Unit 2 How has South Africa chosen to remember the past?
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**Key question:** Why did South Africa choose a Truth and Reconciliation Commission and how has the struggle against apartheid been remembered?

To answer these key questions, in this unit you will learn about:

- various forms of justice
- debates concerning the Truth and Reconciliation Commission
- responses to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission
- how the struggle against apartheid has been remembered.
Apartheid was a brutal system in which the civic and human rights of the majority of South Africans had been abused. The detentions and torture of the 1960s and 1970s had given way to the abduction, torture and murder of the 1980s. The question facing South Africans was: What was the best way to deal with the violent past? There were two possibilities when considering justice in terms of righting past wrongs: retributive justice and restorative justice.

1.1 Retributive justice and the Nuremberg trials
Retributive justice was the type of justice meted out at the Nuremberg trials in Germany when the Nazi leaders were put on trial for atrocities committed during World War II. In many instances, these leaders were sentenced to death or long terms in prison for the crimes against humanity they had committed. This type of punishment was regarded as suitable, since retributive justice is administered in a court of law and seeks to bring about justice by applying a type of punishment that fits the type of crime the offender committed.

1.2 Restorative justice and the TRC
Restorative justice focuses on the needs of the victims and the offenders, as well as the involved community, instead of satisfying abstract legal principles or punishing only the offenders. This form of justice rejects the exclusive focus on punishment and, instead, brings victims and perpetrators together in some way to resolve collectively how to deal with the aftermath of the offence and its implications for the future.

South Africa chose restorative justice when it considered how to deal with the perpetrators of violence during the struggle against apartheid because it believed this type of justice would help to unite rather than polarise
South Africans and to assist in healing the country. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) was established to implement restorative justice.

1.2.1 Establishing the Truth and Reconciliation Commission

The idea of a truth commission for South Africa first came from the ANC. After the ANC was unbanned, it faced accusations of human rights abuses in some of its training camps in Tanzania and other parts of southern Africa. It set up an internal inquiry and it was revealed that human rights violations had occurred in the ANC camps. The National Executive Committee (NEC) of the ANC accepted the findings, but decided that these violations needed to be seen against the overall human rights violations that were perpetrated over decades in South Africa. So rather than the ANC looking for general amnesty for itself, it called for an independent truth commission so that everyone could be held accountable for the past.

For this reason South Africa established the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). In the TRC hearings, victims and perpetrators of apartheid violence and human rights abuses faced each other. Victims described their suffering and perpetrators had to take responsibility for their actions, by disclosing fully what they had done, and asking the victims for forgiveness. In this way, it was intended that the divide between victims and perpetrators would be closed (or, at least, narrowed) and that both parties could find closure on the past and move into the future, reconciled. In this way, the TRC was, in fact, a political compromise in the interests of national reconciliation.

The Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act of 1995 created
the TRC that had to facilitate this process. The Chairperson was Archbishop Desmond Tutu who was assisted by 17 commissioners.

The TRC and its commissioners at the first hearings in East London (Source: Oryx Media Archive)

---

**The Truth and Reconciliation Commission**

**The role of the TRC was:**

- to compile as complete a picture as possible of gross human rights violations that had taken place on all sides between 1960 and 1993
- to hear testimony from victims and perpetrators
- where there was full disclosure and a clear political motivation, to grant perpetrators amnesty from prosecution or civil action (legal action between civilians)
- to suggest how victims could be compensated through reparations.

The TRC had a limited time period of two years to achieve its tasks. The overriding objective was to encourage truth telling. However, in trying to compile the ‘picture of the past’, the TRC faced the dilemma of how to validate the ‘subjective truths’ of the painful experiences and memories.
of human rights violations of the victims, while at the same time producing a suitably ‘objective’ and authoritative account of the apartheid past. One of the most important aspects of the TRC hearings was the fact that they were held in public. Everyone daily witnessed the pain and suffering that apartheid had caused to fellow South Africans.

The TRC had three committees:

- Committee on Human Rights Violations to hear and investigate the public testimonies by victims and their families of gross abuses of human rights that took place between 1960 and 1994. This committee was not a court of law.
- Committee on Reparation and Rehabilitation investigated cases, gave support and awarded reparations to victims.
- Committee on Amnesty, which could grant amnesty from prosecution under certain conditions.

Activity 2  Source-based activity: Why was the TRC established?

History skills: Extract and interpret information from a number of sources; Recognise that there is often more than one perspective of a historical event; Organise evidence to substantiate an argument, in order to create an original, coherent and balanced piece of historical writing.

Work alone.

Examine the sources and then answer the questions.

