CHAPTER 3

CHANGING FORMS OF COEXISTENCE

Louis Kriesberg

Throughout history, relations between different peoples often have been characterized by great brutality. They have included enslavement, forced conversion, and genocide. However, relations between peoples have also been characterized by respectful coexistence, equitable opportunities, and shared governance. Moreover, these relations are not static, becoming increasingly oppressive at times and increasingly equitable at other times. The purpose here is to explore how accommodations between communal groups can and do become more integrated, peaceful, and just. Those who would support movement in such directions have a never-ending task, but one that is always possible to undertake, often with good effect.

To begin, the grand concepts of peace, justice, reconciliation, and coexistence will be distinguished. After mapping out different kinds of coexistence, varying in mutuality and integration, I discuss the factors affecting various forms of coexistence and their changes are discussed. The focus shifts to movements toward greater integration, peace, and justice. In concluding, the role of reconciliation in affecting such movements is examined.
CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

The words peace, justice, reconciliation, and coexistence are used in various senses and often overlap in meaning. For purposes of this chapter, each term will be used in a relatively narrow sense so that they do not subsume each other and become analytically useless.

Peace has a great variety of meanings, ranging from imposed order to loving harmony. It may refer to the absence of direct physical violence or to relations in which no group experiences structural violence; the former condition is often called negative peace and the latter positive peace (Galtung 1996) (Stephenson 1994). Negative peace then refers to the absence of war; it may connote order and security, but it may also connote suppression of struggles to redress injustice. Positive peace refers to at least a minimal level of equity in the life conditions of the people in the same social system. To distinguish the word peace from the term justice, the word peace is generally used to refer to personal and group security and legitimate order.

Justice here refers to a multifaceted, ongoing set of processes moving toward social relations that are regarded as equitable by the people engaged in them. Justice is never fully realized, involving as it does contradictory qualities and changing standards. We are most concerned here with varying degrees of justice among parties in social relations, as assessed by the members of those parties themselves. The often heard chant, “no justice, no peace; no peace, no justice,” suggests the desirability of advancing peace and justice together, but also the frequent failure to do so.

Reconciliation refers to the processes by which parties who have experienced an oppressive relationship or a destructive conflict with each other move to attain or to restore a relationship that they believe to be minimally acceptable. It is a way, then, of advancing peace and, optimally, justice as well. Reconciliation also is understood to be an aspect of an existing
relationship, marked by varying degrees of mutual acceptance. In this sense, it may be a feature of a peaceful and just relationship. But, as we shall see, reconciliation involves so many aspects that some aspects, at a given time, may contribute to peace and justice, while others do not.

Coexistence generally refers to an accommodation between members of different communities or separate countries that live together without one collectivity trying to destroy or severely harm the other (Weiner 1998). This minimal level of coexistence is compatible with competition and even conflicts, if conducted through legitimate channels. It is also compatible with significant differences not only in values and cultural patterns, but also in economic standing and political power. It can be viewed as a minimal level of peace.

Coexistence, however, is often understood to go beyond this minimal level, to include a sense of mutual tolerance and even respect. Also, it sometimes is understood to entail relative equality in economic position and political power. Great differences in economic conditions and power are likely to mean that one party dominates another and the accommodation is not symmetrical. Accommodations marked by great asymmetry and unilateral imposition are usually regarded as unjust and are not treated here as relations of coexistence.

The character of the coexistence between peoples matters. One or more party may judge a form of coexistence as unjust, as a violation of their sense of equity or fairness. What is just and what is unjust depends upon the standards of judgment parties use, and all sides in a social relationship often do not share those standards. Discrepancies between the actual form of coexistence and the standards of justice held by one or more parties in the relationship is a fundamental source of discontent and frequently of intense struggle.
FORMS OF COEXISTENCE

Coexistence is one set of possible relations between different collectivities. To help examine the many possible forms of coexistence, two dimensions of any kind of inter-communal relationship are stressed: the degree of integration and the degree of unilateral imposition (Kriesberg 1999b).

A crucial dimension of the relations between ethnic, religious, linguistic, or other communal groups is the degree to which the members of the groups are integrated with each other. High integration refers to high rates of social interaction between members of the coexisting peoples and high levels of interdependence in their economic and political relations. It also entails shared institutional arrangements and cultural patterns. Consequently, members of the different communal groups also share some common identities.

