases there was significant mass support for conflict resolution and eventual reconciliation, without which it would be very difficult to accomplish. The success of the reconciliation process depends on the dissemination of the ideas associated with it among the grass roots. This is essential to convincing the masses to change their psychological repertoire from supporting the conflict to favoring the emergence of peaceful relations.

In general, then, the reconciliation process requires policies that aim at changing the psychological repertoire of society members (Ackermann, 1994; Shonholtz, 1998; Volpe, 1998; Gardner-Feldman, 1999; Kelman, 1999a). These policies cannot merely be relayed in statements and speeches, but must be reflected in formal acts that symbolically communicate to society the change

in the relationship with the past rival. The formal acts occur in various spheres, beginning with formal meetings between the representatives of the rival groups, later between the leaders, then the establishment of formal relations, followed by political, economic, and cultural acts. These acts must be institutionalized and widened to encompass many society members, institutions, and organizations (Chadha, 1995; Kriesberg, 1998a; Lederach, 1998; Kelman, 1999a; Norval, 1999).

The mobilization of the masses for the psychological change is also performed by middle-level leaders—that is, prominent figures in ethnic, religious, economic, academic, intellectual, and humanitarian circles (Khalaf, 1994; Lederach, 1997; Thompson, 1997; Lipschutz, 1998). In this process elites play a very important role. The elites include those individuals who hold authoritative positions in powerful public and private organizations and influential movements (Kotzé and Du Toit, 1996). Such individuals can take an important part in initiating and implementing policies of reconciliation and reconstruction (Ackermann, 1994; Chadha, 1995; Lederach, 1998). At the grassroots level, local leaders, businessmen, community developers, local health officials, and educators can also play an important role in initiating and implementing such policies (Chetkov-Yanoov, 1986; Thompson, 1997; Lederach, 1998).

The challenge of reconciliation calls for different methods to facilitate the psychological change. We now turn to some of these.

Methods of Reconciliation

A variety of methods to facilitate reconciliation have been proposed in the literature. Some are part of the formal policies and some are carried out voluntarily and informally. All, however, serve as mechanisms to change society members' motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and emotions in the direction of reconciliation. We will describe several of these methods, especially those that can be used for interstate as well as intrastate reconciliation.

APOLOGY. As most analysts have pointed out, reconciliation requires confrontation with the past, especially when transgressions were performed by one or both parties in the conflict (Bronkhorst, 1995). In these cases, the victims of the transgressions harbor strong negative feelings toward the perpetrators, which stand as major obstacles to reconciliation. Such negative feelings must be reduced to enable the psychological change required for reconciliation. Here, one method is formal apology offered by the side(s) that committed the misdeeds (Scheff, 1994). Through apology, the past injustices and grievances are acknowledged and addressed. Apology is a formal acceptance of respon-

sibility for the misdeeds carried out during the conflict and an appeal to the victims for forgiveness. It implies a commitment to pursuing justice and truth (Asmal et al., 1997; Kriesberg, 1998a; Gardner-Feldman, 1999; Norval, 1999). Apology allows the victims to forgive and be healed so that eventually their negative feelings toward the past enemy will change. An example of apology can be seen in the case of South Africa's former president, F. W. de Klerk, who in August 1996, after Nelson Mandela was elected president, publicly apologized for the pain and suffering caused by the past policies of the National Party. He acknowledged that the National Party governments had approved unconventional measures that had created an environment in which abuses and gross human rights violations occurred (Kriesberg, 1998a). The Czech-German Declaration on Mutual Relations and Their Future Development, signed in January 1997, is an example of mutual apology. Germany accepted responsibility for the events of World War II and expressed regret for the sufferings and wrongs wrought against the Czech people; the Czech Republic expressed remorse for the sufferings and wrongs perpetrated against innocent Germans expelled from the Sudetenland after the war (Handl, 1997).

TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSIONS. These commissions are a way of dealing extensively with the past. Their purpose is to reveal the truth about the past and to serve as a mechanism for establishing justice. They are of special importance in light of the fact that in most cases individual compensation is not possible. They expose acts of violence, violations of human and civil rights, discrimination, and other misdeeds perpetrated by the formal institutions of the state or by groups and individuals (Asmal et al., 1997; Barnes, 1997; Kaye, 1997; Kriesberg, 1998a; Liebenberg and Zegeye, 1998). In this process, the revelation of the past allows the groups to construct their new collective memory and thereby facilitates recovery (Asmal et al., 1997; Chirwa, 1997; Hayner, 1999; Norval, 1999; Zalaquett, 1999).

