

# Global Peace Services USA

*...an idea whose time has come*

Vol. 16, No. 2

December 2015

---

*Greetings from John Eriksson, President, GPS USA*

*This second 2015 issue of the GPS Newsletter opens with a summary by GPS Board Member Dr. Mindy C. Reiser of a workshop discussion on the topic of “Engineers as Peacebuilders.” The workshop was sponsored by GPS on October 29, 2015, at the World Bank, and the discussion was enriched by the active participation of several professional engineers and those who work with engineers. This exchange continued and built upon GPS efforts which have been underway for the past year in Iowa City, Cincinnati and Seattle to reach out to the engineering profession to catalyze exploration by engineers and engineering educators of the critical roles the profession can play in exacerbating or preventing and resolving conflicts brought to the fore through the development, design and implementation of engineering projects. As Dr. Reiser points out, the discussion tended to focus on issues of the ethics and the sustainability of engineering projects, all related to the potential for conflict and its prevention or resolution.*

*GPS plans a winter workshop on Climate Change and Conflict. Further information will be provided later, closer to the program date.*

*The second article is the first of two installments of a first published paper by GPS Board Member Dr. Robert J. Muscat on the subject of “Apology: A Cement for Peace?” This pioneering paper represents the first attempt to systematically document and assess the role of apology as an instrument in the spectrum of approaches with the potential to move hostile parties toward mutual acceptance and ultimately to reconciliation. Drawing from real examples of the use of apology, Dr. Muscat explores the factors that have made and limited apology as a credible and sustainable instrument of peacebuilding.*

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

*In order to continue and expand our current work, such as the GPS Newsletter, the workshops described above, and the Peace Dispatch, we need greater resources. As the end of the year approaches, we ask that you make as generous a tax-deductible contribution as you can to GPS. This may be done by mailing a check to the postal address shown above or through our website [www.globalpeaceservices.org](http://www.globalpeaceservices.org).*

# Engineers as Peacebuilders

Practicing engineers, engineering educators, development experts – supporting major assistance projects – as well as attorneys and social scientists came together on October 29th at the World Bank to explore the role of engineers as peacebuilders. Global Peace Services, as part of its ongoing/continuing focus on the potential of the professionals to embed peacebuilding and conflict transformation in the very fabric of their professional practice, convened the meeting to explore interest by the engineering community in incorporating peacebuilding in engineering training and practice.

According to several participants, the increasing focus by engineers and their clients on ensuring the sustainability of engineering projects provides one avenue for addressing long-festering drivers of conflict. Dr. William Kelly, former dean of engineering at Catholic University and newly retired from the American Society of Engineering Education, noted the rapidity of change in engineering practice and the profession's increasing attention to outreach and collaboration with those impacted by engineering projects. Clients and development assistance donors were more commonly calling for transparency in the engineering design process and consideration of the human rights implications of engineering projects.

Designers of major infrastructure projects, costing in the hundreds of millions of dollars, needed to ensure that parties to long-festering conflicts in the region affected by a project were in agreement over the allocation of benefits from the project and the sharing of any burdens brought about by the massive intervention. Engineers needed to be sensitive to the social, economic and political environments in which they were operating and the possibilities provided by a significant engineering initiative to exacerbate or transform existing ethnic, religious or economic conflicts, and thus the long-range sustainability of the engineering undertaking. A challenge before the engineering profession, was how best to provide engineering students and practicing professionals with the tools to best understand the areas of conflict in which they operated and how to help ameliorate or transform such divisions in the execution of their engineering activities. Initiatives such as the Envision Rating System for Sustainable Infrastructure,

developed by the Zofnass Program for Sustainable Infrastructure at the Harvard University Graduate School of Design and the Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure, and the Sustainable Infrastructure 360° Awards of the Inter-American Development Bank were useful tools in highlighting important sustainability challenges and creative solutions to the problems posed.

Marc Apter, Board member of the American Association of Engineering Societies and former president of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers-USA called attention to the important roles played by engineering codes of ethics, as well as ethics courses, generally, in highlighting the challenges faced by engineers in the course of conducting their work and the impact of the choices they make in affecting their employers, their clients, the engineering profession and society-at-large. Engineering educators, some participants noted, needed to more systematically incorporate classes on engineering ethics directly into the engineering curriculum. Dr. Joe Manous, of the US Army Corps of Engineers and George Mason University, noted that views of engineering and its values were strongly shaped by childhood experiences, thus it will take time for increasing attention to the social dimensions of engineering to be as firmly implanted in engineering considerations as the traditional prioritization of project technical and economic dimensions.

