EUR Research Information Portal

Transitional justice and the ‘Colombian peace process’

Published in:
ruth, Justice and Reconciliation in Colombia

Publication status and date:
Published: 28/05/2018

Document Version
Version created as part of publication process; publisher's layout; not normally made publicly available

Document License/Available under:
Unspecified

Citation for the published version (APA):
Diaz Pabon, F. (2018). Transitional justice and the ‘Colombian peace process’. In *ruth, Justice and Reconciliation in Colombia: Transitioning from Violence* (1 ed., pp. 1-12). Routledge.

Link to publication on the EUR Research Information Portal

Terms and Conditions of Use
Except as permitted by the applicable copyright law, you may not reproduce or make this material available to any third party without the prior written permission from the copyright holder(s). Copyright law allows the following uses of this material without prior permission:

- you may download, save and print a copy of this material for your personal use only;
- you may share the EUR portal link to this material.

In case the material is published with an open access license (e.g. a Creative Commons (CC) license), other uses may be allowed. Please check the terms and conditions of the specific license.

Take-down policy
If you believe that this material infringes your copyright and/or any other intellectual property rights, you may request its removal by contacting us at the following email address: openaccess.library@eur.nl. Please provide us with all the relevant information, including the reasons why you believe any of your rights have been infringed. In case of a legitimate complaint, we will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website.

Erasmus University Rotterdam
Making Minds Matter

Truth, Justice and Reconciliation in Colombia; edited by Fabio Andrés Díaz Pabón
Format: Royal (156 × 234 mm); Style: A; Font: Times New Roman;
Dir: P:/Frontlist Production Teams/eProduction/Live Projects/9781857438659/dtp/9781857438659_text.3d;

1 Transitional justice and the 'Colombian peace process'

Fabio Andrés Díaz Pabón

The signing of the peace agreements between the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia—Ejército del Pueblo (FARC—EP) and the Government of Colombia in late November 2016 has generated new prospects for peace in Colombia, opening up the possibility of redressing the harms inflicted on Colombians by Colombians.

The negotiation process and the agreements have been explicit about the importance of justice and the prioritization of victims. In fact, the negotiation agenda established the topic of justice for victims as central to the peace process. Other elements of the agreements relate to land, demobilization, disarmament and reintegration of cadres, illicit crops and illicit drugs, and political participation.

The agreements regarding victims and justice present a roadmap for a journey towards a more peaceful environment. They signal the intention and commitment of actors to reach this goal, but institution building and specific policies and programmes to implement these agreements are necessary to achieve it. Statehood and peace have never been built by decree; they are built by institutions, bureaucrats, and by government policies that are consistent across time.

Peacebuilding and state-building must not be seen as processes which are disconnected from justice. The strengthening of institutions, endowments, processes, and practices that realize the agreements signed in a peace process will condition the possibility of justice agreements being implemented. They also affect citizens' perceptions of the credibility of their state.

For this process of state-building and for the consolidation of a justice framework to take place successfully, institutions and the state apparatus must assess the gaps between the commitments contained in the agreements and the realities of the country. This ensures that institutions can be designed to implement procedures and processes accordingly. If we are talking about peace and justice seriously we need to think about **how** to operationalize peace agreements, otherwise we risk pursuing armchair justice in favour of real justice, and using the peace agreements and their transitional justice frameworks as hollow rhetorical tools rather than pathways to peace.

Truth, Justice and Reconciliation in Colombia; edited by Fabio Andrés Díaz Pabón
Format: Royal (156 × 234 mm); Style: A; Font: Times New Roman;
Dir: P:/Frontlist Production Teams/eProduction/Live Projects/9781857438659/dtp/9781857438659_text.3d;

2 *Transitional justice and the peace process*

Transitional justice is a broad label that refers to a series of different interim arrangements applied in post-agreement scenarios, with different outcomes (De Greiff, 2012). In the case of Colombia, the idea of transitional justice has been embraced as the primary framework through which the victims and perpetrators of the Colombian conflict will be engaged, and as the mechanism for the provision of justice and redress (Gobierno de Colombia y FARC—EP, 2016).

Transitional justice as a field of practice and study in intra-state conflicts is fairly new (less than 40 years old); claims with regard to what must be done in transitional justice initiatives thus seem, in some cases, to be driven by normative claims rather than by evidence (Teitel, 2000). Because of this, the process of making transitional justice initiatives a reality remains a great challenge in practice (Fischer, 2011). Determining how best to operationalize transitional justice in the context of the frailty of the state —a natural context to a post-conflict scenario—is thus no easy endeavour.

