



TRUTH, JUSTICE, AND RECONCILIATION: THE ROLE OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION IN THE TRANSITIONAL PROCESS OF POST-APARTHEID'S REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Karolina Baraniak

ABSTRACT

This text presents a detailed analysis of transitional justice processes in the Republic of South Africa following the historical collapse of the apartheid system. The transition from a long-standing, oppressive racist regime to a democratic constitutional order was achieved through a negotiated political compromise. A key instrument of this unprecedented transformation was the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of South Africa, created pursuant to the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act of 1995. Operating under the chairmanship of Archbishop Desmond Tutu since 1996, the body combined the controversial requirement of individual amnesty grants with a profound commitment to publicly uncovering the truth regarding gross human rights violations committed between 1960 and 1994. The Commission's activities rested upon the pillars of three specialized structures: the Human Rights Violations Committee, the Amnesty Committee, and the Reparation and Rehabilitation Committee. The TRC adopted an innovative model of restorative justice, placing the subjective experiences of victims at the center of its focus while striving to restore their fundamental human and civic dignity. The Reconciliation Register also served as a significant element of social cohesion. Published in 1998, the five-volume final report attributed primary moral and political responsibility for systemic crimes to the apartheid state and its security agencies. Concurrently, the Commission addressed and identified human rights violations committed by liberation movements, including the African National Congress (ANC) and the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP), which elicited widespread criticism and sharp opposition from major political factions. Despite objective difficulties—such as the mass destruction of documents by the outgoing regime or subsequent financial barriers in paying reparations—the TRC's work became a globally unique model for addressing a difficult past. This endeavor demonstrated that national reconciliation is a long-term process requiring not only confrontation with historical truth, but also thorough and well-considered socio-economic reforms.

KEYWORDS : Republic of South Africa, apartheid, amnesty, Truth and Reconciliation Commission

I. INTRODUCTION AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE TRANSITION

The collapse of the apartheid system in the Republic of South Africa in the early 1990s constituted one of the most complex processes of systemic transformation in contemporary history. The transition from an oppressive regime to democracy was achieved through a negotiated compromise, which culminated in the first universal elections in 1994 and the inauguration of Nelson Mandela as president.

Despite this political breakthrough, the new government inherited a state burdened by a legacy of violence, economic oppression, and deep racial divisions. Apartheid caused the death of a greater number of people through social and economic oppression (famine, forced removals, poor healthcare) than through direct physical violence. Political violence remained a constant feature of the landscape, encompassing torture, murders, bombings, and community massacres involving both state security forces and liberation movements. A key challenge became the implementation of transitional justice mechanisms that would reconcile the pursuit of truth with the imperative of maintaining peace. Conditioning the peaceful transfer of power, the National Party demanded guarantees of amnesty for political crimes. To avoid a sense of complete impunity for perpetrators, the new authorities decided to make individual amnesty conditional upon a full, public disclosure of the truth. The outcome of this compromise was the adoption of the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act in 1995, which established the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC).

II. Structure and Objectives of the Commission

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission began its work in April 1996 under the chairmanship of Archbishop Desmond Tutu. The TRC adopted a model of restorative justice, focusing on the experiences of victims and the restoration of their dignity.

The Commission operated primarily through three specialized structures :

- **Human Rights Violations Committee:** Addressed cases of fundamental rights violations committed between 1960 and 1994, determining the identity of victims, perpetrators, and the context of events based on statements.
- **Amnesty Committee:** Reviewed applications for exemption from liability for political crimes committed until December 1993 (a deadline that was subsequently extended).
- **Reparation and Rehabilitation Committee:** Proposed support and treatment policies for the injured parties and society as a whole, striving to prevent similar abuses in the future.

An important tool for promoting social cohesion was also the Reconciliation Register, in which citizens could express remorse for their own passivity during the apartheid era and declare their willingness to build a better society.

III. The Process of Truth and Amnesty

1. The Amnesty Committee

The issue of amnesty provoked the greatest controversy, with many citizens (including victims' families) opposing the pardoning of perpetrators. Nevertheless, as proponents of this solution argued, without the promise of amnesty, peace negotiations would have collapsed, and the country would have plunged into further civil war.