These various aspects of integration tend to vary together, but integration may be much greater in one way than another. For example, in societies with considerable ethnic discrimination, people of different ethnicities may live segregated lives and have low rates of social interaction, but nevertheless share important societal identities and function within the same major institutions.

The second important dimension discussed here is the extent to which the relationship either is mutually constructed or is unilaterally imposed and sustained. Unilateral imposition is high insofar as the nature of the accommodation is determined and harshly imposed by one party and not accepted by the other party. Unilateral imposition is widely regarded as unjust, and this is particularly so among the people subjected to the imposition.

In this chapter, the focus is on relations between members of collectivities who share ethnic, religious, linguistic, or other communal identities, and so regard themselves as a people or nation (Smith 1991). Such identities are based on a socially constructed common history and
on having a sense of common fate. This means that the identity is shaped by persons who are not members of the group as well as by the members themselves. After all, being treated as a distinct people tends to make the persons so designated believe that they have a common destiny [Nagel, 1994 #722].

Peoples, communities, and societies, however, are not unitary entities. Because of the diversity among the members of such collectivities, no single characterization of the accommodation fully captures the degree of integration and of imposition that the diverse members experience. For example, even where one people is forced to live in segregation by another, the conditions and expectations of the segregated vary somewhat as do those of the people imposing the segregation. Such variations, as well as the shared qualities forming the bases for solidarity, provide sources for changing the form of accommodation.

Relations between collectivities that entail at least a modest degree of integration and not extreme unilateral imposition are of primary interest here. In such accommodations, the peoples are regarded as coexisting. Relationships that are largely imposed by one side or whose integration results in assimilation are not viewed as relationships of coexistence. Relationships that are unilaterally imposed may entail considerable integration between distinct people, but be regarded as unjust and resisted by the dominated side; such relationships would generally not be treated here as reaching the level of coexistence. Thus, the relations between Jews and Arabs in Palestine between 1948 and 1993 were so widely regarded as unacceptable by the Arab Palestinians that the relationship is viewed as not quite reaching the coexistence level for most people for most of the time (Kriesberg 2000).
Several relatively common forms of inter-communal coexistence warrant discussion. They are presented in Figure 1. First, consider the forms in terms of the degree to which distinct peoples are integrated with each other. At one extreme are independent countries whose governments are at peace with each other; for example, during the cold war, relations between the Soviet and American governments were often characterized as ones of peaceful coexistence. Members of different communities within the same country sometimes have come to regard political separation between them as a mutually satisfactory form of relationship. This has been the case for Norwegian separation from Sweden in 1905, the Slovenian withdrawal from Yugoslavia in 1991, the division of Czechoslovakia into two republics in 1993, and the establishment of several countries from what had been the Soviet Union in 1991. Social, cultural, and economic integration can accompany political separation into two or more sovereign states.

Even the creation of independent states, of course, does not guarantee peaceful coexistence. Borders cannot be drawn that neatly separate distinct peoples. Persons with
different ethnic, religious, linguistic, and other bases for communal identities are intermingled throughout every region and in the world at large. Such intermingling can be the source of destructive conflicts when secessions are attempted, as has been made brutally evident in much of the territory of the former Yugoslavia. Such terrible cases demonstrate that peaceful and mutually acceptable separations generally need to be reached by a process the peoples deem legitimate.

Many forms of coexistence within a country have been tried; some of them have been peaceful for extended periods of time. One set of forms involves substantial separation between people with different collective identities. This may involve regional autonomy where, for example, a country’s constitution provides that different languages have primacy in various regions (Lapidoth 1996). This is the case in contemporary Switzerland, Spain, and Canada. In the United States, autonomy includes reservations for indigenous peoples; it also includes a commonwealth relationship with Puerto Rico.

Separation may also take the form of segregation, often imposed by one group upon another. The segregation is sometimes enforced by law, as was true with apartheid in South Africa and with the Jim Crow system in the American south. Such segregation, rejected by the subjugated group, does not constitute coexistence. Segregation, however, also may result from blends of informal imposition and self-selection, as is the case currently with residential and occupational discrimination against African Americans and the choice of some African Americans to live and work with each other. That relationship is a marginal kind of coexistence.