Reflecting on the challenges related to the idea of justice within the Colombian agreements is vital. The implementation of the agreements on transitional justice can cement (or fail to) a social covenant to reassert the legitimacy of the Colombian state in its territory after more than 50 years of internal war and violence. Being aware of the challenges ahead of implementing the agreements with regard to transitional justice is as important as achieving the agreements themselves.

What has been agreed on in Colombia is neither good nor bad *per se*. It constitutes an opportunity, a roadmap, and a framework for attempting to consolidate state legitimacy within the country. This volume distances itself from debates regarding what justice is, what justice should be, and how should it be implemented. Instead, the focus is placed on **how** what has been agreed to relates to the implementation of the transitional justice initiatives, and what challenges they will face in their implementation in relation to the victims' needs in the Colombian context.

It is these challenges that this volume considers. It focuses on identifying the challenges facing the implementation of the objectives of the transitional justice component of the peace agreement between the FARC—EP and the Colombian Government. By reflecting rigorously on some of the challenges to be encountered in realizing this vision of justice, this work hopes to inform the debate on what is required to bring justice to the victims of the Colombian conflict in accordance with the peace agreement and the transitional justice frameworks it establishes. A full understanding of these challenges should inform the implementation strategy and practice for the peace agreements.

This volume will explore the following challenges with respect to the conception and implementation of the transitional justice framework in Colombia: reconciliation, memory, education, land, gender, demobilization and reintegration.

This reflection is led by Colombian academics and practitioners, in partnership with researchers and practitioners in other countries where transitional justice initiatives have taken place (notably Bosnia and Herzegovina,

Truth, Justice and Reconciliation in Colombia; edited by Fabio Andrés Díaz Pabón
Format: Royal (156 × 234 mm); Style: A; Font: Times New Roman;
Dir: P:/Frontlist Production Teams/eProduction/Live Projects/9781857438659/dtp/9781857438659_text.3d;

South Africa, Sri Lanka, and Peru). This volume has been written in the south, by the south, for the south.

Transitional justice: Tensions and challenges of a field in the making

In modern peacemaking processes aiming to move countries away from civil war and internal conflict, it is common to see provisions for justice arrangements made as part of peace negotiations. These are commonly referred to as transitional justice mechanisms. Transitional justice has become a more popular approach to post-conflict reconstruction in the case of civil wars and internal conflicts since the late 1980s when Latin American dictatorships transitioned from dictatorial regimes towards fuller democracies (Sriram, 2010; Sriram, 2000).

The prevalence of transitional justice in 'modern' peacebuilding is illustrated by the fact that transitional justice initiatives now tend to be integrated into peace negotiations in order to facilitate post-conflict peacebuilding (Kostic, 2012). State-building initiatives, combined with mechanisms to deal with past atrocities, are expected to lead to stability and reconciliation (De Greiff, 2012). Transitional justice as part of peace agreements aims to establish channels to determine accountability for war crimes, to individualize responsibility, and to generate a comprehensive view of violent pasts (Kostic, 2012). The measures and mechanisms created to achieve these ambitious objectives constitute transitional justice: the addressing of human rights violations via the establishment of tribunals; truth commissions; lustration; reparations; and political and societal projects aimed at fact-finding, reconciliation, and remembrance (Fischer, 2011).

A number of debates and tensions exist within the field and practice of transitional justice: notions of justice—retributive or reparative—compete; international jurisprudence, institutions and norms often contrast with national and local legal frameworks; institutions and cultural practices, each of which may be employed to differing degrees, shape the transitional justice process; and finally, the end of the process is contested—should transitional justice establish truth, or deliver retributive justice? The Colombian peace process illuminates each of these debates and demonstrates the possibility of moving beyond the dichotomies implied in these debates to achieve a more holistic process.

Traditionally within the field of transitional justice the policy options for reparation, retribution, and restoration have been seen as mutually exclusive and debated in opposition to each other. This has limited the potential for transitional justice processes to be perceived and operate as an integral approach for peacebuilding, able to consider different needs and alternatives. One of the main examples of this opposition is the debate of peace versus justice: a legalist approach advocates for an emphasis on criminal justice in order to deter future human rights violations, while those in favour of focusing on peace agreements may allow élites related to the conflict to be included in post-conflict scenarios (Fischer, 2011).