In recent years, variants of such commissions have been undertaken in South Africa, Chile, Argentina, El Salvador, Honduras, Uruguay, and Rwanda. Among these, the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) has received the most attention (Asmal et al., 1997; Chirwa, 1997; De la Rey and Owens, 1998; Hayes, 1998; Hamber, 1998; Liebenberg & Zegeye, 1998; Norval, 1998). It was established in 1995 with the principal objective of promoting "national unity and reconciliation in a spirit of understanding which transcends the conflict and divisions of the past." To this end, the TRC was supposed to (a) establish a comprehensive record of the causes, nature, and extent of gross human rights violations that occurred from March 1, 1960, to May 10, 1994; (b) decide on granting amnesty to individuals who made full

disclosure of the transgressions they had committed in a political context; (c) restore the dignity of the victims by giving them an opportunity to recount their experiences; and (d) recommend measures for reparation and rehabilitation, as well as for preventing future human rights violations.

PUBLIC TRIALS. Public trials of particular individuals, charged for human rights violations and crimes against humanity, constitute another method that is regarded as facilitating the reconciliation process (Kritz, 1996). First, such trials provide an opportunity to reveal the misdeeds and thus acknowledge the victims' suffering. Second, when the criminals are found guilty and punished, the trials fulfill the deep-seated desire for retribution and give the victims the sense that justice has been carried out. In addition, the trials place the responsibility for crimes on particular individuals, thereby reducing the responsibility of the group to which they belong. Finally, these trials serve as warnings by showing that those who commit such crimes can be found, tried, and punished (Kriesberg, 1998a; Lederach, 1998; Liebenberg and Zegeye, 1998). In essence they enable catharsis, foster a sense that grievances have been addressed, and thus allow progress toward reconciliation by satisfying the basic needs of the victims. Examples of such trials are taking place at the War Crimes Tribunal in the Hague, where perpetrators from the Balkan conflict and the Rwandan genocide are being judged.

REPARATIONS PAYMENTS. This method is used when one or both sides accept responsibility for the misdeeds performed during the conflict and are willing to compensate the victims. This method goes beyond apology and facilitates changes of the psychological repertoire (see Shriver, 1995). On the one hand, the reparations offer indicates an admission of guilt and regret by the perpetrator; on the other, the victims' acceptance of the reparations signals a readiness to forgive. These elements are important for reconciliation when transgressions were perpetrated. An example is the compensation paid to the Czech victims by the German government for their sufferings under German occupation during 1939-1945 (Handl, 1997; Kopstein, 1997).

WRITING A COMMON HISTORY. This method involves recreating a past that can be agreed on by groups that have been in conflict. It usually involves a joint committee of historians who work together to collect and select materials, and finally negotiate to establish an agreed account of the past events. Such work requires exposure to the untold past of one's own group, which often includes misdeeds, and to the unheard past of the other group. Moreover, this method requires adhering to agreed facts and rejecting myths and unfounded

accusations. The product of this joint work should allow the construction of a well-founded and agreed narrative that sheds new light on the past of both groups. This narrative provides a basis for the eventual involvement of a new collective memory that is compatible with reconciliation.

The jointly published document not only has a symbolic value but should also have practical applications. It should serve as a basis for rewriting history textbooks, which can affect the beliefs and attitudes of new generations. These textbooks can also influence many other important cultural and educational products, such as books, films, television programs, and so on.

An example of this method is the Franco-German commission of historians, which by the 1950s had already critically scrutinized the myths of hereditary enmity between the French and German peoples and revised the existing history textbooks. As a final product the commission provided new accounts of the history of both nations, based on facts agreed to by the historians of both groups (Willis, 1965). Another example is the German-Czech committee of historians, which produced a document that presented an agreed account of their common history (Kopstein, 1997). It is not always necessary, however, to revise the entire history between nations; sometimes reconciliation may require rewriting only the history of a significant and symbolic event. Thus, in the case of the Polish-Russian reconciliation, a joint commission of historians investigated the murder of 15,000 Polish officers by the Soviets in Katyn in 1939. For years the Soviets had claimed that the Germans had performed the atrocity, whereas many Poles blamed the Russians. This bitter controversy formed one of the major obstacles to reconstructing Polish-Russian relations. The commission, which investigated the Soviet state archives, provided unequivocal evidence of Soviet responsibility. The commission's work led to a formal Russian acknowledgment of responsibility and apology to the Polish people.