Paul Cadario, now retired from the World Bank and teaching engineering students at the University of Toronto in a course focusing on engineering and global development, noted the importance of ethical concerns to today's engineering students and their receptivity to serving in multidisciplinary teams implementing engineering projects. Participants in the World Bank meeting highlighted the importance of exploring project design alternatives at the outset of engineering project planning, which constitutes an important opportunity to identify potential sources of conflict and consider collaborative ways of addressing them.

Global Peace Services, following the World Bank meeting, will be building on the insights shared and underscoring the impact of conflict on long-term

engineering project sustainability. We plan to further address the potential of engineers as peacebuilders with engineering faculty in the US, and internationally through continuing work with academic engineering programs, professional

societies, the World Federation of Engineering Organizations and other international bodies.

Mindy Reiser

## Apology: A Cement for Peace?

In August 2015, marking the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the end of World War II, Emperor Akihito expressed “deep remorse” over Japan’s wartime actions, and the Prime Minister of Japan apologized. Many earlier Japanese Prime Ministers had apologized or expressed “regret” on different occasions. Nonetheless, these expressions have never been accepted by the Chinese leadership or public opinion as satisfactory recognitions of guilt and responsibility. Numerous Japanese statements of regret for the country’s colonialism in Korea, and for the specific injustice of the Korean “comfort women” program during WW II, have similarly been received coolly, as incommensurate with the injustices committed. The wording has sometimes been ambiguous, avoiding forthright admission of guilt or use of the word “apologize.” Right-wing opinion in Japan has often opposed these apologies as misreading history and erroneously casting blame on Japan. There have been divisions in Japan on how school textbooks should deal with the “Rape of Nanking” episode. The education authorities have resisted outside pressures for textbooks to contain full exposure of the facts (or question what the true facts really are), which has reinforced opinion in China that Japan’s apologies have been insincere and unacceptable. (Japan is not the only country where the treatment of regrettable historical episodes in school texts has been hotly debated.) Japan’s offer of financial compensation was rejected by a few of the “comfort women” as inappropriate or insufficient. Some opinion in Japan sees the Chinese and Korean refusals to credit Japanese apologies as a tactic to pressure concessions from Japan. As these cases show, the dynamics of apology for events even 70 years in the past can continue to affect current politics and tensions.

When President Clinton apologized in 1998 for U.S. inaction during the Rwanda genocide, and for the

historic trade in African slaves, he spoke as the legitimate representative of America, a lawfully elected head of state. However, he was not backed by any Congressional expression, as was the case when the U.S. apologized, and appropriated financial compensation, to Japanese-Americans for their WWII internment. Thus, his apologies in Africa were more than personal but less than fully authoritative nationally. Critics argued that he should have attributed responsibility also to those traders who were African, and that his attribution of complicity to the American polity -- by referring to “we” -- overlooked the fact that a large portion of the present U.S. citizenry descended from immigrants who had reached the U.S. long after the country had abolished slavery.

## Apology Has a Deep History

Apology has deep roots in human history. Individual apology to God in a religious ritual, the Day of Atonement, goes back well over 2000 years in Judaism. In Christianity the practice of regular confession was introduced in 1215. In human pre-history, apology to fellow humans probably developed very early as a means to restore peace and cohesion within families and clans after inter-personal clashes. Rituals of collective apology to a divinity also have deep roots.

Also long-standing in some cultures, apologies for individual acts of violence against other persons can take a collective form. Instead of one-on-one “I’m sorry,” the offending person, or his relatives, provides material compensation to the offended family. The act is public, and the compensation serves to make credible the admission of guilt and responsibility. There is a parallel in criminal justice proceedings in the U.S.: whether or not the accused shows regret and penitence, or makes an apology, is considered a factor in the severity of sentence. In

short, apology – an acknowledgment of moral failure, an act of contrition – has had enduring cultural and legal importance.