Truth, Justice and Reconciliation in Colombia; edited by Fabio Andrés Díaz Pabón
Format: Royal (156 × 234 mm); Style: A; Font: Times New Roman;
Dir: P:/Frontlist Production Teams/eProduction/Live Projects/9781857438659/dtp/9781857438659_text.3d;

The field of transitional justice evolved from an initial legalistic view, focused on processing war crimes, and extending its aims and objectives to include a broader and transformative dimension (Teitel, 2000). Transitional justice mechanisms must support institutions seeking justice to redress aggressions, whilst also supporting future good governance (Andrieu, 2010) and the consolidation of institutional legitimacy and the rule of law (Betts, 2005). These multiple objectives have driven the implementation and design of transitional justice initiatives towards a more comprehensive interpretation of the field. Recent transitional justice initiatives combine provisions that aim to improve accountability and adherence to the rule of law, reform institutions, and rebuild trust. These mechanisms are believed to provide for reconciliation while consolidating justice and reparations (Fischer, 2011).

The objectives of the transitional justice framework contained in the agreements established between the Colombian Government and the FARC—EP relate to access to justice, the definition of a justice system that serves the Colombian society, and its contribution to reparation. Hence, the agreements combine elements of both restorative and retributive justice. In doing so, the agreements aim to create a system with the objectives of justice, restoration, reparation, and non-repetition (Gobierno de Colombia y FARC—EP, 2016).

The agreements between the FARC—EP and the Colombian Government pursue a third way in comparison to other agreements on justice for victims, by not applying the dichotomy of retributive and restorative justice. The agreements include a series of elements that combine reparation, retribution, and restoration of the rights of the victims. The Colombian agreements appear to constitute an example of what is referred to in the literature as a 'hybrid' justice system (Sriram, 2010). The 'local versus international' debate frames another set of opposing ideas within the transitional justice field. When transitional justice mechanisms are implemented, they are in some cases applied in accordance with international rules and standards to the detriment of local and national rules and practices. Where this is the case, tensions and legitimacy gaps may be created. This is especially true for communities that had no access to formal systems of justice before conflict emerged (as is common in weak states) and depended on customary law but that post-conflict are required to pursue justice and reconciliation processes outside of this through institutions shaped by international rules and standards. The introduction of new laws, institutions and trials that are perceived to be alien structures can be cause for concern and can be seen as colonial instruments. The literature refers to this privileging of the international over the local as the 'liberal' co-option of customary law and local forms of justice. These initiatives are commonly encountered as removed or distant, and often fail to support sustainable peacebuilding initiatives (Andrieu, 2010).

This should not make of local initiatives of justice a romantic goal for justice in opposition to international frameworks per se. Their advantages lie on the capacity of allowing a context-sensitive operation, empower citizens and

Truth, Justice and Reconciliation in Colombia; edited by Fabio Andrés Díaz Pabón
Format: Royal (156 × 234 mm); Style: A; Font: Times New Roman;
Dir: P:/Frontlist Production Teams/eProduction/Live Projects/9781857438659/dtp/9781857438659_text.3d;

link the processes of transitional justice with the experiences and realities of communities (Lederach, 1997).

However, local frameworks are not exempt of their own challenges. In some cases, "local" justice frameworks and customs ignore the rights of women, minorities and LGBTI communities, making of local initiatives means reproduction of existing inequalities through a local/localized "justice" system. Also there is the risk of spoilers, former warlords or remaining armed actors manipulating this process for their benefit (Hirblinger, 2017). Thus, assuming that local/localized processes are better than international processes can be a simplified description of the challenges of implementing these initiatives at a local level (Mac Ginty & Polanska, 2015).

The transitional justice framework contained in the agreements established between the Colombian Government and the FARC—EP speaks to local realities and necessities, and it relates to the international jurisprudence set by the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. The agreements were shaped by the interplay between international jurisprudence on human rights (and the obligations/restrictions imposed on nations by international treaties in this regard) as well as the demands of national legislation and context.

