Chapter 10
Reconciliation as a Foundation of Culture of Peace

Daniel Bar-Tal

Introduction

One of the most important challenges facing the international community is the peaceful resolution of numerous harsh and violent conflicts. The challenge is posed on two levels. The first involves the temporary management of the conflict; it usually involves negotiation, meditation and arbitration, and rests on leaders and elites, although it still requires support by the general population. The second, deeper, level involves reconciliation. This requires change in the societal repertoire shared by society members. The repertoire that feeds the conflict must evolve into a new repertoire that can serve as a basis for a culture of peace[1]. This latter challenge is of great importance because it both lays the foundations for successful conflict resolution and at the same time prepares the society members to live in lasting peace.

This chapter elaborates on the nature of reconciliation as a foundation of a culture of peace. It begins by describing the nature of a culture of conflict, then elaborates on the nature of the reconciliation needed for a culture of peace, and finally describes the needed process of achieving reconciliation.

Nature of Culture of Conflict

Although some degree of conflict is an inseparable aspect of most intergroup relationships, this chapter focuses on those continuous severe conflicts that require reconciliation (Bar-Tal 2000a). Many of these are of an intractable[*] nature. Of special importance for the maintenance and continuation of these types of conflicts is the evolvement of a culture of conflict that is dominated by societal

[1] Culture denotes historically accumulated symbols which are created to communicate a particular meaning about all what is experienced in life of a particular society (Geertz, 1993)

[*] Intractable conflicts are characterized as lasting at least 25 years, over goals that are perceived as existential, being violent, perceived as unsolvable and of zero sum nature, preoccupying greatly society members, with parties involved investing much in their continuation (see Bar-Tal 2007; Kriesberg 1998).

Joseph de Rivera (ed.) *Handbook on Building Cultures of Peace,*

beliefs, collective memories, and an ethos of conflict and collective emotional orientation (Bar-Tal 2007). A collective memory of conflict evolves to describe the "history" of the conflict to society members (Wertsch 2002). Ethos of conflict provides dominant orientation to a society at present and directs it for the future (Bar-Tal 2000b).** These narratives are selective, biased and distorted as their major function is to satisfy societal needs rather than provide an objective account of reality. They therefore justify the position of the society in conflict, portray it in very positive light and as the victim of the conflict, and delegitimize the opponent.

In addition to societal beliefs imbedded in these narratives, the socio-psychological repertoire in situations of intractable conflicts includes collective emotional orientations (Bar-Tal 2007; Bar-Tal et al. 2007). The most notable is the collective orientation of fear, but they may also be dominated by hatred and anger (e.g., Petersen 2002).

Since all the members of society are involved actively or passively, directly or indirectly with the conflict, the described repertoire is widely shared, especially during its intractable stage. This repertoire is expressed in the major societal channels of communications, appears to be dominant in public discourse, is expressed in institutional ceremonies and eventually permeates into cultural products such as books, plays, and films. Moreover, it is often used for justification and explanation of decisions, policies and courses of actions taken by leaders. Finally, it is expressed in the educational system, and this imparts the repertoire to young generations. By adulthood many members share very similar societal beliefs, attitudes, values and emotions about the conflict, and this serves as a prism though which they interpret experience and process new information. All this occurs in selective, biased and distorted ways that allow maintenance of the dominant repertoire and avoid alternative information that could provide a basis for conflict resolution and reconciliation. The repertoire serves as a foundation for the evolved culture of conflict, and control mechanisms ensure that the repertoire developed in conflict will not change (Bar-Tal 2007).

Although at least some aspects of intractable conflicts may be managed by groups finding ways to resolve the contradiction between their goals, it soon becomes clear that such management is only the first formal step in a peace process. The societal

** In an earlier work, it was proposed that the challenges of the intractable conflict lead to the development of eight themes of societal beliefs that comprise ethos of conflict (Bar-Tal, 2000b). They include: Societal beliefs about the justness of own goals, which first of all outline the goals in conflict, indicate their crucial importance and provide their explanations and rationales. Societal beliefs about security refer to the importance of personal safety and national survival, and outline the conditions for their achievement. Societal beliefs of positive collective self image concern the ethnocentric tendency to attribute positive traits, values and behavior to one's own society. Societal beliefs of own victimization concerning self-presentation as a victim, especially in the context of the intractable conflict. Societal beliefs of delegitimizing the opponent concern beliefs that deny the adversary's humanity. Societal beliefs of patriotism generate attachment to the country and society by propagating loyalty, love, care and sacrifice. Societal beliefs of unity refer to the importance of ignoring internal conflicts and disagreements during intractable conflict in order to unite the forces in the face of the external threat. Finally, societal beliefs of peace refer to peace as the ultimate desire of the society.

process of reconciliation requires changes in the socio-psychological repertoire of the culture of conflict that fed the intractable conflict and served as a barrier to the peace process. This repertoire does not change overnight, even when the groups' leaders resolve the conflict peacefully and sign a peace agreement. The reconciliation process is a long one and does not take place unintentionally, but requires reciprocal planning and active efforts that can overcome obstacles and facilitate its solidification.