## Official Apology

This paper is about official apologies, that is, apologies by legitimate authorities and internationally recognized leaders, for deliberate actions by their predecessors, by themselves and their administrations, or their society as a whole. In drawing on the historical record and the analytical literature, I exclude apologies made to God, not humans, like Lincoln's in 1863, for the slaughters of the Civil War; or made to acknowledge injustices to individuals, like the French Government's apology in 1998 for the "judicial error" and imprisonment of Captain Dreyfus in 1898; or apologies by private individuals to whole groups, like Henry Ford's apology to American Jews in 1927 for years of anti-Semitic rants printed in his newspaper. I also will merely mention government-to-government apologies for violent acts that were accidents or acts unauthorized by the authorities. Finally, apologies that have been made by individual private corporations (such as German manufacturers that employed slave labor during the Nazi years) or by private organizations (like the American Psychology Association, which apologized in 2015 for its role in justifying CIA use of torture in interrogation) are also excluded here.

While the focus is on the societal or national level, I will also consider the many community-level apology processes inspired by the South African post-apartheid experience; these form an important basis for considering the dynamics of national level apology. The communal expressions of contrition are a significant group among the recent proliferation of apologies on the world stage. As the U.S. and Japan cases above illustrate, inter-state apology is not a simple or straightforward matter. In fact, a scholarly literature has been developing in recent years to examine the legal, moral, and political aspects of apology, compensation, and reconciliation. (Some academic writers have dubbed the subject "apology theory." Many of the cases and aspects we can only touch upon here have been extensively researched and debated.) That the subject is relatively new is evident from the paucity of books or journal articles before the 1980s. While

most of the literature is secular, the Vatican issued in 1999 a lengthy study and opinion on apology from a Christian theological perspective (cited in the bibliography below).

Apology may serve to cement a peace settlement. Cementing is important because the most statistically robust predictor of warfare (since the end of WW II) is whether two antagonistic entities or groups have previously been at war. Thus, strengthening a settlement can help block one of the key dynamics of conflict -- renewal. We often see an asymmetrical dynamic in the history of inter-group and inter-country relations. Overcoming hostility, restoring harmony, or even maintaining a stable tolerance, is usually difficult; destroying harmony is easy. Single incidents have often destroyed years of trust in a flash. To contribute to a durable post-conflict peace therefore, an apology needs to be robust and credible.

After a settlement, relations between former antagonists may range over a spectrum, from merely refraining from further violence at one end, to full reconciliation at the other. The potential reconciliation relationships and sentiments have been described as ranging from weak to strong, or from thin to thick. The weakest post-conflict relationship – mere tolerance and abandonment of any policy of revenge, with no amelioration of hostile sentiments -- would hardly merit characterization as "reconciliation," although it is a necessary first step. Moving beyond mere non-violent co-existence (sometimes dubbed a "negative peace"), increasingly strong stages of reconciliation might include steps to restore or create trust; undertake credible justice proceedings; cultivate cooperative relations at different levels of society (inter-personal, communal, economic, political); promote inter-group educational, sports, and cultural exchange; inter-marriage. Some writers caution that achieving full reconciliation in the sense of mutual empathy, a transformed ability to face differences without firing up old hostilities, perhaps a fading of we/them as the essence of the relationship and a complete shedding of desire for historic vengeance, may be possible only over a long period of time, or may even be unachievable.

Much of the literature analyzes interpersonal, small group, and large collectives and inter-state relationships, in an integrated narrative. While the

social and psychological nuances the literature explores are essential for understanding reconciliation processes at the individual human, inter-personal, and local community levels, they are less salient for cementing peace between states or other large collectives that are under ruling authorities still operating in the world of interests and *realpolitik*. Those nuances remain relevant for *realpolitik*, however, and must be dealt with when leadership levels are attempting to sustain peace or to promote active reconciliation in the face of a legacy of mistrust or post-conflict hostility and grievance among their populations at large. But the essential requirement for a stable settlement is a mutually acceptable resolution of the conflicts of real interest that precipitated the hostilities in the first place.

It is important to stress the need for dealing with the political or collective conflicts of real interest as fundamental for lasting conflict resolution as opposed to temporary cessation. This is because of an asymmetry at the core of the reconciliation problem. Reconciliation at the top, even if only a few steps beyond bare non-violence, can create a favorable framework for reconciliation to be cultivated throughout the societies involved. Local or micro reconciliation programs (e.g. peace education, inter-group conferences, summer camps for teenagers) are not likely to lead to general reconciliation if leadership enmity remains entrenched and underlying conflicts of interest remain unresolved.