Another dilemma that often arises in discussions around transitional justice relates to the role that 'truth' and the role truth and reconciliation commissions, as opposed to trials and courts, can play in reconciliation. Truth commissions have been presented as viable alternatives to trials and prosecutions and as effective mechanisms for countering denial about human rights abuses. Truth has the potential to provide partial redress for victims, contributing to healing and reconciliation (Fischer, 2011). In addition, it is argued that truth commissions can promote public dialogue (Sriram, 2010). However, critics of truth commissions assert that revealing the truth about human rights violations can become an impediment to reconciliation as it can also promote animosity, reopen wounds, and increase political instability (Skaar, 2013). Some academics are in fact sceptical of the very idea that truth-telling mechanisms in themselves can bring healing and maintain peace in a post-conflict society (Mendeloff, 2004). Another critique to the use of truth commissions is the fact that these commissions often lead to the creation of official, state-sanctioned versions of a violent past. This can impose particular versions of the conflict, often making the multiplicity of individual experiences and interpretations of an armed conflict less visible (Andrieu, 2010). Where this happens, it creates controversy regarding whose truth is presented by truth commissions when these processes are undertaken (Loyle & Davenport, 2016).

The task of implementing transitional justice mechanisms as part of peace processes and agreements is riddled with different dilemmas. These dilemmas are inherent to the transition from war to peace, and in moving from agreements to practice, and require decision-making on how to proceed and effectively achieve justice in accordance with the requirements of particular contexts. Context-specific requirements relate to the actors and the histories

Truth, Justice and Reconciliation in Colombia; edited by Fabio Andrés Díaz Pabón
Format: Royal (156 × 234 mm); Style: A; Font: Times New Roman;
Dir: P:/Frontlist Production Teams/eProduction/Live Projects/9781857438659/dtp/9781857438659_text.3d;

of the particular contexts that suffered violence and war. Framing discussions about transitional justice as centred merely on theoretical dichotomies and debates will illuminate the type of initiatives undertaken, but may also obscure reflection on the capacity of the agreements and the instruments set in place to achieve peace and to incorporate the voices of the victims. A strong focus on the context/s in which the transitional justice process will be undertaken is necessary for the latter.

We must not forget that transitional justice is a mechanism that is used to deal with pasts comprised of mass human rights violations within reconciliation and peacebuilding processes in contexts of state weakness and fragility. The prefix transitional is not given loosely, and we need to reflect on how to effect these transitions to take place. This requires researchers to see transitional justice through a peacebuilding and a process lens, and not solely from a human rights perspective (Andrieu, 2010). Transitional justice is thus likely best served by a toolset that allows for the combination of different mechanisms to achieve these ends (De Greiff, 2012). The final goal of transitional justice is peace, and that is where our focus should be oriented.

Transitional justice in the 'international' context: restorative and retributive debates meet the Colombian agreements

The decision about what justice means also depends on whom the justice system is focused on: the perpetrator (amnesty, prosecution, and lustration) or the victim (financial compensation, truth telling, and memorialization[1]).

In the case of Colombia, the agreements reveal a holistic model of restoration and retribution. On the side of restoration, the Colombian example uses an existing legal framework defined by the existing Victims' Law. The Victims' Law establishes a mechanism for repairing the harm done to victims by different actors in the conflict (Gobierno de Colombia, 2011). In addition, some of the agreements hint at a reparative role for the perpetrators of crimes, in that they outline a possible role for the latter in activities such as de-mining processes,[2] the participation of victimizers in illicit crop eradication programmes, and the construction of infrastructure projects by perpetrators. Such activities can be seen as a twofold mechanism that is both retributive and reparative (Gobierno de Colombia y FARC—EP, 2016).

The agreements between the Colombian Government and the FARC—EP may break new ground in relation to the abandonment of the dichotomy of international/national/local definitions and standards of justice, reaching a middle ground that is able to comply with national needs and international standards, and that incorporates notions of both restorative and retributive justice.

In combining elements of restorative and retributive justice, and in bridging international and local understandings and standards of justice, the agreements outline a system that aims toward justice, reparation, and non-repetition, and which serves as a guideline for institutionalizing this process. However, its implementation will prove challenging.

