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Further information: 

The counterpoint to the idea of "resolving" the information deficit is that the government often produces information that is irrelevant or misleading. This is because the government's primary goal is to promote its own agenda, not to inform or educate the public. The government may also withhold information that it deems sensitive or politically damaging. As a result, the public is often left with a distorted or incomplete picture of the world.

However, the government also has a responsibility to ensure that the public is informed. This is especially important in a democracy, where the government is answerable to the people. The government should provide accurate and timely information to the public, so that the public can make informed decisions.

In conclusion, the relationship between the government and the public is a complex one. While the government has a responsibility to provide information to the public, the public also has a responsibility to seek out and understand that information. The government should strive to provide accurate and timely information, and the public should be vigilant in seeking out that information and using it to make informed decisions.

The government's responsibility to inform the public is not limited to the provision of information. The government also has a responsibility to ensure that the information it provides is accurate and that it is presented in a way that is easy to understand. This means that the government should be transparent about its actions and should be willing to answer questions from the public. The government should also be willing to change its policies in response to public opinion.

In conclusion, the government's responsibility to inform the public is a critical one. The government should strive to provide accurate and timely information, and the public should be vigilant in seeking out that information and using it to make informed decisions.
When and how do governments cooperate...
as a major reason for not supporting an official federal government apology for slavery (Brooks, 1999).

A third influencing factor is whether other governments have apologized for similar harms and not suffered ill consequences. An earlier government apology that is accepted by the targeted victimized group, does not lead to further costly demands, and is generally approved by the majority seems especially likely to encourage subsequent apologies for similar injustices. When the U.S. government apologized and offered compensation to survivors of the Japanese American internment in August 1988, the Canadian government provided an almost identical redress package to survivors of the Japanese Canadian internment less than 6 weeks later. Canada would almost certainly have been more hesitant to act if the American majority had responded negatively to the U.S. redress effort. Similarly, in 2007, the state of Virginia became the first American state to offer an official expression of regret for its role in slavery. Six other states apologized within the next year, and more states are expected to apologize shortly. In support of the inspirational role played by Virginia’s apology, Senator Tony Rand described the precedent set by Virginia as a major contributing factor to his decision to place an apology bill before the North Carolina legislature (personal communication, April 22, 2008). It seems likely that this series of state apologies, combined with the absence of escalating demands from African Americans or a significant majority backlash, will motivate an official apology from the U.S. federal government.

Finally, governments seem less likely to apologize when either too little or too much time has passed since the injustice. Governments may be disinclined to apologize soon after an injustice, in part because their current members supported the discriminatory actions. If they participated in the injustice, they are perhaps more likely to justify or deny the wrongdoing than to express remorse. Also, it is likely that shortly after the injustice, the attitudes of the majority of citizens have not yet shifted from acceptance to revulsion. With the passage of time, members of the current government are no longer directly associated with the injustice, and the beliefs and values of the majority have changed. The government can apologize for the past injustice while dissociating itself from the individuals who perpetrated the act.

When much time passes, governments may be reluctant to apologize for what they deem to be historical curiosities. The effects of the injustice will have seemingly dissipated, and there are no victims who need or demand an apology (Starzyk & Ross, 2008). As the recent spate of apologies for slavery indicates, however, apologies occasionally occur long after the episode ends. One explanation for such delayed apologies may be that negative effects of the injustice are perceived to persist. If members of the previously victimized group regard the effects of the injustice as continuing, they may demand redress long after the injustice has supposedly ended.

These four factors—persistent victim demands, minimal majority opposition, precedents, and time lapse—at least partially explain the modern “age of apology.” And with every new apology, the barriers to subsequent apologies will almost certainly continue to dissolve. Previously victimized groups will mobilize and persist in the hope of receiving similar redress, majority groups will acclimate to the process and offer less resistance, and governments will imitate the apologies of other governments.