Another type of coexistence involves relatively high integration, but distinguishes among people in terms of their ethnic, religious, linguistic, or other cultural markers. One form this may take is that of power sharing. That is, particular religious and linguistic groups are allocated
fixed roles in the political system, as in Lebanon. A second form of this coexistence type is
cultural pluralism, ranging from informal self-designations to institutionalized multicultural
arrangements, as exemplified in contemporary Canada and the United States. In the third form of
this type, preeminence, one ethnicity, religious community, or linguistic group accords primacy
to itself. Thus, in some countries, members of a dominant group, adhering to an ethno-nationalist
ideology, may enact rules that place obstacles to obtaining citizenship by those who they regard
as having different historical origins (Smith 1991). In many countries or empires, a single
religion is designated as the state religion or a single language is designated as the country’s
official language. In conjunction with this system, varying degrees of personal and group
autonomy for persons practicing other religions and using other languages may be found.

In another set of forms with a high degree of integration, assimilation is possible but not
imposed. In countries where people generally adhere to an ideology of civic nationalism (Smith
1991), acquiring certain cultural markers or expressing political allegiance suffices to become a
citizen of the country with equal rights.

These various forms of coexistence are ideal types; no country purely exemplifies any
one of them. Rather, for different groups within a country and for different aspects of integration,
there may be varying amounts of domination and of pluralism. Thus, while people in the United
States generally claim to follow an ideology of civic nationalism, some Americans think that
others do not “look American,” implicitly adopting an ethno-nationalist ideology.

Although these forms of coexistence have been discussed thus far largely in terms of
their degree of integration, referring to the degree of unilateral imposition associated with them
could not be avoided. That matter will now be discussed directly. The forms of coexistence vary
greatly in the degree of imposition involved. For example, one people, against the desires of
another people who do not wish to assimilate, may harshly impose assimilation. In such cases, members or representatives of the dominating ethnic, religious, or linguistic community may insist that members of subordinated groups not practice their religion, not use their language, and adopt the cultural markers of the dominating ethnic group. Such impositions may be quite coercive and insofar as that is the case, the relationships would not be regarded here as cases of coexistence. This has often been true for peoples in Europe who do not move but become a minority as the political boundaries shift or find that the demands of the majority group change and require assimilation. The situation of many Kurds in Turkey is illustrative.

Assimilation may not be imposed, but be permitted. If assimilation is what many members of the minority or subordinated groups seek, then the relationship would not be regarded as to be unilaterally imposed and would be treated as a form of coexistence. This has been the case for many European immigrant groups in the United States. Of course, this can result in the disappearance of a distinct people in that territory, which also marks the end of coexistence.

Particular forms of autonomy, power sharing, and multiculturalism also vary in their degree of imposition by one side and the methods used to sustain them. Typically no one side wholly determines the way these forms are structured. Rather, particular forms are frequently the result of conflict, often waged constructively (Kriesberg 1998). The terms of the form of coexistence generally are formally negotiated and enacted into laws, as occurred in Spain after Francisco Franco died in 1975. Terms often also result in some degree from tacit bargaining by different people in various parts of a country.

Having sketched out many kinds of coexistence, it should be evident that they are subject to change. Some forms are more stable than others, and certain sequences of changes are more
likely than others. To consider these matters, the conditions and the processes fostering stability and constructive change in these forms of coexistence will be discussed.

**SEQUENCES**

Although changes in the form of coexistence may be inevitable, some relationships are more enduring than others. Stable relationships are often regarded as peaceful. Furthermore, if the changes that do occur are the result of orderly and legitimate methods, and not destructive fighting, they too are generally viewed as peaceful. In this section, the focus is on movements toward more stable and peaceful accommodation, toward less unilaterally imposed and more just accommodations, and toward those marked by increasing integration.

Four sets of factors affect the forms of coexistence and their sequential changes: 1. Features of the coexistence arrangements, 2. The social context for the coexisting parties, 3. Internal features of each party, and 4. The structure and interactions between the coexisting parties. The effects of each on the stability, mutuality, and integration of the relations between communal groups will be examined.

*Coexistence Arrangements*

The terms of any particular form of accommodation are likely to have implications for future changes of that form. They tend to affect movements toward 1. increased stability of the form of coexistence, 2. greater mutuality in determining the form of coexistence, and 3. increased integration between communal groups.

Many features of the form of coexistence affect its stability. Its adaptiveness is particularly important. Changes in the social context and in the relations between the coexisting
entities, as well as their internal features, also have impacts on the form of coexistence. Consequently, rigidity in the terms of coexistence makes the form susceptible to rupture, often accompanied by intense and destructive struggle. Lebanon is illustrative of this possibility. According to a National Covenant agreed to in 1943, the president would be a Maronite Christian and the prime minister a Sunni Muslim. As the years went by, the relative size of the Muslim communities grew and the relative role of the Shiite Muslims especially increased. The power-sharing formula was not changed and this contributed to the civil war that broke out in 1975, ending in a new formula.