Truth, Justice and Reconciliation in Colombia; edited by Fabio Andrés Díaz Pabón
Format: Royal (156 × 234 mm); Style: A; Font: Times New Roman;
Dir: P:/Frontlist Production Teams/eProduction/Live Projects/9781857438659/dtp/9781857438659_text.3d;

The legalistic language of the agreement can be seen to give preponderance to penal sentences. It does not clarify how the reparative aspects of the agreements speak to the needs of the victims. This is as a result of the fact that the previous peace processes, and the institutions which emerged from them, were not as focused on the needs of the victims. The 'what', but not the 'how', is clearly stated. The work to operationalize and implement the plans to reach the objectives defined by this transitional justice framework is left to the existing institutional structures. This transitional justice approach, being holistic and multiple in its aims, is different to the previous peace processes that gave rise to the existing institutional framework. The existing institutions are thus not necessarily well equipped to implement the current transitional justice process or to achieve its aims. Reflection is necessary to determine how the existing institutions need to be adapted in order to perform the functions that they will be called upon to provide. In addition, the lack of clarity on the process of integration of the special jurisdiction for peace with the integrated system of truth, reparation, and non-repetition leaves the role of the victims in this process open to interpretation (see Chapter 5). This ambiguity regarding how the process will be grounded has been met with concern by some sectors of the Colombian polity and the international community (Amnistía Internacional, 2016).

A complex institutional setting complicates the system designed for truth, reparation, and non-repetition in the peace agreement. This institutional layout reflects the intersection of a series of mechanisms and institutions that should bring a comprehensive understanding of restorative justice, reparation, and retributive justice and its connection to the wider peace process. The transitional justice process that is taking place aims to recognize the rights of the victims beyond the peace agreement with the FARC—EP (victims from paramilitaries, the armed forces, and other operating guerrillas will have access to the benefits under this framework).

According to the agreements signed in Bogotá, human rights abuses will not be the object of pardons or amnesties or alternative judicial punishments. It is worth noting that this jurisdiction will be applied to both citizens and fighters responsible for crimes within the Colombian conflict. It can thus become a framework for bringing justice for atrocities committed by both the FARC—EP and the Colombian Government forces (Alto Comisionado para la Paz, 2016).

The role of victims in the Colombian agreements seems to be more pronounced than in other transitional justice initiatives. The framework includes clauses that are orientated towards a victim-focused justice, supporting truth and reconciliation initiatives rather than a functioning as a simple punitive device. However, victims did not participate directly in negotiating the agreement, although the negotiations were informed by the views and needs of a group of 60 victims, which met once with the negotiation teams of the FARC—EP and the Colombian government in Havana to represent the voice of more than eight million victims (Verdad Abierta, 2014). As the agreements did not involve the victims' consent or approval it could be claimed that their participation was more aesthetic than real. Within the context of a patriarchal society the extent

Truth, Justice and Reconciliation in Colombia; edited by Fabio Andrés Díaz Pabón
Format: Royal (156 × 234 mm); Style: A; Font: Times New Roman;
Dir: P:/Frontlist Production Teams/eProduction/Live Projects/9781857438659/dtp/9781857438659_text.3d;

of meaningful participation by indigenous groups; Afro-Colombians; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex (LGBTI) minorities; and women in the implementation of the agreements remains to be seen.

Transitional justice is part of an agenda for change. It is necessary, yet not sufficient in itself, to achieve change (Sriram, 2010). The capacity of the state to implement this agenda will define its success. This is something already demonstrated in Colombian history; it has proved difficult and challenging to fulfil the promises made in previous peace initiatives (Amnistía Internacional, 2012).

Structure of the book

To reflect on these questions regarding the challenges facing the transitional justice process within the wider Colombian peace process, the volume is structured in three sections. The first section deals with the background of the Colombian conflict and previous peace attempts. The second is concerned with the challenges of transitional justice with regard to forced displacement, land, gender, reconciliation, the demobilization of former combatants, memory, and the intergenerational transmission of the history of the Colombian armed conflict. The third section focuses on the lessons for Colombia from transitional justice initiatives in Peru, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Rwanda, and South Africa.

The book begins with a brief history of the conflict and of previous peace processes, making the case that the current peace process is best understood in relation to the wider historical process of state consolidation and successive peace attempts in Colombia (see Chapter 2). The current peace process and the agreements reached with the FARC—EP are the outcome of an effort that involved several peace processes over the last three decades. This longer historical process explains, informs, and guides the current peace process with the FARC—EP, as Nasi notes in Chapter 3.

The Colombian Government has implemented and experimented with a diversity of measures in pursuit of justice and transitional justice in Colombia. These developments have occurred in line with the evolution of the field of transitional justice. As Velázquez notes in Chapter 4, initiatives including justice in peace processes are not new in Colombia and have taken different forms, such as amnesties, pardons, restitution, and reparation programmes. The current agreements with the FARC—EP are an evolution of these previous experiences.