EDUCATION. Education constitutes one of the most important methods for promoting reconciliation (Chetkov-Yanoov, 1986; Calleja, 1994; Gordon, 1994; Chadha, 1995; Asmal et al., 1997; Kriesberg, 1998a). This mostly involves using the school system for peace education, since this system is often the only institution of which the society can make formal, intentional, and extensive use to change the psychological repertoire of society members. Peace education aims at constructing the students' worldview (that is, their values, beliefs, attitudes, motivations, skills, and behavior patterns) in a way that reflects the reality of the peace process and prepares them to live in an era of peace and reconciliation (Bar-Tal, in press). This means the school system must provide students with knowledge that is consonant with the principles of rec-

conciliation (for example, about the other group, the course of the conflict, future peaceful relations, the nature of peace, and conflict resolution). In addition, peace education should aim at developing new attitudes and skills among students (for example, tolerance, self-control, sensitivity to others' needs, empathy, critical thinking, and openness). This is a large-scale endeavor that requires setting educational objectives, preparing curriculum, specifying textbook contents, developing instructional material, training teachers, constructing a climate in the schools that is conducive to peace education, and so on (Bjerstedt, 1988, 1993; Harris, 1988; Hicks, 1988; Reardon, 1988; Burns and Aspeslagh, 1996).

Examples of peace education that have advanced reconciliation can be found in Japan, where, among other subjects, it has had to deal with the atrocities perpetrated by the Japanese during War World II, the meaning of apology, and the nature of peaceful relations in postwar Japan (Murakami, 1992). In conflict-ridden South American societies, peace education aims at teaching the young generation about human rights, and how to prevent structural violence and economic inequality (Garcia, 1984). In Northern Ireland, peace education seeks to foster Mutual Understanding programs (EMU), whose goal is to create a genuine culture of peace in the Protestant and Catholic school systems (Duffy, 2000).

MASS MEDIA. The mass media can be a very powerful tool for promoting reconciliation (Bruck and Roach, 1993; Calleja, 1994; Chadha, 1995; Elhance and Ahmar, 1995; Barnes, 1997; Kopstein, 1997; Kriesberg, 1998a; Norval, 1999). It can be used to transmit information to a wide public about the new peaceful goals, the formerly rival group, one's own group, the developing relations, and so on. However, first and foremost the media serves as a channel to communicate leaders' messages about peace and reconciliation. The media in itself constructs public reality by framing the news and commentaries. Its support for the reconciliation process is often crucial. In democratic states, however, the media cannot be mobilized via decrees and orders; instead, it too must be persuaded of the importance of peace.

PUBLICIZED MEETINGS BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GROUPS. Much has been written about various types of meetings between members of rival groups (for example, Burton, 1969; Kelman, 1996). These encounters, which often are secret, are aimed at gaining greater understanding of the psychological dynamics of the conflict and may even contribute to conflict resolution if the participants have influence over decision making. To promote reconciliation, however, these meetings must be well publicized. If so, and especially

when carried out between the epistemic authorities of both sides, such meetings influence the attitudes and beliefs of society members. They indicate that members of the other group are human beings, that it is possible to talk with them, treat them as partners to agreements, trust them, and even consider their needs. For example, the meetings, symbolic handshakes, negotiations, and signed agreements between Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu and Palestinian Authority (PA) Chairman Yassir Arafat had a significant positive influence on Israeli supporters of the hawkish parties. Montville (1993) offers two other examples of the positive influence of such meetings on public opinion: one, in Northern Ireland, included representatives of rival political parties; the other, in the Middle East, included respected theologians and scholars representing Christians, Muslims, and Jews of the region.

THE WORK OF NGOS. Nongovernmental organizations, either from the societies involved in conflict or from the international community, can contribute to the reconciliation process (for example, Chetkow-Yanoov, 1986; Aall, 1996). They can help spread the message about the importance of constructing peaceful relations, help establish cooperative and friendly relations with the past adversary, or provide economic assistance to the society members and thereby show that peaceful relations have important benefits. NGOs often have direct contacts with the grassroots level and therefore can play the role of facilitator and mediator (Voutira and Whishaw Brown, 1995). They can even facilitate a healing process by providing professional help (for example, Staub and Pearlman, 2001). In societies involved in conflict, NGOs can serve as peace movements; examples include the Peace People Movement in Northern Ireland, organized by the Protestant Betty Williams and the Catholic Mairead Corrigan, and the Peace Now movement in Israel (Beeman and Mahony, 1993).