Another major factor contributing to stability is consistency among the characteristics of the form of coexistence. Some features may have contradictory implications for each other. For example, high economic integration and social-political segregation are difficult to sustain, unless considerable coercion is exercised. This certainly produces severe strains. For example, in South Africa considerable economic interdependence existed from the beginning of European settlement in the region (Greenstein 1995). This generated many problems in social relations and economic motivation. Apartheid was an attempted solution to these problems. Established in 1948 by the government led by the National Party, apartheid produced additional strains, nevertheless surviving in somewhat changing forms for 50 years. In the United States, the American Creed of individual rights and equal opportunity was inconsistent with the enforced segregation and subordination of African Americans (Myrdal, Sterner and Rose 1944). That contradiction contributed greatly to the transformation of black-white relations in the 1950s and 1960s.

One other notable feature of a relationship is the nature of the creed or ideology that characterizes its form of accommodation. The values, norms, and practices that are part of a
creed or ideology may pertain to the legitimacy of the class, status, and power differences, and to the legitimacy of procedures for changing them. Ideologies vary in the way religious, linguistic, ethnic and other communal groupings are viewed. Thus, the Stalinist Soviet Union and Hitlerite Germany both had been totalitarian societies. The Nazi ideology, however, glorified authoritarian control from the top and the racial superiority of Aryans while Communist ideology glorified people’s democracy and national rights of the Soviet Union’s constituent peoples. The Nazi system was overthrown from the outside. The Communist ideology was used by opponents of centralized totalitarian rule and contributed to the non-violent transformation and then dissolution of the Soviet Union.

Changes toward more or less symmetry in intercommunal relations also are greatly affected by various features of the actualized coexistence arrangements. Thus, some features provide opportunities for members of different groups to sustain their culture and interests as they see them. These characteristics include shared norms supporting diversity. Another important feature is the provision of opportunities and structures enabling vulnerable groups to legitimately participate and raise challenges to aspects of the arrangements that they believe to be asymmetrical.

Other features of coexistence arrangements, on the other hand, tend to increase the asymmetry of the relations between communal groups. Insofar as different entities have unequal resources, the more powerful have the capability and the temptation to use that power to increase their domination. Consequently, rules and institutions are established that buttress their authority and hamper challengers.

Finally, many features of accommodation arrangements affect further integration. This is examined by functionalists, according to whom international organizations may increase and
expand in order to serve the initial functions for which they were created (Mitrany 1966). The way the European Coal and Steel Community, established in 1953, contributed to forging a European common market and a series of European institutions is illustrative (Haas 1958).

Some coexistence accommodations help create vested interests in expanding the compact and the integration it entails. One mechanism that helps generate such vested interests is the establishment of an agency to implement particular provisions of the form of coexistence. Leaders of such agencies tend to seek an expansion of their activities and of the staff to perform the activities (Kriesberg 1984). This may be seen in the effects of official and nonofficial organizations in the fields of affirmative action and human rights, as well as of organizations working to subjugate challenging communal groups in the society.

The creed associated with a particular form of coexistence also has implications for the direction in which that form changes. Members of an ethnic, religious, or other communal group, for example, may adhere to an ideology that proclaims their superiority to other communal groups. Such ideologies tend to propel communal groups toward greater separation. On the other hand, some creeds may be relatively inclusive; they varyingly emphasize ideas of tolerance, liberty, equal opportunity, civic nationalism, and the separation of church and state. Such creeds can contribute to increasing equality and assimilation.

Certain characteristics of the form of coexistence foster increasing separation between different collectivities. The coexistence arrangements may give privileged positions to intellectuals and politicians within each collectivity. Some of who, particularly from the subordinated collectivity, would have a vested interest in advancing separatism, which in turn would further enhance their status and power.
Contextual Factors

Whatever the features of the accommodation may be, they do not determine its future. Many changing external conditions also affect the direction that any accommodation takes. Coexisting entities interact within larger social systems, which themselves undergo changes. Societal and the global social systems are important sources of changing circumstances for coexisting communal groups. Societal and global changes help determine the stability of any accommodation that has been achieved and the movement toward or away from increased integration and greater mutuality.