The volume proceeds to present and discuss in detail the agreements between the FARC—EP and the Colombian Government and its transitional justice component. Transitional justice agreements are anything but simple mechanisms, and Colombia's is no exception. As Gamboa and Díaz argue in Chapter 5, the agreements present a model that can be seen as the intersection of the international demands and the national needs for transitional justice.

With this background established, the volume proceeds to analyse the challenges facing the implementation of these transitional justice mechanisms in a country still in transition. The analysis of the challenges with regard to the implementation of the agreements and their success is informed by an

Truth, Justice and Reconciliation in Colombia; edited by Fabio Andrés Díaz Pabón
Format: Royal (156 × 234 mm); Style: A; Font: Times New Roman;
Dir: P:/Frontlist Production Teams/eProduction/Live Projects/9781857438659/dtp/9781857438659_text.3d;

analysis of the capacity of and the challenges faced by Colombian institutions in previous peace initiatives and as well as the current context. There is a multiplicity of elements that should be considered in relation to the initiatives for transitional justice in Colombia, but given the restrictions of what can be discussed in a book, the debate in this text will be centred on land, gender, demobilization, reconciliation, the role of truth and memory, and education.

Challenges encountered in relation to policies regarding land and its restitution in Colombia are discussed in two chapters. In Chapter 6, Peña Huertas discusses a series of challenges seen in the implementation of previous initiatives. These difficulties are part of a structural problem present in previous initiatives undertaken by the state to deal with the land issue. Initiatives for peace and justice operate in the context of a political economy where institutions are often weak, underfunded and overstretched.

The volume proceeds to reflect on the insights gained through a gendered lens. As Céspedes argues in Chapter 7, particular understandings of gender in relation to transitional justice initiatives can, in fact, overshadow other types of victimization, and misinform other policy initiatives, as she demonstrates is the case with policies responding to land dispossession and their impact on women. The particular biases of a narrow gender perspective are entrenched in much of the transitional justice field, where gender is considered primarily or only as it relates to sexual abuse. This can lead to policy and implementation blind spots, leaving a great deal of the victims in Colombia ostracized. At least 50% of the victims of the Colombian conflict are women.

There are victims and victimizers. We speak of cadres as perpetrators, but rarely do we see also see them as victims. Cadres have been represented in public discourse as dangerous animals, lurking in wait to attack their fellow citizens. However, in most cases, cadres have been also victims of war, and their role within a transitional justice framework as it links to reconciliation and reintegration into society should not be overlooked. Citizens that have been pushed to fight against each other should be seen as humans who were pushed towards warfare, unless we assume a Hobbesian vision of humanity. Acosta and Reyes reflect in Chapter 8 on how justice, reconciliation, and reintegration can cohabit. Supporting initiatives where former victimizers can play their role in restitution and reparation, whilst helping former victims become able to transcend their own victimization in a post-agreement setting as both victims and perpetrators are reintegrated into society, can promote transitional justice. As reconciliation is a relational concept, we cannot expect to achieve reconciliation without the victimizers.

The volume proceeds to reflect on the tensions between justice, memory, and education, and the possibilities for transitional justice mechanisms to support memory, history, truth, and reconciliation exercises. Doing so might entail challenges for Colombia, as Jimeno presents in Chapter 9. An analysis of justice and memory processes highlights the tensions between local and national actors and agendas, and the tensions between mandated versions and processes of memorialization in practice. Tejada takes this reflection forward in

Truth, Justice and Reconciliation in Colombia; edited by Fabio Andrés Díaz Pabón
Format: Royal (156 × 234 mm); Style: A; Font: Times New Roman;
Dir: P:/Frontlist Production Teams/eProduction/Live Projects/9781857438659/dtp/9781857438659_text.3d;

Chapter 10, through discussion of the work of the truth commission for Colombia in the light of the transitional justice mechanisms which have been established. Tejada explores whether these can, or cannot, promote reconciliation. Finally, Sánchez, in Chapter 11, interrogates the understanding of the links between memory and education in an analysis of how education interacts with, creates, and re-creates narratives and understandings of the conflict.