JOINT PROJECTS. Joint projects of different kinds are an additional method of facilitating psychological reconciliation. Joint projects in different areas can foster links between members of the two groups at different levels of society, such as elites, professionals, as well as the grass roots. These projects provide opportunities for personal encounters in which past opponents can form personal relations (Chetkow-Yanoov, 1986; Brown, 1988; Chadha, 1995; Kriesberg, 1998a; Volpe, 1998), which, in turn, can help legitimize and personalize members of both groups. Joint projects may also create interdependence, common goals, and benefits for society members. Thus, members of both groups learn about each other and about the importance of peaceful relations.

Joint projects can take various forms. In the French-German reconciliation process, a project of town twinning during 1950–1962 created 125 partnerships

between French and German towns. By 1989 this project had expanded to include over 1,300 towns and went beyond towns to establish twin relations between secondary schools as well as universities (Ackermann, 1994). In the Czech-German reconciliation process, with the aim of facilitating changes in the psychological repertoire, a number of joint projects were initiated that included meetings between young people of the two nations, tending to monuments and graves and so on (Handl, 1997).

TOURISM. Tourism is another very important method for facilitating psychological reconciliation in cases of interstate conflict. First it is built on trust, since people do not visit places where they encounter inconvenience, danger, or rejection. If the members of the formerly rival groups visit each other, it indicates that some of the psychological barriers to social relations have successfully been removed. Second, tourism provides an opportunity to learn about the past rival's readiness to form peaceful relations. Finally, tourism allows learning about the other group—its culture, history, economy, and so on. Social psychologists have long recognized the importance of tourism for improving intergroup relations (for example, Allport, 1954; Amir, 1969; Hewstone, 1996). Some years ago, Ben-Ari and Amir (1988) demonstrated the positive influence of Israeli tourism to Egypt on changing the Israeli tourists' attitudes and beliefs.

CULTURAL EXCHANGES. Another method that is especially effective in interstate reconciliation is that of various cultural exchanges, such as translations of books, visits of artists, or exchanges of films, television programs, or exhibitions. These events provide the opportunity to learn about the past opponent in human and cultural perspective. Chadha (1995) notes that performances by Indian and Pakistani artists across the border of each state contributed to changing the two nations' negative images of each other.

There are, then, different methods to promote the process of psychological reconciliation, and they can involve different sectors and layers of society. No single method is best; what is required is a combination of methods. The use of particular methods depends on many different factors, such as the nature of the conflict, the types of misdeeds perpetrated during it, the extent to which one or both sides were responsible for the outbreak of the conflict and the misdeeds committed, the history of relations between the groups, the culture of the groups, the availability of economic resources, the involvement of the international community, and so on. It is important, however, to note that the reconciliation process requires establishing well-defined and unequivocal pol-

icies that are supported by the institutions and leadership of the state(s). These policies must be executed in a well-planned manner with the objective of involving as many society members as possible in the reconciliation process.

Nevertheless, the success of the reconciliation process is never assured; many different factors influence its outcome (see also discussions by Kriesberg, 1998a; Gardner-Feldman, 1999; Bar-Tal, 2000b). The next section outlines some major factors in determining the success of such processes.

Factors Affecting the Reconciliation Process

First of all, the reconciliation process depends on the peaceful resolution of the conflict. Moreover, the resolution has to be satisfactory to both parties, who must perceive that it has fulfilled their basic needs and addressed their fundamental aspirations (Kelman, 1999a). These are decisive requirements in any conflict resolution; if they are not upheld, the process is doomed to fail eventually. This does not mean groups cannot relinquish their visions, alter their goals, or reframe their concerns. Every group, however, has existential needs and a *raison d'être*, and if these are compromised under pressure or weakness, the result will not only hamper the reconciliation process but also plant the seeds for future conflict.