On a personal note, I saw this asymmetry up close in Bosnia in 1998. I was studying a group of local NGO projects promoting post-conflict reconciliation, supported by the International Rescue Committee. The NGOs had been started by teachers, social workers, health professionals and psychotherapists, mostly women, of different ethnicities. Some activities brought together school-age youth who had been separated by ethnicity during the conflict years and who readily resumed the pre-war camaraderie. While this inter-personal and civil-society reconciliation was spontaneous, and heart-warming to observe, there has been no “trickle-up” of reconciliation to the frozen levels at the top of the Bosnian multi-ethnic governance structure.

At the inter-state and intra-collective levels we can envision a spectrum from weak to strong reconciliation with steps along the following lines: cessation of violence; sustained peace-keeping; establishment of mutually acceptable new/renewed modes of dialogue, interaction, and conflict-resolution; disarmament and reintegration of insurgency forces; confidence-building measures; reestablished economic rules of the game and institutions; renewed trade and travel; easing of border restrictions; creation of joint civil society organizations; legal cooperation; degrees of economic integration; development of common norms concerning justice; and visions and programs for long-term integration and policy harmonization. Parallel measures in educational, person-to-person, and cultural exchange, would reinforce such progress. The obvious model for near-total movement from one end of this spectrum to the other, from a period of warfare and barbarity to full-scale reconciliation and harmonization, is the road Western Europe traveled from World War II to the European Union (a work obviously still in progress). There are also examples of post-conflict societies and countries that have not moved beyond the first two or three steps, such as Bosnia, North and South Sudan, and India-Pakistan. The reconciliation and reintegration of Aceh province within Indonesia has moved well along the spectrum. In Northern Ireland, peacekeeping has been sustained, legal and formal governance has made progress, but trust and other dimensions of integration remain weak. Between Serbia and Kosovo, normalization has moved minimally, pushed by the need to meet the requirements the European Union has imposed on Serbia for entry; popular reconciliation in the face of recent memories and antipathies will not be easy. Diplomatic, security, political, economic, and psychological reconciliation between the U.S. and Japan has been full although, of course, integration along European lines was never intended. Each case is unique.

Apology, acknowledgement of responsibility and regret, at the start, can help move a post-conflict relationship along the spectrum from mere cessation of violence to durable peace and some considerable degree of reconciliation. In fact, without apology and acknowledgment of injustices, movement toward substantial reconciliation may be impossible to accomplish.

## A Catalog of Apologies

There have been over 180 official state and non-state apologies, dating mostly from WW II. Going further back in history, one finds very few official apologies, even few expressions of regret without explicit apology. The earliest I have come across was Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV's famous apology in 1077 to Pope Gregory VII for church-state conflicts. In the next case, six centuries later, Massachusetts apologized to all the families of the Salem witch trials victims.

The relatively recent official (often dubbed "political") apologies have taken the following forms:

1. Apologies by a government (or other entity) for *acts committed by some of its citizens (or members) but not at the behest of the government*. For example, Prime Minister Nehru apologized in 1955 for attacks on foreign missions by Indian demonstrators. In 1948, Israel apologized to the U.N. for the assassination in Jerusalem of the U.N. mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte. Some papal apologies have cited acts committed by Catholics for which the Church said the institution itself bore no responsibility. In these cases, the apologizing authority expressed regret but denied official culpability.
2. Apologies by a government (or other entity) for *acts it has committed against some of its own citizens*. In 1988, Congress apologized for the WW II internment of 100,000 Japanese-Americans, and offered \$20,000 reparations to each surviving internee. The governments of Canada, Australia and New Zealand have apologized for their histories of assimilation programs imposed on their indigenous peoples, and provided compensation; the complex issues of reparations, and of current policies to deal with the cultural and economic legacies of the past, continue to figure in the politics of these countries. In 1997, the U.S. (President and Congress) apologized for the infamous 40-year Tuskegee "medical experiment" in which a group of African-Americans with syphilis were merely observed instead of treated. There is a long history of apology and litigation in the U.S. over land rights, compensation and reparations for injustices in the country's treatment of Native Americans. In 2000, the U.S. Congress apologized for the country's

slavery history, but stipulated that the apology could not be used as a legal basis for seeking reparations. In 2009, the government of Peru apologized to its two million Afro-Peruvian citizens for its history of apartheid abuses. In 2015, Kenyan President Uhuru Kenyatta apologized for government violence in 2007-2008 against citizens protesting election manipulation. In 2011, then Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan apologized for the 1930s bombing of Turkish Kurds that killed 14,000. In 1996, former South African president de Klerk apologized for apartheid to South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission. In 1995, the U.S. Southern Baptist Convention apologized to African-Americans for having "defended" slavery in the old South.