Unlike blanket amnesties known from other countries, in South Africa, the condition for exemption from criminal liability was an individual, full disclosure of the truth.

- A total of 7,112 amnesty applications were submitted to the Commission.
- Out of this pool, 849 applications were granted, and over 5,300 were rejected.
- Hearings were frequently conducted in public, and those who concealed facts or acted out of malice or for personal gain were exposed to criminal prosecution.

2. Establishing Perpetrators and Victims

The findings of the TRC disproved numerous myths. During the hearings, it emerged that the "direct perpetrators" were

most frequently rank-and-file state officials (predominantly Afrikaners) who believed they were safeguarding public order against "terrorists." Higher-ranking commanders and politicians—the "indirect perpetrators"—rarely assumed responsibility. The TRC report categorically condemned attempts by high-ranking politicians to evade guilt for acts committed by their subordinates.

One of the TRC's most significant achievements was also the decriminalization of the actions of system opponents—thousands of individuals who had been labeled as bandits and criminals during the apartheid era due to their political struggle were able to regain their status as freedom fighters.

IV. Reparations and Compensation

Since the amnesty-guaranteeing Act deprived victims of the right to pursue civil claims against state perpetrators, the obligation of reparations was assumed by the state. The Commission formulated a multi-tiered reparation program:

- **Urgent interim reparations:** assistance for individuals in need of immediate financial, medical, or educational support.
- **Individual grants:** it was proposed to pay financial support to victims over a period of 6 years, basing the amount on the median annual income in South Africa (approx. 21,700 rands).
- **Symbolic reparations:** exhumations, reburials, construction of monuments, street renaming, expungement of political criminal records, and the establishment of a national day of remembrance.
- **Community rehabilitation and institutional reform:** demilitarization of youth raised in a culture of violence, programs for internal refugees, reconstruction of schools, and the provision of local mental health support.

The implementation of these recommendations encountered immense difficulties. State authorities ignored the demand for annual payments over a period of 6 years and the imposition of a wealth tax on corporations that profited from apartheid. Instead, one-off lump sums of 30,000 rands were offered to identified victims, which met with severe criticism from the victims themselves.

V. Final Report and the Accountability of Perpetrators

The Commission's report, published at the end of 1998, explicitly indicated, that the apartheid state and its security agencies bore the primary blame for gross human rights violations. It was established that apartheid in itself constituted a "crime against humanity".

However, the Commission also assigned blame to liberation movements, including the African National Congress (ANC) and the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP). It was determined that the IFP was responsible for over 1/3 of significant human rights violations during the apartheid era (primarily armed conflicts in the territories of Natal and KwaZulu).

In turn, according to the report, the armed wings of the ANC also committed offenses in their military camps against suspects and enemy agents.

These findings provoked immense resistance from the ANC, whose members argued that the fight against a criminal regime was moral by definition and should not be equated with state violence. They even attempted to block the publication of the report through the courts, though they were unsuccessful. The TRC firmly maintained the stance, that "a just war does not justify the commission of gross human rights violations".

VI. Evaluations, Difficulties, and Criticisms of the TRC

Model

The Commission's activities encountered numerous accusations emanating from every side of the political spectrum:

- **Accusations of leniency toward perpetrators:** many commentators and victims felt that justice in the TRC model boiled down to a "truth for amnesty" deal, releasing criminals from accountability and leaving victims with inadequate state compensation.
- **Politicization:** the National Party and the IFP accused the Commission of bias and favoritism toward the ANC, even resorting to boycotting its proceedings
- **Incomplete Truth:** due to the destruction of key archives by the old regime (especially between 1990 and 1994) and the silence of prominent officials, an objective reconstruction of the whole truth was impossible.
- **Flaws in the narrative regarding victims:** Mahmood Mamdani emphasized, that the TRC narrowed the definition of victimization, focusing almost exclusively on political activists as individual victims. Consequently, the harm inflicted upon entire racial communities was ignored, which distorted the picture of apartheid. The TRC also omitted an analysis of the discriminatory customary law system, which resulted in its failure to recommend fundamental legal reforms in the new state.

VII. CONCLUSION

The work of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission became a globally unique model for addressing systemic past crimes during a period of democratic transition. Instead of relying on traditional forms of criminal judiciary, which under South African conditions would have threatened a multi-year financial paralysis of the courts and likely evidentiary failure, an innovative path was chosen. Through the implementation of restorative justice, freedom fighters were stripped of their criminal status, and primary responsibility was assigned to the state apparatus.