Nature of Reconciliation

There is a consensus that reconciliation involves the formation or restoration of genuine peaceful relationships between societies and that this requires extensive changes in the socio-psychological repertoire of group members in both societies (Ackermann 1994; Arnson 1999; Asmal et al. 1997; Bar-Siman-Tov 2004; Bar-Tal 2000a; Gardner Feldman 1999; Krepon and Sevak 1995; Lederach 1997; Norval 1999; Rothstein 1999; Wilmer 1998)[2]. It has become evident that even when a formal peace agreement is reached, it may fall far short of establishing genuine peaceful relations between former adversaries (e.g., Knox and Quirk 2000; Lederach 1997; Simpson 1997; Wilmer 1998). Formal conflict resolution sometimes abides only with the leaders who negotiated an agreement, or in the narrow strata around them, or among only 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 the world view that has fueled the conflict. As a result, formal resolutions of conflicts can be unstable—they may collapse, as in the case of Angola, or may turn into a cold peace as in the case of the Israeli-Egyptian relations. In these and similar cases, hopes of turning the conflictive relations of the past into peaceful societal relations has not materialized because the reconciliation process either never actually started, was stalled or has progressed very slowly. Even when a peace process includes the creation of structural economical and political mechanisms and institutions to form interdependence, linkages and affinity, it does not guarantee lasting peaceful relations because it does not necessarily induce a deep change in the public's psychological repertoire (Arnson 1999; Lederach 1997, 1998; Wilmer 1998). A recent study by Long and Brecke (2003) that analyzed different intergroup conflicts provides unequivocal evidence that reconciliation is a necessary process to stabilize peaceful relations.

The essence of reconciliation involves socio-psychological processes consisting of changes of motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes and emotions by the majority of society members (Kelman 1999; Lederach 1997; Shonholtz 1998; Wilmer 1998). In fact, it is necessary that these changes begin in a pre-agreement phase in order to facilitate the peaceful resolution of the conflict and its support by the society

[2] Although the chapter focuses mainly on the analysis of reconciliation in society, it should be unequivocally assumed that the process has to be reciprocal and take place in the two societies that were engaged in intractable conflict and then both try to establish lasting peace.

members. It is by its nature gradual, reciprocal and voluntary. The fundamental requirement is that the psychological basis will penetrate deep into the societal fabric so as to be shared by the majority of the members of both societies (Asmal et al. 1997; Bar-Tal 2000b; Lederach 1997; Staub 2006). Only such change guarantees an initial successful conflict resolution and a later solidification of the peaceful relations between rival groups: a stable foundation that is rooted in the psyche of the people. The initiation of such change depends on such factors as the level of violence, the realization that continuation of the conflict will cause to great costs, the degree of support for the peace process in both societies, especially among their leaders, and support from the international community.

General Nature of Reconciliation

While most researchers agree on the importance of the psychological component in reconciliation, they are vague or disagree about its nature. Most have recognized the importance of creating a common psychological framework in order to promote the process of reconciliation (Asmal et al. 1997; Hayes 1998; Hayner 1999; Kopstein, 1997; Kriesberg, 1998b; Lederach 1997; Volkan 1998; Weiner, 1998; Whittaker 1999). They realize that during the conflict the rival parties had different views about the conflict, about each other and about their relationship. They know that to ensure reconciliation these different views have to adjust dramatically. What then is the nature of the common psychological framework that is required?

There is not doubt that the first condition for reconciliation is legitimization and humanization of the rival. This recognition allows viewing the rival as a legitimate partner in peace and deserving of humane treatment. In addition, reconciliation requires viewing the conflict as solvable and recognizing that both sides have legitimate contentions, goals and needs that must be satisfied in order to establish peaceful relations.

On the general level, a number of definitional specifications have been proposed by different writers. For example, Marrow (1999) pointed out that reconciliation "is reestablishment of friendship that can inspire sufficient trust across the traditional split" (p. 132). In emphasizing trust, he asserts that the basic thrust of reconciliation is to be sensitive to other's 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 intra-societal reconciliation and posits four elements of it that can be extended also to inter-societal conflicts: *truth*, which requires open revelation of the past, including admission, acknowledgment and transparency; *mercy*, which requires acceptance, forgiveness, compassion and healing for building new relations; *justice*, which requires rectification, restitution, compensation and social restructuring; and *peace*, which underscores common future, cooperation, coordination, well being, harmony, respect, institutionalized mechanisms for conflict resolution and security for all the parties. This view is similar to Long and Brecke's (2003) model, which suggests that reconciliation is based on truth telling