The Content of Political Apologies

Not every apology is created equal; the extent to which members of a previously victimized group benefit from receiving a government apology may depend on its content (Lazare, 2004; Negash, 2006). Linguists and psychologists have suggested that a comprehensive apology contains as many as six elements (Bavelas, 2004; Lazare, 2004; Scher & Darley, 1997; Schlenker & Darby, 1981): (a) remorse (e.g., “I’m sorry”), (b) acceptance of responsibility (e.g., “It’s my fault”), (c) admission of injustice or wrongdoing (e.g., “What I did was wrong”), (d) acknowledgment of harm and/or victim suffering (e.g., “I know you’re hurt”), (e) forbearance or promises to behave better in the future (e.g., “I will never do it again”), and (f) offers of repair (e.g., “I will pay for the damages”).

Theorists have hypothesized that a statement that contains more of these elements is superior to one that contains fewer elements (e.g., Bavelas, 2004; Lazare, 2004). There is little research, however, linking the comprehensiveness of an apology to forgiveness and reconciliation. Moreover, there probably needs to be a match between the severity of a misdeed and the comprehensiveness of an apology. A comprehensive apology for a very minor transgression may seem facetious. This matching of the comprehensiveness of the apology to the severity of the harm may help explain why over 90% of everyday interpersonal apologies consist of a simple “I’m sorry” or its equivalent (Meier, 1998).

Governments don’t apologize for minor historical wrongs. As a result, their apologies are likely to be more comprehensive than the typical interpersonal apology. Each of the six elements in a comprehensive apology could address important psychological needs in members of a previously victimized group. A government that expresses remorse for the injustice demonstrates good conscience and genuine concern for the victims and their group (Scher & Darley, 1997). By assigning blame for the injustice outside the victim group (usually to the responsible government or leaders), a government asserts the innocence of the victims. An admission of injustice assures the victimized group that the current government upholds the moral principles that were violated (Lazare, 2004) and is committed to maintaining a legitimate and just social system. By acknowledging harm and victim suffering,
The government's role in the delivery of justice and legislative outcomes is fundamental in ensuring the rule of law and the protection of citizens' rights. The government, as the primary source of laws and policies, has a critical role in shaping and enforcing legal frameworks. This role is not just about creating laws but also about ensuring their effective implementation and fair enforcement.

The government must be accountable and transparent in its actions to maintain public trust and ensure the rule of law. Effective governance requires a balance between executive, legislative, and judicial powers to prevent any single branch from becoming too powerful.

In the context of legislative outcomes, the government plays a crucial role in drafting laws, shaping policies, and enacting legislation. These laws and policies should reflect the interests of all citizens and address the needs of society. The government must be responsive to the public's demands and work collaboratively with various stakeholders to ensure that laws are well-received and effective.

The government's commitment to the rule of law is also evident in its ability to hold itself accountable for any violations of laws and policies. This accountability is crucial in maintaining public trust and ensuring that the state acts in the best interests of the citizens.

In summary, the government's role in the delivery of justice and legislative outcomes is multifaceted. It requires a strong commitment to the rule of law, effective governance, and public accountability. By fulfilling these responsibilities, the government can ensure a fair and just society for all its citizens.
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## Table 12.2: Elements Present in School 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>In the 1870s, the Canadian federal government closed existing residential schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>In the 1880s, Canadian federal government launched Indian residential schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Between 1850 and 1980, residential schools were closed, and the Indian residential school system ended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In the 1990s, the Federal Government of Canada expressed regret for the loss and pain caused by residential schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In the 2000s, the Canadian government acknowledged the harm caused by residential schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Injustice

- Note: Element 1 = Remorse; 2 = Acceptance of Responsibility; 3 = Immediate Action; 4 = Acknowledgment of Harm and/or Victim Suffering; 5 =培育努力; 6 = Offer of Reconciliation; 7 = Praise for Victims Group; 8 = Praise for Present System; 9 = Association of Injustice from Present System.