However, the Colombian experience and the challenges facing the implementation of its transitional justice framework are not wholly unique. It is important to reflect on and understand the challenges faced in comparable experiences and practices elsewhere in the world, as this can inform Colombia's path forward. The experiences of South Africa, Peru, Sri Lanka, and Bosnia and Herzegovina are thus brought to the fore to inform reflection on the challenges that transitional justice will face in Colombia. Colombia will most likely not travel the same path as these countries, but can learn from the challenges they faced and the response they mobilized in the implementation of their transitional justice initiatives.

In Chapter 12, Delgado and Guzmán reflect on the lessons demonstrated by the case of South Africa regarding advancing a new social covenant against the backdrop of a broad failure to adequately tackle structural issues such as inequality and effective reparation for the victims of the apartheid regime. García-Godos reflects on the experience of Peru, and outlines how the dangers of the politicization of transitional justice mechanisms can affect the credibility of transitional initiatives and their institutions, weakening their mandates and enfeebling the possibility of justice in Chapter 13. The experience of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina then presents the dangers of elevating imposed versions of transitional justice that are internationally legitimate, but perceived as too far removed from the citizens, thus creating a sense of illegitimate justice, as Monroy-Santander argues in Chapter 14. Finally, the case of Sri Lanka warns us against the instrumental use of transitional justice mechanisms as a way to fulfil a checklist of what needs to be done in the eyes of the international community. As Jayasundara-Smits argues in Chapter 15, we must be aware of the danger of making transitional justice mechanisms a totem that allows countries to claim their liberalness and openness, while sweeping aside the needs of the victims.

In all of these cases, and in past transitional justice experiences in Colombia, challenges have emerged most forcefully in the practice, rather than in the theory. The framework set into place by the peace agreements and their implementation in Colombia opens up a new opportunity and constitutes a junction between two possible scenarios. In the first scenario, the implementation of transitional justice mechanisms is beneficial and important in improving Colombian democracy, creating a series of public policy instruments with the potential to increase the legitimacy of the state, and recognize the human rights of the victims of the conflict. The second scenario is shaped by the looming risk of other armed groups, and a virulent opposition to the peace agreements and transitional justice. These 'spoilers', and failures of the

Truth, Justice and Reconciliation in Colombia; edited by Fabio Andrés Díaz Pabón
Format: Royal (156 × 234 mm); Style: A; Font: Times New Roman;
Dir: P:/Frontlist Production Teams/eProduction/Live Projects/9781857438659/dtp/9781857438659_text.3d;

institutional framework of transitional justice, could undermine and oppose the objectives of peace in Colombia, leaving Colombia with the agreement, but a weak justice and a general discontentment with peace.

The Colombian case can serve as a valuable case study through which to explore strategies to deal with human rights violations and build peace, while considering the challenges these objectives entail. To reflect on the practical challenges related to the implementation of the agreements regarding transitional justice and human rights in Colombia in light of the experiences of Colombians on the ground, as well as those related to the nature of pertinent institutions and their capacity to realize the human rights of Colombians affected by the conflict, is thus a point of departure from which to inform contributions towards peace—the aim of transitional justice.

The following chapters should thus be seen as an engagement with the challenges ahead for Colombia as a nation in its foreseeable future. However, if we discuss transitional justice as part of peacebuilding it is vital that academics, politicians, activists, and international organizations transcend their discourse and address how to implement changes in order to build peace, given these challenges and these frameworks. Rivers of ink have dealt with the end goals of transitional justice, but victims require us to take the quest for human rights beyond the normative realm of theorizing justice and into the practical realm of engaging how to implement justice initiatives.

The tension between theory—the legislative frameworks guaranteeing human rights—and practice—the realization of these ideas—will frame Colombia's success (or failure) in consolidating the implementation of the peace agreements with the FARC—EP.

Notes

1 Memorialization can be understood as a cultural approach to confronting a traumatic past through practices of remembrance, representation and commemoration where communities come to terms with a difficult event through means of expression such as novels, films, music, performances, monuments or museum exhibitions. (Obradović-Wochnik, 2013).
2 Since 1990 it is estimated that more than 11,000 people have died or been injured by landmines. 38% of the victims are civilians and 62% are members of the armed forces. 80% of the victims have been injured and 20% died (Dirección para la Acción Integral contra Minas Antipersonal, 2015).

References

Alto Comisionado para la Paz, 2016. *ABC Jurisdiccion Especial para la Paz*, [Online] Available at: www.altocomisionadoparalapaz.gov.co/oacp/Pages/informes-especiales/jurisdiccion-especial-paz/index.html [Last accessed 30 September 2016].