3. Apologies for *deliberate injustices to an external, non-state collective*. German government apologies and substantial reparations to Jewish survivors of the Holocaust; Switzerland's apologies for treatment of bank accounts set up by Jews before and during WW II; Japanese government expressions of regret over the Korean "comfort-women" program in WW II; UK, German, and Vatican apologies for their roles in the slave trade. In 1998, the German parliament apologized to the Basque people of Spain for the Nazi bombing of the town of Guernica in 1937 when Germany intervened directly for the rebel side in the Spanish Civil War. In 1995, Pope John Paul II apologized for the Church's complicity in historic violence against indigenous South American peoples. On other occasions, modern popes have apologized for other historic injustices, for example, the St. Bartholomew Day massacre of Huguenots in France in 1572.

4. Apologies by a government for *accidental or mistaken government violence*. In 1999 the U.S. apologized to China (as China had demanded), and paid a substantial reparation, for the accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade during the U.S. campaign against Serbian "ethnic cleansing" of Kosovo. In 1937, China apologized for bombing the U.S. ship *President Hoover*, and Japan apologized for sinking a U.S. gunboat. In October 2015, President Obama apologized to the NGO Doctors Without Borders and to the families of the victims injured and killed by the US bombing of a hospital in Kunduz, Afghanistan; the bombing was apparently

mistakenly authorized through a failure of command.

5. Official apologies *to other states for deliberate government (or other legitimized entity, such as an apex church body) external aggression and/or human rights violations.* In 1993, President Yeltsin apologized for USSR internment of Japanese POWs after the end of WW II. Many European countries have apologized to their former colonies, all now independent states, for past injustices. In 2010, the president of Croatia apologized to Bosnia for “crimes” committed during the Yugoslav break-up war. After WW II, Germany apologized to the countries it had invaded; as noted, Japanese governments have also issued official statements of regret.

A policy of *government abetting and supporting* violent injustice by other authorities can still warrant an apology. In 1999, President Clinton expressed regret for past U.S. support to Guatemalan security forces that had committed “violent and widespread repression” and abuse of human rights during that country’s civil war. A few days later, the head of the Guatemalan rebel army apologized for abuses the rebels had committed. (The government refused to make a parallel apology, arguing that abuses on the government side had been committed only by rogue units.) In April 2015, German President Joachim Gauck acknowledged official German complicity with the Turkish government in the Armenian genocide of 1915. His acknowledgement was seconded by the German parliament and by an ecumenical gathering of heads of German and Middle East churches; their use of the word “genocide” was vehemently rejected by the government of Turkey.

6. Apologies for *actions not taken, justice omitted:* In 1997, British Prime Minister Tony Blair expressed regret for the English failure to help the Irish during the Potato Famine of the 1840s. In 1995, on the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the end of WW II, Swiss President Villiger apologized for the country’s refusal to accept Jewish refugees during the war. Also in 1995, the International Red Cross apologized for its “moral failure” in not denouncing Nazi atrocities during the war. In 1997, the French Catholic Church apologized for its silence during the Vichy regime. In 1998, President Clinton (as noted above) apologized for inaction during the

1994 Rwanda genocide. In 2000, Belgium apologized for similar inaction.

7. *Mutual government apologies; both sides apologize for excesses and injustices:* In 1997, the governments of Germany and the Czech Republic issued a joint declaration of mutual apologies. Germany apologized for WW II Nazi violence; the Czech apology was for the post-war expulsion of over 2 million ethnic German residents of the Czech Sudetenland region. The apologies had the immediate effect of enabling the German government to support Czech admittance into the European Union and NATO. (The apologies in Guatemala of President Clinton and the leader of the rebel army could have been seen as deliberate mutuality, although that was not the case.) In 1996, soon after former president de Klerk apologized for apartheid to the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Nelson Mandela and other leaders of the African National Congress apologized to the Commission for killings the ANC had carried out in its resistance campaign. While both of these latter apologies were hedged, they contributed to a political transition noted for its negotiations and ultimately peaceful character. In 2003, after the Serbian president apologized to Croatia for crimes committed during the 1991-1995 Yugoslav war, the president of Croatia apologized in turn. In the Guatemalan and Serbia/Croatia cases, the apologies appear to have been reciprocal rather than deliberately mutual events. In any case, even a *de facto* mutuality of apology is a constructive event.