The stability of any given form of coexistence is greatly impacted by developments in the society and in the world as a whole. First of all, continuity in relevant institutions and patterns of conduct in the society and the world helps perpetuate already established forms of coexistence. Thus, economic stability, persistence in ideologies, and continuities in demographic balances generally reinforce current forms of coexistence.

Large and abrupt changes in a society or the global system, on the other hand, undermine established coexistence arrangements. Thus, breaking up an empire creates new countries with sets of peoples living with each other in new relationships. This was evident after the dissolution of the Ottoman, Austria-Hungarian and Soviet empires, when new borders created new dominant and subordinate communities.

Particular contextual changes tend to support certain kinds of coexistence. Thus, implementing policies to increase mutuality and integration in economic activities would be aided by an expanding economy. For example, this played an important role in the relatively effective affirmative action policies in Malaysia, with a rapidly expanding economy (Mauzy...
1993). In general, economic well being and prospects of continuing improvement ease problems of mutual accommodation.

Governmental and non-governmental organizations that are not directly engaged in a particular intercommunal relationship often mediate or otherwise help the engaged parties to reach an accommodation. This kind of intervention is increasingly happening in inter-communal conflicts. The survival of the accommodation reached often depends upon ongoing efforts by such intermediaries, as a study comparing the survival of peace settlements in Cyprus, Namibia, Angola, El Salvador, and Cambodia indicates (Hampson 1996).

Asymmetries in the relations between communal groups are also greatly impacted by various changes in the regional and global context. The changes may help groups with relatively fewer resources to improve their position. This occurs when the external allies of the dominated group improve their relative position and therefore can provide increased support. This may also follow from changes in the salience of particular ideological, religious, or other normative ideas. Thus, subjugated peoples are better able to make claims for greater civic equality, buttressed by the new global salience regarding human rights and self-determination.

A wide variety of contextual developments affect the degree of integration between communal groups. These include facing a new common external enemy. If an external threat arises, and is not too severe, it often contributes to solidarity against the common enemy. As most frequently studied, the common enemy is another country making war on the country in which the communal groups coexist (Coser 1956; Kriesberg 1998).

As the prevailing regional or global ways of thinking about social identities and forms of organization change, so does the salience of various shared identities by coexisting communal groups. Increasing global attention to religious, racial, or linguistic identities are echoed within
each society or region. Consequently, old divisions in a society may decline in salience and new-shared identities rise in salience. The result is declining integration among some groups and increased integration among others. For example, the decline in Soviet and communist identity and increased importance of religious identity in central Asia alters many integrative bonds throughout the regions of central Asia and the Middle East.

**Internal Factors**

Changes within each party coexisting with other parties also affect the collectivities’ form of coexistence. These internal factors to a significant degree have their own dynamic in affecting stability, integration, and mutuality.

Among other factors, stability of the form of coexistence is affected by the continuity in the leadership of each collectivity. Changes in leaders or in the relative authority of different elites, on the other hand, undercut past arrangements. For example, in Quebec, the growing urbanization of French speakers tended to increase the role of intellectual and political elites compared to the Catholic Church hierarchy. This fostered a shift in identity and strengthened separatist sentiments.

Changes with each party also affect the degree of imposition by one party relative to another. Members of a dominant collectivity may come to doubt the justifications for their dominance. Religious doctrine may have provided an acceptable justification for members of the dominant community, but changes in the doctrine weakened their sense of righteousness about their superiority. A significant step in this change among Afrikaners in South Africa occurred in 1986, when the general synod of the Dutch Reformed Church resolved that there was no biblical imperative for the forced separation of peoples.
As a consequence of such doubts or acknowledged past unfairness by members of the relatively dominant group, members of the subordinated group have better opportunities to effectively achieve co-existence on more equitable terms. In the United States after World War Two, anti-Semitism expressed in conventional discriminatory practice and other widespread overt behavior markedly decreased. This was partly a consequence of recognizing how anti-Semitism could lead to the Holocaust experienced by Jews in Europe and how it contributed to the failure of the United States to act more energetically to prevent or to ameliorate the tragedy.

The degree of integration between the coexisting parties is affected by internal changes within each collectivity. Thus, as members of one collectivity become more specialized and less self-sufficient as a collectivity, their dependence on relations with members of other communal groups tends to increase. Consequently, they experience greater need for closer connections with those others with whom inter-dependence has grown. Thus, the apartheid system was undermined by the growth of economic dependence of whites on the black workers and managers (Kane-Berman 1990).