about the harm done by both parties, forgiveness, which requires new view of both parties, giving up retribution and full justice, and building new positive relationships. Rather than "mercy," Kriesberg (2004) uses the concept of *regard* (which includes a mutual recognition of the humanity and identity of the societies), and rather than "peace," he stresses a *security* that ensures that both societies are safe from physical harm. Kelman (1999) presents elaborated components of reconciliation in what he calls a "positive peace." In this view, reconciliation consists of the following components: (1) solution of the conflict, which satisfies the fundamental needs of the parties and fulfills their national aspiration, (2) mutual acceptance and respect of the other group's life and welfare, (3) development of sense of security and dignity for each group, (4) establishment of patterns of cooperative interactions in different spheres, and (5) institutionalization of conflict resolution mechanisms (e.g., Bar-Siman-Tov 2004). In a later paper, he defines reconciliation as "the development of working trust, the transformation of the relationship toward a partnership based on reciprocity and mutual responsiveness, and an agreement that addresses both parties' basic needs" (Kelman 2004, p. 119). In his view reconciliation requires change of identity via a process of internalization.

As the process of reconciliation proceeds, there is wide agreement that the successful outcome requires the formation of a new common outlook on the past. It is suggested that once there is a shared and acknowledged perception of the past, both parties take a significant step towards achieving reconciliation. Reconciliation implies that both parties not just get to know, but truly acknowledge what happened in the past (Asmal et al. 1997; Gardner Feldman 1999; Hayes 1998; Hayner 1999; Norval 1999). This acknowledgement implies recognizing that there are two narratives of the conflict (Hayner 1999; Norval 1999; Salomon 2004). This is an important factor, because the collective memories of each party's own past underpin the continuation of the conflict and obstruct peacemaking (Bar-Tal 2007). Reconciliation necessitates changing these societal beliefs 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 process of negotiation about collective memories, 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).

Often, however, preoccupation with the past requires more than a new narrative. During the conflict both parties accumulate many grievances. Years of violence leave deep scars of anger, grief, a sense of victimhood and a will for revenge. These grievances must not only be known, but also truly acknowledged by the rival society (Asmal et al. 1997; Norval 1999; Wilmer 1998). Some researchers have gone even further by asserting that collective acknowledgement of the past is not enough and that reconciliation must ultimately lead to a collective healing and forgiveness for the adversary's misdeeds (Hayner 1999; Shriver 1995; Staub 2000).

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, relive the experiences under safe conditions, mourn the losses, validate the experienced pain and grief, receive empathy

and support, and restore broken relationships (Long and Brecke 2003; Minow 1998; Montville 1993; Staub 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, when one party is attributed with responsibility for the outbreak, and/or maintenance of the conflict, and/or for misdeeds done during the conflict (e.g., Auerbach 2004). It symbolizes psychological departing from the past to new peaceful relations (Norval 1999). It requires a decision to learn new aspects about one's own group, to open a new perspective on the rival group and to develop a vision of the future that allows new positive relations with the perpetrator. In many cases, forgiveness may be required by both groups, for both may have been involved in extensive harm-doing. For some, forgiveness makes reconciliation possible (Staub 2000); for others, it is a necessary step that is not always possible and not sufficient. In Auerbach's (2004) view, the success of forgiveness depends on the compatibility of the religious-cultural context, importance of the interests promoted through this move, the power of the perpetrator, status of leaders who are supposed to ask for forgiveness, authenticity of the request and the length of time that passed since the harmful acts took place.

It should be noted that some seriously question whether forgiveness and healing are possible or necessary aspects of reconciliation (Gardner Feldman 1999; Hayes 1998). Although they agree that a collective reconstruction of the past is a necessary element in any reconciliation process, they wonder if this can lead to healing and forgiveness. Especially in severely divided societies, like South Africa and Northern Ireland, this may be a very hard, if not impossible, objective to obtain. Hayes (1998), for example, argued that, "Reconciliation is not about the (individualism of) forgiveness of the dreadful and vile acts committed in the name of apartheid, but how all of us are going to act to build a new society (p. 33)."

In my view, reconciliation consists of: mutual recognition and acceptance, invested interests and goals in developing peaceful relations, mutual trust and positive attitudes, as well as sensitivity and consideration of other party's needs and interests. All these elements apply both to situations in which the two groups build peaceful relations in two separate political entities (states) and to situations in which the two rival groups continue to live in one political entity.

Recently, I have elaborated on the type of cognitive and affective changes that seem necessary for reconciliation. In regards to cognitive foundations, I suggested that reconciliation requires changes in the following societal beliefs that were formed during the conflict:

(1) Societal beliefs about one's own group's goals need to change from beliefs about the justness of goals that underlay the conflict (Bloomfield et al. 2003) to beliefs that present new goals for the society that allow compromise and therefore lead to peaceful conflict resolution and peaceful relations.
(2) Societal beliefs about the rival group and the images of the adversary group must change so that its members can be legitimized, personalized, equalized and differentiated (Kaufman 2006; Kelman 1999). Recently, Janoff-Bulman and

Werther (in press) introduced the concept of respect as a necessary condition for reconciliation, defining it as recognition and acknowledgement that the rival group has the equal right to shape their own destinies.