Finally, it is worth noting that in a few cases governments have rejected calls for apology. For example, in 2000 the U.S. decided not to respond to Korean demonstrators who had demanded apology for a civilian bombing incident during the Korean War. That same year, China refused to apologize to Cambodia for having supported the Khmer Rouge during its genocidal rule in 1975-1979.

## **Truth Telling and Transitional Justice**

Individual apology to a collective has emerged in a new form of contrition since World War II. So-called “truth-commissions” have been established in many countries to promote social healing, reconciliation, and human rights. By offering immunity from formal prosecution for criminal acts,

some of the commissions encourage individual violent perpetrators to come forth voluntarily and admit, and apologize for, what they had done. In many cases, the proceedings have been local, held before an assembled community or village. Residents step forward and admit to the assemblage, perhaps explain, their participation in violent acts they now avow were wrong and immoral. It may be understood there will be no subsequent vengeance-taking, especially if the truth-telling process is empowered to grant legal amnesty. The proceedings may be recorded for archiving (even posting on the internet) as a contribution to national reconciliation. The hope is that confronting and apologizing will cement non-violent conflict resolution and prevent any return to the horrors that recently tore the society apart. (The *gacaca* truth-telling process in Rwanda is a good example.) Apologies by perpetrators also help certify the truth of the egregious events, a counter if “deniers” emerge later on. Some countries have formed a “commission of inquiry” to bring the facts of injustices and criminal behavior to light, aiming at criminal prosecution rather than amnesty. The perception that justice has been done can contribute to post-conflict social and psychological healing and is not viewed as an instrument for reconciliation with perpetrators.

These commissions fall under the rubric of “transitional justice,” that is, processes created (again, since WW II) to move countries from regimes of impunity, injustice, and violence, to societies governed by rule of law, democratic procedure, and non-violent dispute resolution. (The precedent-setting events were the Nuremberg Trials and the comparable war-crimes trials in Tokyo.) More than 40 countries have established official truth or inquiry commissions; some have completed their work, some are still active. (The U.S. Institute of Peace maintains an on-line data base on both truth and inquiry commissions.) They have been much publicized and studied. Questions about their efficacy have been debated: pros and cons of truth

commissions with amnesty versus criminal trials and punishment; whether the commissions led to increased social stability or to behavior change on the part of potential rights violators; whether the commissions have produced grudging tolerance, mutual acceptance, or full reconciliation; the merits of national versus international tribunals or commissions; when should the establishment of truth be followed by material compensation to the victims; what are the merits of amnesty versus due process and punishment; and when might silence (as in post-Franco Spain), rather than public airing, be more likely to help smooth transition to democracy. The separate country commissions have operated under different concepts of purpose and different rules of procedure.

On the international level, legal norms and judicial institutions concerned with establishing criminal guilt also emerged after WW II, and are still evolving. Besides the International Criminal Court established in the Hague (in 2002), ad hoc tribunals have been formed to try individuals accused of human rights violations committed during the periods of carnage in Rwanda, Cambodia, Sierra Leone, and the former Yugoslavia. Probably the most radical development in the field of international justice has been the formal adoption by the UN General Assembly (in 2009), of the so-called Responsibility-to-Protect (R2P). Under this concept, drawn from the Genocide Conventions, certain grievous conditions of massive rights violations would justify, even require, international intervention that would override the heretofore sacred rights of sovereignty. It remains to be seen if and when the R2P norm will actually be invoked. As for the role of apology *per se* in international law, legal scholarship thus far has focused on reparative justice and compensation, giving apology only minor importance.

Robert J. Muscat





# *Happy New Year*

*Wishing You a  
Happy and Peaceful 2016*

*Anna Amato, John Eriksson,  
Robert Muscat, Mindy Reiser,  
Ronald Ridker, Kelly Skeith  
and Sovan Tun*

## **Global Peace Services USA**

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

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

Telephone: 202-216-9886  
E-mail: [globalpeaceservicesusa@gmail.com](mailto:globalpeaceservicesusa@gmail.com)

Web site: [www.GlobalPeaceServices.org](http://www.GlobalPeaceServices.org)

Global Peace Services USA  
P.O. Box 27922  
Washington, DC 20038-7922  
[www.GlobalPeaceServices.org](http://www.GlobalPeaceServices.org)