**Relational Factors**

The internal factors of each party impact on the form of accommodation particularly as they are manifested on the interactions and structural character of the relations between the parties. Changes within each party alter their relative positions. Consequently, thus, demographic, economic, cultural, political, and many other aspects of the relations between coexisting parties inevitably change over time. Those changes necessarily affect coexistence arrangements.

The persistence of forms of accommodation is affected by many relational factors. Thus, continuity in the demographic balance among the coexisting parties helps sustain their established arrangements, if the arrangements had not been unilaterally imposed. The persistence
of the demographic balance in Switzerland has contributed to the stability of the form of existence in that country, while the changes in the demographic balance among communal groups in Lebanon contributed to the 1975 rupture of the arrangements established in 1943.

The changing composition of the Canadian population has contributed to the search for a new formula for relations between the Frenchspeakers of Quebec and the English speakers throughout Canada. Canada, in many ways, began as a state consisting of two nations. The high levels of immigration of diverse European and non-European peoples, however, relegated the French to one people among many others in a largely English-speaking multicultural country.

Relational factors also affect the degree of symmetry in intercommunal forms of accommodation. If members of the minority or relatively disadvantaged people acquire more resources and capabilities, they may become able to renegotiate the terms of their coexistence with the relatively advantaged people. This contributed to the changes in the relations between the Walloons and the Flemish in Belgium, as economic development in the Flemish region of Belgium improved more rapidly than in the Walloon region, whose residents had previously been preeminent. The anticipation of a changing relative balance also can have such an effect. For example, the declining proportion of white South Africans contributed to their willingness to re-negotiate the terms of their relationship with the non-whites of South Africa.

An important relational component is the history of the relationship. One or more sides in an intercommunal relationship may harbor grievances from past suffering inflicted by the other. The nature of such grievances affect the standards used by each side to make claims against the other in the present and for the future.

The acquisition of certain resources and capabilities helps groups make greater claims. Long dormant claims may be renewed when the capability to do so emerges. For example, the
land claims of indigenous American peoples have only recently been strongly raised after many decades of dormancy. The revival of claims owes something to the new generation in the native groups who have legal skills to pursue the claims.

The level of integration is affected by changes in the nature of intercommunal relations. Thus, in so far as members of different communities increasingly believe they share important values, identities, or interests, their level of integration is likely to be enhanced. Thus too, as members of different communities become more equal in class, status, and power, they are likely to increase in mutual respect and social interaction.

**Combining Factors and the Direction of Change**

The effects of each factor depend upon the features of the other factors. For example, if the demographic balance between communal groups is changing, then rigid terms of coexistence with fixed arrangements are unlikely to be enduring. This would also be the case if the prevailing norms and standards of fairness were changing for one or more of the major coexisting parties or their social environment.

Some changes in the social context, whether they be new technological developments or shifts in terms of discourse may enable one party to gain relatively more advantage and thus alter its relationship with its coexisting partners. Thus, subordinated groups may more effectively make claims for greater equality based on new views about the right of self-determination or of democratic participation. This argument is supported by the evidence that numerous effective struggles for democracy or for national liberation occurred during particular historical periods (Gurr 1994).

Intercommunal accommodations that move toward greater mutuality sometimes also move in the direction of greater integration. As the relationship between peoples is more
symmetrical and viewed as more just, social interaction is more equal and integration enhanced. The changing terms of accommodation between blacks and whites in South Africa is illustrative, as apartheid ended and new accommodations were forged. Similarly, in the southern United States, the integration between whites and blacks increased in many regards as the discriminatory Jim Crow accommodation was dismantled in the American South in the 1950s and 1960s.

Movement toward greater mutuality, however, can result in accommodations that entail reduced integration between communal groups. Increased freedom by one people from the domination of another can foster the expression and elaboration of cultural differences and the preference for autonomy or independence. Thus, the reduced Israeli control over Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza is accompanied by increased separation between Israel and the emerging Palestine. Similarly, in Canada, increased mutuality between French-speaking Quebec and the rest of Canada has been accompanied by increased separation between them.