(3) Societal beliefs about the relationship with the past opponent need to be modified. Reconciliation requires the formation of new societal beliefs about the relations between the two rival groups that emphasize the importance of cooperation and friendly relationships (Gardner Feldman 1999; Krepon and Sevak 1995).

(4) Societal beliefs about the history of the conflict require a change from the collective memories that were dominating the engaged societies during the conflict. It is necessary to revise these narratives that fueled the conflict into an outlook on the past that is synchronized with that of the former rival (Borer 2006; Salomon 2004).

(5) Societal beliefs about peace must include the formation of new beliefs that describe the multidimensional nature of peace, specify the conditions and mechanisms for its achievement (for example, negotiation with the rival and compromises), realistically outline the benefits and costs of achieving it, connote the meaning of living in peace, and emphasize the conditions for its maintenance.

These themes constitute the foundations of the *ethos of peace* as an opposite societal infrastructure to the ethos of conflict. They begin to evolve when societies embark on the road of peace, but it takes a long time for them to penetrate the societal fabric and become the ethos that underlies peace culture.

Reconciliation also requires construction of general positive affects and specific emotions about peaceful relations with the past opponent. Nadler and Schnabel (in press) suggest this process is central and identify it as socio-emotional reconciliation. In their opinion, this involves the removal of emotional and identity-related barriers through the successful completion of an apology-forgiveness cycle. Positive affects should accompany the new beliefs and indicate good feelings that the parties have towards each other and towards their new relations. I believe reconciliation requires a change in the collective emotional orientations of fear, anger and hatred, which often dominate societies in intractable conflict. Instead, it is necessary to develop an emotional orientation of hope that reflects the desire for the positive goal of maintaining peaceful and cooperative relations with the other party. This emotional orientation indicates a positive outlook for the future and expectations of pleasant events, without violence and hostilities (Bar-Tal et al. 2007; Kaufman 2006; Jarymowicz and Bar-Tal 2006; Snyder 2000; Worchel and Coutant in press).

In essence, the evolvement and solidification of the cognitive and affective changes constitute a new psychological repertoire that indicates the emergence of a culture of peace. Such a culture goes beyond acts and processes of reconciliation that focus on the repertoire of society members. It is the ultimate safeguard that the peace process is routinized deeply into the fabric, institutions and channels of communication of the society.

Culture of Peace

For reconciliation to develop into a peace culture, the former enemies must develop cooperative relations with one another and manage their inevitable conflicts constructively[3]. Woven into the framework of a culture of peace are values of justice, respect of human rights, sensitivity, acceptance and respect for cultural differences, values and practices conducive to nonviolent conflict resolution, and above all recognition of the superiority and importance of peace as a value and practice. From a psychological perspective, this requires the following bases:

Mutual Knowledge. Past rivals should acquire knowledge about each other. The scope of knowledge should be wide, covering various domains, such as the cultural, religious, societal, political, geographical or historical. Knowledge is essential for the development of peace culture since ignorance and distorted or selective information are often the causes of hostility, prejudice and hatred. Mutual knowledge facilitates the development of acquaintanceship, recognition and respect.

Mutual Acceptance. Both sides should accept each other on both the personal and national levels. It means mutual inclusion, legitimization and humanization. Mutual acceptance is a condition for developing cooperative and friendly relations. Building and maintaining trustful relations is the key aspect in mutual acceptance. It serves as a basis for establishing secure existence in the very wide meaning for each group, which is a necessary condition for stabilizing peace.

Mutual Understanding. Beyond knowing and accepting, both sides should understand each other by developing empathy and sensitivity to each other's needs, values, traditions, and experiences. Such an understanding prevents many conflicts because both sides realize that their relationship is governed by mixed motives so that conflict may cause both sides to lose and in peace both sides can gain.

Respect for Differences and Focus on Commonalities. Peace culture both respects pluralism and differences, and stresses commonalties and constructs common goals. All parties have to look for commonalities as well as identify and respect differences. This respect provides the assurance necessary for the secure existence of each party's identity, a condition for peaceful co-existence. Each group has to be able to fulfill its own needs, including its needs to hold its collective identity.

Development of Cooperative Relations. The development of cooperative relations applies especially to the structural and concrete side of peace culture. The cooperation has unlimited scope as it can be part of economic, political, cultural, military, educational and environmental relations. Of special importance are military and security cooperative mechanisms that guard peaceful relations and prevent misperceptions and misunderstandings.

[3] Peace culture is usually viewed in a wide form as extending beyond the specific relations between the former rivals to general perspective on intergroup relations. It is "a set of values, attitudes, modes of behaviour and ways of life that reject violence and prevents conflicts by tackling their roots causes to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation among individuals, groups and nations" (UN Resolutions A/RES/52/13). In the present chapter I limit its nature to particular intergroup relations for the sake of the conception.