Second, the reconciliation process depends on conciliatory acts, both formal and informal, by both parties (Hayner, 1999; Zalaquett, 1999). After years of mistrust, hatred, and hostility, both parties must exhibit much goodwill in order to change these feelings. Reconciliation depends on overcoming deep suspicion, and this requires performing many different, often small and symbolic, acts that signal good intentions, the wish to build peaceful relations, adherence to aspirations of peace, and sensitivity to the other group's needs and goals. Such acts create and disseminate a new climate of relations among the masses. They set the tone for reciprocity, positive spirals of behavior, or even the initiation of unilateral, positive gestures.

Third, reconciliation depends on the determination of the leaders involved in the peacemaking and also on the good and trustful relations that they build with each other. Their moves are often met with opposition among their own group in the form of pressure, public mobilization, and sometimes even smear campaigns or violence, all aimed at obstructing the peace process. Leaders must overcome these obstacles and show great resolve and devotion to the peace process. They must signal to group members that they are determined to advance the reconciliation successfully despite the opposition. Nelson Mandela and F. W. de Klerk in South Africa, or Helmut Kohl and Vaclav Havel in

the Czech-German case, were crucial players whose resolute stance provided the necessary catalyst for the progress of the reconciliation (Handl, 1997; Rothstein, 1999b).

Fourth, the reconciliation process depends on the activism and strength of those who support it (Elhance and Ahmar, 1995; Kriesberg, 1998a; Gardner-Feldman, 1999; Bar-Tal, 2000b). It requires the involvement of individuals, groups, and organizations in persuading hesitant or opposing group members of the importance of reconciliation. Reconciliation also requires an active approach to cementing the peaceful relations between the past enemies. That is, it is important to convey both to one's own and the other group that reconciliation is the goal.

Fifth, the success of reconciliation depends on mobilizing society's institutions to support the process (Gardner-Feldman, 1999; Bar-Tal, 2000b). This pertains to political, military, social, cultural, as well as educational institutions (Asmal et al., 1997; Thompson, 1997; Zalaquett, 1999).

Sixth, the reconciliation process depends on the international context—specifically, the extent to which the international community shows interest in the particular reconciliation, facilitates it, encourages the parties to carry it out, and provides concrete assistance for pursuing it in the form of both involvement and economic assistance (Hume, 1993; Elhance and Ahmar, 1995; Lederach, 1997, 1998; Kriesberg, 1998a; Gardner-Feldman, 1999; Bar-Tal, 2000b). There is no doubt that the international community has played a crucial role in facilitating conflict resolution and reconciliation in most cases of intractable conflict over the past decade (for example, Northern Ireland, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Bosnia). In recent years, with the end of the Cold War, the international community, through such organizations as the United Nations, the European Union, or the Organization of American States, has had a great interest in promoting the peaceful resolution of conflicts followed by reconciliation.

Conclusion

Over the past decade, the discussion on peace processes has focused a good deal on the issue of reconciliation. Years of study of conflict resolution have shown that peaceful resolution of a conflict does not guarantee lasting peaceful relations. Parties may negotiate an agreement on conflict resolution, but often it concerns only the leaders and is not relevant to the group members. In such cases, conflict can erupt again. To cement peaceful relations between the rival sides to an intractable conflict, reconciliation is necessary. It is reconciliation that includes group members in the peace process, since it requires a change

of their psychological repertoire. The essence of reconciliation is the construction of lasting peaceful relations between former rivals based on genuine support by the majority of the group members. Reconciliation, then, requires the formation of new beliefs, attitudes, motivations, goals, and emotions that support the peaceful relations. This new psychological repertoire includes the involvement of mutual respect, trust, positive attitudes, and sensitivity to the other group's needs, fostering friendly and cooperative relations marked by equality and justice. Reconciliation, then, is essentially a psychological endeavor achieved through a psychological process. Structural measures both contribute to its evolution and are among its consequences.

This psychological change is a very arduous process. It requires changing beliefs, attitudes, motivations, goals, emotions, and behavior patterns that have been part of society members' repertoire for many years, sometimes decades and even centuries. This repertoire was functional during the intractable conflict, allowing adaptation and successful coping with the enemy. It was based on the ongoing experiences both of individual society members and the collective. In addition, this repertoire was propagated by all the groups' channels of communication and institutions, transmitted to new generations via the educational system, and grounded in the groups' collective memory.