Which course of development is followed depends on the interaction among many of the factors that have been previously discussed. For example, each party’s creed or ideology tends to sustain the existing mutuality and integration of the inter-communal accommodation; but a change in the creed then would lead to a change level of integration or mutuality. The degree of integration characterizing an accommodation also would tend to be self-sustaining. In the case of South Africa, many whites came to view apartheid as unworkable and morally wrong and that undercut the effort to impose apartheid (Giliomee 1997). The integration of blacks and whites in the South African was so high, however, that separation was not possible. Consequently, both increased mutuality and integration mark the post-apartheid accommodation. In the case of Israeli-Palestinian relations, the Israeli Jews did not lose faith in Zionism and the integration
between Arab Palestinians and Israeli Jews had been relatively limited. Consequently, the increased mutuality of control is accompanied by reduced integration in many regards as separate states are being established (Savir 1998).

RECONCILIATION IN SEQUENCING FORMS OF COEXISTENCE

In recent years, we have seen a remarkable surge in efforts to further reconciliation between former enemies. Representatives of one or more side have expressed regret and apologized, have prosecuted perpetrators of gross violations of human rights, and have provided compensations to the aggrieved party. Reconciliation, it must be stressed, has many aspects and each aspect varies in the degree to which it is attained. Reconciliation is never total, never including all members of former antagonistic parties, not including every dimension of reconciliation completely, nor being fully reciprocal between the parties (Kriesberg 1999b).*** IS THIS CORRECT***.

The varying levels of reconciliation impact greatly upon changes in the form of coexistence. Reconciliation is a very complex set of processes. It occurs between individuals, peoples, governments, and other groups and combinations of them. It may occur among a few or among most members of one or more reconciling sides. It occurs in many different settings, including families, communities, and countries. It occurs over varying time periods after the rupture, oppression, or atrocity about which the reconciliation is occurring.

Reconciliation occurs along at least four dimensions: 1. truth, in the sense of shared understandings of it and at least recognition of varying views of it, 2. justice, whether in the form of punishment of wrongdoers or of a new more equitable system of relations, 3. remorse and forgiveness, either of which may be expressed independently of the other or that are carefully
exchanged, and 4. person and/or group safety and security (Lederach 1997). Reconciliation may vary in degree along each dimension, by the proportions within each side who participate in it, and in other ways. What is of importance here is the kind and degree of reconciliation among different members of each side that contribute to transforming enemy relations and building integrated and mutually acceptable forms of coexistence.

In the transformation of enmity to cooperation in Franco-German relations after World War II, some degree of reconciliation along each dimension was achieved (Ackermann 1994). Justice was advanced by West German provision of some compensation to victims of Nazism, Nazi perpetrators of gross human rights violations were put on trial, and the West German government passed legislation to prevent recurrences of Nazism. Security was advanced by close economic integration through institutions such as the European Coal and Steel Community and then by other economic institutions and by military alliances. Truth was advanced by official and nonofficial reports about the Nazi regime and the atrocities committed throughout the territories controlled by Germany. Reports about French collaboration emerged much later. Official German apologies and German expressions of remorse were evident, and official acceptance of the new Germany by France was also evident. Expressions of forgiveness and of remorse were made by French and German individuals in various settings (Henderson 1996).

In other relationships, the lack of significant reconciliation efforts has been followed by destructive violence, long-lasting antagonism, or at best a mutually mistrusting and hostile accommodation. This is illustrated by the denial of past human rights violations by one or more sides in Serb-Croat relations in the former Yugoslavia, in Turkish relations with Armenians and with Kurds, and in relations between Israeli Jews and Arab Palestinians.
Based on the preceding discussion of coexistence and related work on reconciliation, a few observations can be ventured. First, to achieve more than minimal coexistence, that is, peaceful accommodations marked by moderate to high integration and by moderate to little unilateral imposition, significant and broad reconciliation is important. Reconciliation can be quite limited between groups in accommodations that involve little integration and/or high unilateral imposition.

Second, in relations between large-scale groups, a significant degree of reconciliation between the authorities on each side is usually crucial. Subjective reconciliation and even manifest reconciliation between grass roots or unofficial middle-rank leaders by itself is generally inadequate to transform animosity and antagonism. Reconciliation at those levels, however, can encourage and speed reconciliation at higher levels and make them credible. Undoubtedly, also, reconciliatory actions taken at the highest levels can bring about fundamental changes within and between co-existing communal groups.