Valuing Peace. It is essential that peace be a supreme value. All parties should view peace as a desirable and important value, and as a super-ordinate goal. It should be viewed in concrete and relevant terms, that is, as a realistic and achievable goal. Moreover, it is necessary to establish a common moral as well as utilitarian ground for maintaining peace and imparting this to new generations.

Mechanisms for Maintaining Peace. The culture of peace places great emphasis on mechanisms that allow for the maintenance of peace. This requires the development of various kinds of institutions, organizations, cooperative exchanges, etc., which intend to solidify and crystallize peaceful relations. Moreover, the development of culture requires building new narratives, symbols and rituals that explain, maintain, justify and even glorify peace. Of special importance is establishing continuous peace education that can socialize the younger generation into the culture of peace. Mass media has a role and a mission in maintaining peace, as well as, various cultural channels, such as literature, films or theatrical plays.

These bases must be developed because peace is not only a political process, but also a way of life reflected in the perceptions, thoughts, feelings and behaviors of individuals and nations alike. Like any other culture, peace culture includes abstract and concrete expressions and products, such as symbols, myths, language, collective memories, values and goals. The symbols consists of such tangible and non-tangible elements as artifacts, constructions, art works, scripts, habits, rules, concepts, narratives, myths or knowledge related to a group and to other categories. These evolve as a product of lasting and meaningful experiences. Eventually, when the process is successful, the culture of peace is shared by society members who were previously involved in conflict and provides meaning about the reality of the society and the world in general. It supplies the rules for practices that serve as a safeguard of peace. When society members, at least the great majority, internalize the values, beliefs, attitudes and practices of culture of peace, it is possible to characterize the society as peaceful, and its collective identity is imprinted by this characteristic.

Process of Reconciliation

The bases outlined above can be developed by the coordinated efforts of the parties that were engaged in intractable conflict and/or via process of self collective healing through which each party heals itself independently of the other party (Bloomfield et al. 2003; Long and Brecke 2003; Nets-Zehngut and Bar-Tal 2007). In view of the psychological dynamics that dominated years of intractable conflict, reconciliation usually requires mobilization of the masses in support of the new peaceful relations with the past enemy. This complex process requires a defined policy, planned initiatives and wide variety of activities that can convince society members of the necessity, utility, value and feasibility of the peace process (Bloomfield et al. 2003).

The reconciliation process begins when the parties in conflict start to change their beliefs, attitudes, goals, motivations and emotions about the conflict, and each

other's future relations. Such changes usually begin before the initial resolution to the conflict and can pave the way to a peaceful resolution. In turn, peaceful resolutions of aspects of the conflict and the initiation of measures to establish formal relations serve as a crucial catalyst for subsequent psychological changes. The reconciliation process is an informal one that lasts for a very long time and does not have a formal beginning or end. It is not a linear process of continuous change in the direction of peaceful relations, but one of regressions and progresses.

One must note that reconciliation demands reciprocity. It cannot evolve only on one side when the other side still cultivates a culture of conflict. There must be some level of synchronization, and although there is no need for complete equalization in any stage of the process, for a long time there cannot be a considerable gap between the two groups in their reconciliation attempts. Both sides have to move along a path with clear confidence-building acts that mutually reinforce the process of peacemaking and serve as building blocks for moving to the next stages. This is a cyclic process of peacebuilding, which is antithetical to the process of the vicious cycle of violence described by Bar-Tal (2007).

The process of psychological change almost never begins with a large-scale change by the majority of society members. Rather, it begins with a small minority and continues with a slow process of unfreezing and changing beliefs and attitudes. 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. Social psychology has devoted much effort to studying this process of minority influence, but this is beyond the scope of the present chapter (e.g., Moscovici et al.1985).

It is important to recognize that for reconciliation to be effective, it must always proceed from top-down and bottom-up simultaneously. While psychological changes in leaders greatly influence many members of society, the evolvement of a mass movement that embraces psychological change has an effect on the position of the leaders. In the long process of reconciliation, both processes usually take place (Kaufman 2006). Leaders are of crucial importance because they negotiate the initial peaceful resolution of the conflict and are in the position to lead the reconciliation process, especially when they are committed to the process and have good and trusting relations between them (e.g., Begin and Sadat in the Israeli–Egyptian case or Mandela and De Clark in South Africa; see Bargal and Sivan 2004). A peaceful resolution of the immediate conflict is a necessary condition for a succeeding reconciliation. Moreover, the resolution has to be satisfactory to both parties in the conflict, who must perceive that it has fulfilled their basic needs and addressed their fundamental aspirations (Pratto and Glasford in press; Kelman 1999).