This activity undeniably constituted a difficult moral compromise, forcing victims to renounce the pursuit of criminal justice in the name of a higher purpose—national reconciliation and the preservation of the fragile foundations of democracy. At the same time, the Commission proved that reconciliation itself is a long-term process requiring a thorough social and economic reconstruction of the newly emerging state.

REFERENCES:

1. Tutu, D. (1999). *No Future Without Forgiveness*. Rider & Co, p. 45-48.
2. Ibidem.
3. Boraine, A. (2000). *A Country Unmasked: Inside South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission*. Oxford University Press, p. 12-15.
4. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa (TRC). (1998-2003). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report*, vol. 1, p. 112-115.
5. Steyn Kotze, J. (2020). *Transitional justice*. W. N. De Jager (Ed.), *South African Politics: An Introduction*, Oxford University Press, p. 138-142.
6. Du Bois, F., & Du Bois-Pedain, A. (Ed.). (2008). *Justice and Reconciliation in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Edward Elgar Publishing, p. 45-50.
7. Boraine, A. (2000). op. cit., p. 55-60.
8. *Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act No. 34 of 1995 (RPA)*, pp. 2-6.
9. Tutu D. (1999). op. cit., p. 65.
10. Leman-Langlois, S. (2008). The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa: Crime, Memory and Dignity. *International Criminal Law Review*, 8(2), p. 235-238.
11. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa (TRC). (1998-2003). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report*, vol. 1, p. 55-70.
12. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa (TRC). (1998-2003). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report*, vol. 5, p. 310-315.
13. Boraine, A. (2000). op. cit., p. 120-125.
14. Gibson, J. L. (2004). *Overcoming Apartheid: Can Truth Reconcile a Divided Nation?* Russell Sage Foundation, p. 30-34.
15. Leman-Langlois, S. (2008). op. cit., p. 240-242.
16. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa (TRC). (1998-2003). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report*, 1998, vol. 6, p. 45
17. Ibidem, p. 48.
18. Ibidem, p. 52-55.
19. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa (TRC). (1998-2003). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report*, 1998, vol. 5, p. 180-185.
20. Ibidem, p. 190.
21. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa (TRC). (1998-2003). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report*, 1998, vol. 4, p. 88-92.

22. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa (TRC). (1998–2003). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report*, vol. 5, p. 220-222.
23. Ibidem, p. 225.
24. Ibidem, p.230-232.
25. Ibidem, p. 240.
26. Ibidem, p. 250-255.
27. Boraine, A. (2000). op. cit., p. 210-215.
28. Ibidem, p. 218.
29. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa (TRC). (1998–2003). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report*, vol. 1, p. 25-30.
30. Ibidem, p. 35.
31. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa (TRC). (1998–2003). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report*, 1998, vol. 3, p. 150-160.
32. Ibidem, p. 165.
33. Ibidem, p. 180-185.
34. Boraine, A. (2000). op. cit., p. 180-185.
35. Ibidem, p. 188.
36. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa (TRC). (1998–2003). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report*, vol. 1, p. 40.
37. Mack, K. E. (2014). *From Apartheid to Democracy: Deliberating Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa*. Pennsylvania State University Press, p. 15-20.
38. Mamdani, M. (2002). Amnesty or Impunity? A Preliminary Critique of the Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa. *Diacritics*, 32(3/4), p. 35-40.
39. Boraine, A. (2000). op. cit., p. 140-145.
40. Ibidem, p. 150.
41. Mamdani, M. (2002). op. cit., p. 42-48.
42. Du Bois, F. (2007). Apartheid Law and Customary Law: The Transitional Justice Dilemma in South Africa. *Journal of Transitional Justice*, 12(3), p. 150-155.
43. Leman-Langlois, S. (2008). op. cit., p. 245-248.
44. Boraine, A. (2000). op. cit., p. 80-85.
45. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa (TRC). (1998–2003). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report*, vol. 1, p. 75-80.
46. Tutu D. (1999). op. cit., p. 110-115.
47. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa (TRC). (1998–2003). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report*, vol. 5, p. 300.