### Description of Influence

- Note: Element 1 = Acknowledgment of Harm and/or Victim Suffering; 2 = Praise for Victims Group; 3 = Praise for Present System; 4 = Association of Injustice from Present System; 5 = Education and/or Legal Reform; 6 = Active Efforts to Reconcile; 7 = Mass Media and Social Media; 8 = Other International Efforts; 9 = Intergovernmental Partnerships; 10 = Seventy Years and Beyond; 11 = Between 1951 and 1996; 12 = Between 1951 and 1996 (continued).
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The Psychology of Justice and Legitimacy
Similar to the research on real estate, the study found that similar patterns of police apologies for the police's role in the incidents were common in the states where the police are more involved in the process. The study also found that the police's handling of real estate transactions, particularly in areas where the police are more involved in the process, is often more effective than in areas where the police are not as involved. The study also found that the police's handling of real estate transactions, particularly in areas where the police are more involved in the process, is often more effective than in areas where the police are not as involved.
The accuracy, novelty, and effectiveness of political apologies...
was offered for these events. Across four studies, the results consistently
confirmed the effects of prior involvement with one’s political views and
political affiliation on the likelihood of donating to political campaigns.

In a recent study, researchers explored the impact of political
affiliation on donation behavior. They found that individuals who
identify strongly as a political group are more likely to make donations
to political campaigns, even when controlling for other factors such as
income or education level. This suggests that political affiliation plays
a significant role in influencing donation decisions.

The researchers also examined the role of social influence.
They found that individuals are more likely to donate when they
belong to a group that supports political campaigns. This finding
builds on previous research that has shown the power of social
influence in shaping political behavior.

In conclusion, the study highlights the importance of political
affiliation and social influence in donation behavior. These findings
offer important insights for political campaigns and organizations
looking to maximize their fundraising efforts.

The Effects of Partisan Readers

The Psychology of Justice and Legitimacy

Although the study focused on donation behavior, it also
highlighted the importance of understanding the psychological
dynamics that underlie political participation. Understanding these
dynamics can inform strategies for engaging citizens in the political
process and promoting civic engagement.

In the context of the study, the researchers argue that
partisan readers are more likely to support political campaigns
and the candidates associated with their preferred political
affiliation. This finding underscores the importance of targeting
partisan readers in political campaigns and political communications.

The study’s findings also suggest that understanding the
psychological mechanisms that drive political decisions can
inform the development of more effective political strategies.

In summary, the study’s findings offer important insights
for political campaigns and organizations looking to
maximize their fundraising efforts. By understanding
the role of political affiliation and social influence
in donation behavior, these organizations can
develop more effective strategies for engaging
their target audiences.

The authors conclude that future research should
build on this study to explore the broader implications of
political affiliation on political participation and
civic engagement.

In conclusion, the study highlights the importance of political
affiliation and social influence in donation behavior. These findings
offer important insights for political campaigns and organizations
looking to maximize their fundraising efforts.
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The Rationality, Nature, and Efficacy of Political Agonism

The case study examined the impact of political agonism on government apology. Our analysis revealed that government apologies, even when they are genuine, often lack transparency and are co-opted by political interests. The case studies of the counterinsurgency in Sri Lanka and the government apology in relation to the country’s colonial past demonstrate this dynamic. In both cases, government apologies were used to divert attention from underlying issues and to reinforce the status quo. These findings suggest that political agonism should be approached with caution, as it may not always lead to genuine accountability or reconciliation.

The case studies also highlighted the role of civil society inholding government accountable. In both cases, civil society organizations played a crucial role in exposing the government’s actions and in advocating for justice. This illustrates the importance of civil society in promoting democratic values and in ensuring that government actions are subject to meaningful public scrutiny.

In conclusion, the case studies suggest that political agonism can be an effective tool for promoting accountability and reconciliation, but it is essential to consider the potential for co-optation and diversion. Future research should focus on understanding the conditions under which political agonism can lead to genuine accountability and reconciliation.