However, it is important to note that especially in democratic societies there must be significant mass support for conflict resolution and eventual reconciliation. In all societies, the success of the reconciliation process depends on convincing the masses to change their psychological repertoire from supporting the conflict to favoring the emergence of peaceful relations and reconciliation. This process cannot occur as a result of commands and orders, nor can it merely be relayed in statements and speeches. Rather it must be reflected in continuous formal acts that

symbolically communicate to the society the change in the relationship with the past rival. Thus, the reconciliation process requires policies that aim at changing the psychological repertoire of society members (Ackerman 1994; Gardner Feldman 1999; Kelman 1999; Ross 2004; Shonholtz 1998). It depends on the activism and strength of those who support it and requires the involvement of individuals, groups and organizations in persuading hesitating and opposing group members of the importance of reconciliation (Bar-Tal 2000b; Gardner Feldman 1999).

The mobilization of the masses for the psychological change is also performed by middle-level leaders, prominent figures in ethnic, religious, economic academic, intellectual and humanitarian circles (Lederach 1997). In this process, elites play a very important role in initiating and implementing policies of reconciliation and reconstruction (Ackermann 1994). The elites include those individuals who hold authoritative positions in powerful public and private organizations and influential movements. At the grassroots level, local leaders, businessmen, community developers, local health officials and educators can play an important role. But the persuasion process within a society is not enough. Of special importance in promoting reconciliation are "people to people" activities that bring together "ordinary society members" from both sides to meet and/or work together on various projects that all aim at solidifying the reconciliation (Gawerc 2006).

A number of methods that promote and facilitate reconciliation have been proposed (Kelman 2004; Kriesberg 2004). These acts must be institutionalized and widened to encompass many society members, institutions and organizations (Kelman 1999; Norval 1999). Some of them can begin before formal conflict resolution; others require reciprocation and can occur only after official relations have opened up.

Methods that can take place before signing the conflict agreement include:

Using the mass media to transmit information to a wide public about the new peaceful goals, the past rival group, one's own group, about the developing relations and so on (Norval 1999).

Non-governmental organizations spreading the message about the importance of constructing peaceful relations, helping establish cooperative and friendly relations with the past adversary, or providing economic assistance to the society members and thereby showing that peaceful relations have important benefits (e.g., Aall 1996).

Peace education provides pupils with knowledge that is in line with the principles of reconciliation (for example, about the other group, about the course of the conflict, about future peaceful relations, about the nature of peace, about conflict resolution, etc.; see Asmal et al. 1997; Bar-Tal et al. in press, 1993; Reardon 1988).

Publicizing meetings between representatives of both groups to legitimize the peace process and personalize former rivals.

Methods that take place after formal conflict resolution include:

Joint projects of different kinds that can foster links between members of the two groups at different levels of society, such as elites and professionals, as well as grass roots (Ackermann 1994).

Tourism to indicate that some psychological barriers to social relations have successfully been removed and provide an opportunity to learn about the past rival's readiness to form peaceful relations; *cultural exchanges* provide the opportunity to learn about the past opponent in human cultural perspectives.

Writing a common history can shed new light on the past of the groups and provide a basis for the eventual evolvement of new collective memory that is compatible with reconciliation (Willis 1965).

Truth and reconciliation commissions deal with the past by revealing the truth to the people and to serve as a mechanism of perpetuating justice (Asmal et al. 1997; Kaye 1997).

Apology as a way of accepting responsibility for the misdeeds carried out during the conflict and to appeal to the victim for forgiveness is an acknowledgment of the past injustices (Asmal et al. 1997; Cohen 2004; Gardner Feldman 1999; Handl 1997; Norval 1999).

Public trials of particular individuals charged for violation of human rights and crimes against humanity may enhance a sense of justice that facilitates the reconciliation process.

Payment of reparations may take place when one or both sides accept responsibility for the misdeeds performed during the conflict and are willing to compensate the victims. This indicates an admission of guilt and regret by the perpetrator, while the victims' acceptance of the reparations signals a readiness to forgive.

These different methods can involve different sectors and layers of the society. No single method is best; what is required is a combination. The use of the particular methods depends on many different factors, such as the nature of the conflict, the type of misdeeds perpetrated during it, the extent to which one side or both sides were responsible for its outbreak and the misdeeds committed, the history of relations between the groups, the culture of the groups involved, the availability of economic resources, the involvement of the international community and so on. These acts must be institutionalized and widened to encompass many society members, institutions and organizations in order to eventually evolve into a culture of peace.

Conclusion

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 of conflict resolution, but often this only concerns the negotiating 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. Such reconciliation is in essence a psychological endeavor achieved through psychological processes. It is a foundation to the emergence of a culture of peace, which is the best guarantee of stable peaceful relations. This entails a major societal transformation. New norms, values, opinions, symbols, narratives, ceremonies and cultural products have to emerge.