Amnistía Internacional, 2012. *Colombia: La Ley de Víctimas y Restitucion de Tierras*. Madrid: Amnistía Internacional.

Amnistía Internacional, 2016. *La situación de los derechos humanos en Colombia—9 de Febrero de 2016*. s.l.: Amnistía Internacional.

Truth, Justice and Reconciliation in Colombia; edited by Fabio Andrés Díaz Pabón
Format: Royal (156 × 234 mm); Style: A; Font: Times New Roman;
Dir: P:/Frontlist Production Teams/eProduction/Live Projects/9781857438659/dtp/9781857438659_text.3d;

Andrieu, K., 2010. Civilizing peacebuilding: transitional justice, civil society and the liberal paradigm. *Security Dialogue*, 41(5), pp. 543–601.

Betts, A., 2005. Should approaches to post-conflict justice and reconciliation be determined globally, nationally, locally? *The European Journal of Development Research*, 17(4), pp. 735–752.

De Greiff, P., 2012. Theorizing Transitional Justice. In *Transitional Justice. NOMOS LI. Yearbook of the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy*. New York: New York University Press, pp. 31–77.

Dirección para la Acción Integral contra Minas Antipersonal, 2015. *Víctimas de Minas Antipersonal*. [Online] Available at: www.accioncontraminas.gov.co/estadisticas/Paginas/victimas-minas-antipersonal.aspx [Last accessed 25 October 2015].

Fischer, M., 2011. Transitional Justice and Reconciliation: Theory and Practice. InH. J. Giessmann, B. Austin & M. Fischer, eds. *Advancing Conflict Transformation: The Berghof Handbook II Edition*. s.l.: Opladen/Farmington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers, pp. 406–424.

Gobierno de Colombia y FARC—EP, 2016. *Final Agreement to End the Armed Conflict and Build a Stable and Lasting Peace*. [Online] Available at: www.altocomisionadoparalapaz.gov.co/procesos-y-conversaciones/proceso-de-paz-con-las-farc-ep/documentos-y-comunicados-conjuntos/Documents/comunicado-conjunto-60-23-septiembre-2015.pdf [Last accessed 20 June 2017].

Gobierno de Colombia, 2011. *Ley de Victimas y Restitucion de Tierras*. [Online] Available at: www.centrodememoriahistorica.gov.co/descargas/ley_victimas/ley_victimas_completa_web.pdf [Last accessed 20 June 2017].

Hirblinger, A., 2017. *Preventing Violent Conflict through Community-based Indicators*. Caux: Inclusive Peace and Transition Initiative.

Kostic, R., 2012. Transitional justice and reconciliation in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Whose memories, whose justice? *Sociologija*, 54(4), pp. 649–666.

Lederach, J. P., 1997. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute for Peace Press.

Loyle, C. E. & Davenport, C., 2016. Transitional Injustice: Subverting Justice in Transition and Postconflict Societies. *Journal of Human Rights*, 15(1), pp. 1–24.

Mac Ginty, R. & Polanska, M., 2015. *When the Local Meets the International. Global Trends: Prospects for World Society*, pp. 193–208. [Online] Available at: www.global-trends.info/fileadmin/Globale-Trends/beitraege_kapitel/gt-2015_en.pdf [Last accessed 24 January 2018].

Mendeloff, D., 2004. Truth-Seeking, Truth-Telling, and Postconflict Peacebuilding: Curb the Enthusiasm? *International Studies Review*, 6(3), pp. 355–380.

Obradović-Wochnik, J., 2013. Silent dilemma of transitional justice: silencing and coming to terms with the past in Serbia. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, pp. 1–20.

Skaar, E., 2013. Reconciliation in a transitional justice perspective. *Transitional Justice Review* 1(1), pp. 2–50.

Sriram, C. L., 2010. Beyond conflicts and pursuing accountability: beyond justice versus peace. In O. Richmond, ed. *Palgrave Advances in Peacebuilding: Critical developments and approaches*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 279–293.

Teitel, R. G., 2000. *Transitional Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press on Demand.

Verdad Abierta, 2014. *Víctimas en La Habana: los que fueron y los que faltaron*. [Online] Available at: www.verdadabierta.com/procesos-de-paz/farc/5555-victimas-en-la-habana-los-que-fueron-y-los-que-faltaron [Last accessed 27 September 2017].