Third, among the major dimensions of reconciliation, exposing the truth of past and current oppression and atrocities is crucial and in many instances easier to pursue than admissions of guilt and remorse and expressions of mercy and forgiveness. Developing a shared understanding about the reality of past and present relations provides a base upon which justice, remorse/forgiveness, and peace can be gradually constructed. This is one of the great achievements of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa. It was designed to maximize the attainment of the truth about apartheid and the struggle between those who tried to sustain it and those who tried to end it. It was conducted and used to make that truth known as widely as possible in South Africa.
Finally, progress toward an enduring and an equitable coexistence is in itself a significant aspect of reconciliation. Progress towards peace encompasses personal and group security and the protection of basic human rights. Increasing security and protection of human rights is a way of manifesting reconciliation since institutionalizing such assurances reduces the chances that past atrocities and oppression will recur. On the basis of that kind of peace, other aspects of reconciliation, even involving remorse and expressed apologies, become possible. Such sentiments and actions may occur generations after the perpetration of large-scale violations of human rights, as occurred in many colonized parts of the world.

CONCLUSIONS

There are worse conditions than coexistence. Furthermore, coexistence can be the prelude to increasing peace, advancing reconciliation, and achieving greater justice. The forms of coexistence constantly undergo change, sometimes slowly but other times abruptly, sometimes the changes are slight but other times transforming, and sometimes the changes are in the direction of increased peace and justice but other times moving in the other direction. The changes result from developments within one or more party in the conflict, from developments in the relations between the contending sides, and also developments in the social context.

History and the reality of the relations between antagonistic parties profoundly affect the course of changes in the form of coexistence and the possible roles of various aspects of reconciliation for those changes. Developing a shared history or at least a mutually acknowledged varied set of histories is an important aspect of reconciliation.

Justice is never wholly achieved nor wholly absent, but it varies in degree and for different members of the groups in a social relationship. Furthermore, the degree and character
of justice is not static. Social conditions change and in addition, standards of judgment vary over time. Within this broad context, only a few observations are made about justice in relationship to coexistence.

Coexistence and justice have different relationships, depending on the concept of justice that is accepted. When people regard justice to be based on particular absolute standards, their attempts to realize it would interfere with the achievement of coexistence. In such circumstances, a group may regard those who do not share their standards of justice to be acting unjustly and try to correct their conduct or to destroy them. On the other hand, if justice is understood to be totally relative, then no basis for universal basis for valuing coexistence exists. Justice, however, is regarded here neither as absolute nor as wholly relative. Some standards are almost universally regarded as important in determining what is justice, while other standards are widely disputed. Accepting a conventionalist conception of justice, the focus here is on those standards of justice about which there is high consensus (Kriesberg 1999a; Welch 1994). These include condemnations of genocidal policies, coerced uni-directional exploitation, and gross violations of human rights.

Furthermore, the priority people place on any single goal, be it peace, justice, or even coexistence, should not be absolute. Each is desirable, as is freedom, security, and economic well being. At some level, there are trade offs among all these values that each of us would seek and defend. People are likely to differ, within given historical circumstances, what the

***PLEASE PROVIDE MISSING TEXT***

The analysis presented here has implications for theory and policy making about problem-solving conflict resolution and about the transformation of intercommunal conflicts so that relations between adversaries become more just and peaceful. Every accommodation is
embedded in a wider context that profoundly affects subsequent intercommunal accommodations.

The interconnections between justice, peace, reconciliation, and coexistence are profound and should be more fully recognized and examined. A first step in such an examination is to distinguish among them. The inevitability of changes in each of these aspects of social relations has been emphasized here. Several points about such changes deserve mentioning in conclusion. The analysis indicates that the stability of any particular co-existence arrangements and the direction of their sequence of changes are not determined solely by the character of those terms. The continuity of any particular kind of accommodation is greatly shaped by contextual, relational, and internal factors. The persistence of the terms of coexistence and the way they change when they do, depends upon the interaction between the changes in contextual, relational, and internal conditions and the already form of coexistence. An effective accommodation is one that meshes well with future changes.

The quality of the accommodation, its fairness, is affected by contextual, relational, and internal factors. The parties have ultimate responsibility for their relations, but many groups outside the relationship also affect the course of changes in the forms of coexistence. Whatever those groups do or do not do, they have some effect and therefore some responsibility.

Analysts and peacemakers should anticipate that the terms of coexistence change over time. They should expect to modify or restructure the terms of any accommodation. Taking that perspective recognizes actual experience and it may well serve to reduce the tasks and burdens of each negotiation, recognizing that it is not final. Finally, accommodation formulas should allow for change, and build in considerable flexibility.
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\(^i\) An earlier version of this paper was presented at the conference, “Promoting Justice and Peace through Reconciliation and Coexistence Alternatives,” held at American University, Washington, DC, February 19-20, 1999.