Such a change requires a large accumulation of new experiences that can induce change in the psychological repertoire, transmitting a new message of peace and a new image of the former enemy. These experiences do not come about by themselves. People must create them, act upon them and disseminate their meaning. That is, people have to perform acts that provide the new experiences, such as peaceful gestures, meetings, joint projects, exchanges and so on. These acts supply the information that enables group members to look at their world differently. It is necessary to form a supportive climate that indicates to all society members that new reality evolves, free of threats, dangers and fears. This is a major undertaking for the society. Just as in times of conflict when society was mobilized for waging a violent struggle with much resolution and sacrifice, the time of reconciliation process requires determination and efforts to persuade the opposition, as well as rivals, of the genuine importance of the reconciliation and its benefits.

Individuals and groups always rally sooner and more easily to the banner of fear, dehumanization, hostility and hate than to the banner of trust, cooperation and respect of the other. But it is the latter that provides hope for a better life, and it is the duty of humanity to enable groups to follow the path of reconciliation that can lead to a culture of peace.

References

Aall, P. (1996). Nongovernmental organizations and peace making. In C. A. Crocker, F. O. Hampson, & P. Aall (Eds.), *Managing global chaos: Sources of conflict of and responses to international conflict* (pp. 433–443). Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Ackermann, A. (1994). Reconciliation as a peace-building process in post-war Europe: The Franco-German case. *Peace & Change,* 19, 229–250.

Arnson, C. J. (Ed.) (1999). *Comparative peace processes in Latin America*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Asmal, K., Asmal, L., & Roberts, R. S. (1997). *Reconciliation through truth: A reckoning of apartheid's criminal governance*. Capetown: David Phillips Publishers.

Auerbach, Y. (2004). The role of forgiveness in reconciliation. In Y. Bar-Siman-Tov, (Ed.), *From conflict resolution to reconciliation* (pp. 149–176). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bar-Siman-Tov, Y. (Ed.), (2004). *From conflict resolution to reconciliation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bar-Tal, D. (2000a). *Shared beliefs in a society: Social psychological analysis*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bar-Tal, D. (2000b). From intractable conflict through conflict resolution to reconciliation: Psychological analysis. *Political Psychology, 21,* 351–365.

Bar-Tal, D. (2007). Sociopsychological foundations of intractable conflicts. *American Behavioral Scientist, 50*, 1430–1453.

Bar-Tal, D., Halperin, E., & de Rivera, J. (2007). Collective emotions in conflicts: Societal implications. *Journal of Social Issues*, *63*, 441–460.

Bar-Tal, D., Rosen, Y., & Nets, Z. R. (in press) Peace education in societies involved in intractable conflicts: Goals, conditions, and directions. In G. Salomon & E. Cairns, (Eds.), *Handbook of peace education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bargal, D., & Sivan, E. (2004). Leadership and reconciliation. In Y. Bar-Siman-Tov, (Ed.), *From conflict resolution to reconciliation* (pp. 125–148). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bloomfield, D., Barnes, T., & Huyse, L. (Eds.), (2003). *Reconciliation after violent conflict: A handbook*. Stockholm: International IDEA.

Borer, A. T. (2006). *Telling the truth: Truth telling and peace building in post conflict societies*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Cohen, R. (2004). Apology and reconciliation in international relations. In Y. Bar-Siman-Tov, (Ed.), *From conflict resolution to reconciliation* (pp. 177–196). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gardner Feldman, L. (1999). The principle and practice of 'reconciliation' in German foreign policy: Relations with France, Israel, Poland and the Czech Republic. *International Affairs,* 75, 333–356.

Gawerc, M. I. (2006). Peace-building: Theoretical and concrete perspectives. *Peace & Change*, 31, 435–478.

Geertz, C. (1993). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. London: Fontana Press.

Handl, V. (1997). Czech-German declaration on reconciliation. *German Politics*, *6,* 150–167.

Hayes, G. (1998). We suffer our memories: Thinking about the past, healing, and reconciliation. *American Imago,* 55, 29–50.

Hayner, P.B. (1999). In pursuit of justice and reconciliation: Contributions of truth telling. In C. J. Arnson (Ed.), *Comparative peace processes in Latin America* (pp. 363–383). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Janoff-Bulman, R., & Werther, A. (in press). The social psychology of respect: Implications for delegitimization and reconciliation. In A. Nadler, T. E. Malloy, & J. D. Fisher (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup reconciliation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jarymowicz, M., & Bar-Tal, D. (2006). The dominance of fear over hope in the life of individuals and collectives. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36,* 367–392.

Kaufman, S. (2006). Escaping the symbolic political trap: Reconciliation initiatives and conflict resolution in ethnic wars. *Journal of Peace Research, 43(2)*, 201–218.

Kaye, M. (1997). The role of the Truth Commissions in the search for justice, reconciliation and democratization: The Salvadorian and Honduran cases. *Journal of Latin American Studies, 29,* 693–716.