Reconciliation requires changing this repertoire, abolishing old fears, mistrust, hatred, and delegitimization of the enemy, and often also adjusting the group's longstanding dreams and aspirations. Such change is very long and complex, marked by both progress and setbacks. It requires new experiences that can induce the change of the psychological repertoire by transmitting a new message of peace and a new image of the former enemy. However, such experiences do not come about by themselves. People have to create them, act on them, and disseminate their meaning. That is, people must perform acts that provide the new experiences, such as peaceful gestures, meetings, ceremonies, and so on. Such acts supply the information that enables group members to look at the world differently. But changing group members' worldview requires a large accumulation of new experiences that support peacemaking. There is a need to form a supportive climate that indicates to all society members that the new reality can evolve free of threats, dangers, and fears. Such a reality is not always easy to form, since in societies engaged in a process of peace and reconciliation there is always a potent opposition to the process, and small groups may even resort to violence to put a halt to it.

As noted earlier, the evolution of the new reality is an active process, requiring the involvement of leaders, elites, professionals, the grass roots, organizations, and institutions. This is a major undertaking for a society. Just as during the conflict the society was mobilized to wage the violent struggle with

greater resolution and sacrifice, the reconciliation process, too, requires determination and efforts to persuade the opposition of its benefits.

Moreover, the reconciliation process requires not only persuading the members of one's own group but also convincing the other side of one's sincere desire to build peaceful relations. To do so, groups need to focus on their own shortcomings, misdeeds, and inhibitions and ask what they can do to facilitate reconciliation. This is a very challenging requirement, since groups are conditioned to focus on the other group's shortcomings and demand that it demonstrate its good intentions, while overlooking their own failings and negative intentions. Thus, groups usually tend to blame others for failures in the reconciliation process.

The reconciliation process requires forming a new ethos embedded in a culture of peace. This entails a major societal transformation. New norms, values, opinions, symbols, and collective memory have to emerge. Groups have been able to undergo such transformations successfully, as the Franco-German case of reconciliation demonstrates. That process, however, took almost four decades to complete. Individuals and groups always rally more easily to the banner of fear and hate than to the banner of trust and respect. But it is only trust and respect that provide hope for a better life, and it is the duty of humanity to enable groups to follow the path of the reconciliation process. We, as social scientists, can contribute to a better understanding of this process and the factors that influence it. That is our mission for the well-being of human society and for preventing future bloodshed and suffering.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT The research for this chapter was supported by a grant from the Leonard Davis Institute for International Relations, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. The final draft was written by the first author when he was a fellow at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Correspondence about this chapter should be directed to Daniel Bar-Tal, School of Education, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel; daniel@ccsg.tau.ac.il.

NOTE

1. *Societal beliefs* are defined as the society members' shared cognitions on issues that are of special concern to society and contribute to its unique characteristics. They are organized around themes and consist of such contents as collective memories, ideologies, goals, and myths. *Ethos* combines central societal beliefs into a particular configuration and gives meaning to societal identity. During intractable conflict, the involved societies tend to form conflictive ethos composed of eight themes: societal beliefs about the justness of one's own goals, security, positive self-image, one's own victimization, de-legitimization of the opponent, patriotism, unity, and peace (Bar-Tal, 1998, 2000a).

2

U Reconciliation: Reflections on the Theoretical and Practical Utility of the Term

Tamar Hermann

War and peace, peace and war: this duality has always been of major interest to students of human collective behavior (historians, social scientists, and philosophers), as well as to practitioners (politicians, military professionals, or, alternatively, peace activists). Unlike many other matters of debate in the sociopolitical area, these two basic existential situations have also been a focus of the general public's attention, since their ultimate relevance to people's well-being has almost no equivalent. Still, the question of the transition process from a violent conflict to coexistence, or the opposite, in the relations between two or more national, ethnic, or religious communities has become of particular theoretical and practical interest in our days. This growing salience reflects developments that sometimes seem to show startling contradictions. On the one hand, it can be attributed to the shockingly violent outbreak or dramatic aggravation of bloody conflicts, such as the ethnic strife in former Yugoslavia or the genocide in Rwanda. On the other, the last decades have also seen the launching of peace negotiations and sometimes even the signing of formal agreements in cases of highly visible and protracted conflict, such as those in South Africa, Northern Ireland, the Basque country, Sri Lanka, or Israel-Palestine. Nevertheless, efforts to solve the puzzle of the transition to or away from war, and to find better conceptual and practical tools to deal with it, have been affected by the partial or even total and rapid collapse of several of these recent peace processes. Thus, conflicts that seemed to have been resolved,