Kelman, H. C. (1999). Transforming the relationship between former enemies: A social-psychological analysis. In R.L. Rothstein (Ed.), *After the peace: Resistance and reconciliation* (pp. 193–205). Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Kelman, H. C. (2004). Reconciliation as identity change: A social psychological perspective. In Y. Bar-Siman-Tov, (Ed.), *From conflict resolution to reconciliation* (pp. 111–124). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Knox, C., & Quirk, P. (2000). *Peace building in Northern Ireland, Israel and South Africa: Transition, transformation and reconciliation*. London: Macmillan.

Krepon, M., & A. Sevak (Eds.). (1995). *Crisis prevention, confidence building, and reconciliation in South Asia*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kriesberg, L. (1998). Intractable conflicts. In E. Weiner (Ed.), *The handbook of interethnic coexistence* (pp. 332–342). New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.

Kriesberg, L. (2004), Comparing reconciliation actions within and between countries. In Bar-Siman-Tov, Y. (Ed). *From conflict resolution to reconciliation* (pp. 81–110). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Long, W. J., & Brecke, P. (2003). *War and reconciliation: Reason and emotion in conflict resolution*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Marrow, D. (1999). Seeking peace amid memories of war: Learning from the peace process in Northern Ireland. In R. L. Rothstein (Ed.), *After the peace: Resistance and reconciliation* (pp.111–138). Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Minow, M. (1998). *Between vengeance and forgiveness*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Montville, J. V. (1993). The healing function in political conflict resolution. In D. J. D. Sandole & H. van der Merve (Eds.), *Conflict resolution theory and practice: Integration and application* (pp. 112–127). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Moscovici, S., Mugny, G., & Van Avermaet, E. (Eds.). (1985). *Perspectives on minority influence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Nadler, A., & Shnabel, N. (in press). Instrumentals and socio-emotional path to intergroup reconciliation and the needs-based model of socio-emotional reconciliation. In A. Nadler, T. E. Malloy, & J. D. Fisher (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup reconciliation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nets-Zehngut, R., & Bar-Tal, D. (2007). The intractable Israeli-Palestinian conflict and possible pathways to peace. In J. Kuriansky (Ed.), *Beyond bullets and bombs: Grassroots peacebuilding between Palestinians and Israelis* (pp.3–13). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Norval, A. J. (1999). Truth and reconciliation: The birth of the present and the reworking of history. *Journal of African Studies*, 25, 499–519.

Petersen, R. G. (2002). *Understanding ethnic violence: Fear, hatred, and resentment in twentieth-century Eastern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pratto, F., & Glasford, D. E. (in press). How needs can motivate intergroup reconciliation in the face of intergroup conflict. In A. Nadler, T. E. Malloy, & J. D. Fisher (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup reconciliation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reardon, B. A. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education: Educating for global responsibility*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ross, M. H. (2004). Ritual and the politics of reconciliation. In Bar-Siman-Tov, Y. (Ed.), *From conflict resolution to reconciliation* (pp. 197–224). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rothstein, R. L. (Ed.). (1999). *After the peace: Resistance and reconciliation*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Salomon, G. (2004). A narrative-based view of coexistence education. *Journal of Social Issues, 60(2),* 273–287.

Shriver, D. W., Jr. (1995). *An ethic for enemies: Forgiveness in politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Shonholtz, R. (1998). Conflict resolution moves East: How the emerging democracies of Central and Eastern Europe are facing interethnic conflict. In E. Weiner (Ed.), *The handbook of interethnic coexistence* (pp. 359–368). New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.

Simpson, G. (1997). Reconstruction and reconciliation: Emergin from transition. *Development in Practice, 7,* 475–478.

Snyder C. R. (Ed.). (2000), *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and applications*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Staub, E. (2000). Genocide and mass killing: Origins, prevention, healing, and reconciliation. *Political Psychology, 21*, 367–382.

Staub, E. (2006). Reconciliation after genocide, mass killing and intractable conflict: Understanding the roots of violence, psychological recovery, and steps toward a general theory. *Political Psychology, 27(6)*, 867–894.

Volkan, V. D. (1998). The three models: Psycho political dialogues and the promotion of coexistence. In E. Weiner (Ed.), *The handbook of interethnic coexistence* (pp. 343–358). New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.

Weiner, E. (Ed.). (1998). *The handbook of interethnic coexistence*. New York: Continuum.

Wertsch, J. V. (2002). *Voices of collective remembering*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whittaker, D. J. (1999). *Conflict and reconciliation in the contemporary world*. London: Routledge.

Willis, F. R. (1965). *France, Germany, and the New Europe, 1945–1963*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Wilmer, F. (1998). The social construction of conflict and reconciliation in the former Yugoslavia. *Social Justice: A Journal of Crime, Conflict & World Order,* 25(4), 90–113.

Worchel, S., & Coutant, D. K. (in press). Between conflict and reconciliation: Toward a theory of peaceful co-existence. In A. Nadler, T. E. Malloy, & J. D. Fisher (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup reconciliation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.