1. Refer to SOURCE 12.
1. Why does the cartoonist portray ‘SA’s Past’ as a haunted house? (2 × 1) (2)

2. Dullah Omar holds a lamp and is preparing to enter the haunted house. Using the speech bubble as a clue, explain the central mission or aim of the TRC according to him. (1 × 2) (2)

2. Refer to SOURCE 13.

1. What reasons does Thabo Mbeki give for the ANC leaders’ choice of a truth commission rather than trials such as those held at Nuremberg after 1945? (2 × 2) (4)

3. Refer to SOURCE 14.

1. Does Goldstone’s reason for the truth commission in SOURCE 14 coincide with the reason given in SOURCE 13? Use evidence from both sources to explain your reasoning. (1 × 5) (5)
   1. Define the concept ‘blanket amnesty’. (1 × 2) (2)
   2. Why would the former government have been interested in gaining a blanket amnesty? (1 × 2) (2)
   3. According to Goldstone, what would have been the result of the choice of trials to deal with atrocities that had been committed in South Africa? (1 × 2) (2)

2. Explain what this statement means: “The Truth and Reconciliation Commission is a bridge from the old to the new.” (1 × 3) (3)

4. Refer to SOURCE 15.

1. What are the four reasons given by Dullah Omar to explain why a
1. Explain what he means by the concept ‘human rights culture’.  

2. Explain why exposing and acknowledging the truth was essential to achieving a human rights culture in South Africa, according to Omar.

2. Do you agree with Omar that it was essential for the victims to be heard in order for SA to move forward? Give a reason for your answer.

5. Study the **SKILLS FILE**. Then use all the sources and your own knowledge to write a paragraph to answer this question: *Do you think the TRC was a better way to deal with the past and to make progress with nation building than legal trials such as those held at Nuremberg?* Substantiate your view with evidence. Your teacher will indicate how this question will be assessed.

**Total marks: 50**

**Source 12 A cartoonist’s view**

*This cartoon by Zapiro, called Dullah Omar and the haunted house, was published in the Sowetan on 23 May 1995.*
Source 13 Thabo Mbeki’s views

In this source Thabo Mbeki explains the shift in thinking of the ANC leadership from trials equivalent to the Nuremberg trials to a truth commission:

Within the ANC the cry was ‘to catch the bastards and hang them’. But we realised that you could not simultaneously prepare for a peaceful transition. If we had not taken this route I don’t know where the country would be today. Had there been a threat of Nuremberg-style trials for the members of the apartheid state security establishment we would never have undergone a peaceful change.


Source 14 A legal view on the TRC

Justice Richard Goldstone helped to draft the bill that set up the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. In this extract he explains the decision to set
Reconciliation Commission. In this extract he explains the decision to set up the TRC:

The decision to opt for a Truth and Reconciliation Commission was an important compromise. If the ANC had insisted on Nuremberg-style trials for the leaders of the former apartheid government, there would have been no peaceful transition to democracy; and if the former government had insisted on a blanket amnesty then, similarly; the negotiations would have broken down. A bloody revolution sooner rather than later would have been inevitable. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission is a bridge from the old to the new.


Source 15 The new democratic government’s view of the TRC

On 27 May 1994 Dullah Omar, the Minister of Justice, announced to parliament that a commission of truth and reconciliation would be set up. Here is an extract from this statement:

If the wounds of the past are to be healed, if a multiplicity of legal actions are to be avoided, if future human rights violations are to be avoided and indeed if we are to successfully initiate the building of a human rights culture, then disclosure of the truth and its acknowledgement are essential ... The fundamental issue for all South Africans is therefore to come to terms with our past on the only moral basis possible, namely that the truth be told, and that the truth be acknowledged.

Choosing words carefully

When you become aware of the tricky relationship between historical cause and effect, it can seem as if nothing is certain in history. In this case, it becomes very difficult to write about history with confidence. One way to guard against the problem of reductionism is to take care with the words you use. Here are some guidelines:

- Avoid sweeping statements: Do not make generalised statements, such as: "By the end of the 1980s, all whites had been indoctrinated to believe that a black government would be a Communist dictatorship ..." Rather write something like: "By the end of the 1980s, many whites had come to believe government propaganda that a black government would no doubt be a communist dictatorship ...">

- Beware of over-explaining: If it is unclear who did what, or why they acted as they did, simply report what you know. For example, the following sentence is full of guesses and assumptions: "The protesters got so angry and scared when the police opened fire that they decided to start burning buildings ..." Instead, it would be safer to say: "The police fired into the crowd and a number of buildings were destroyed by the protestors."

- Stick close to the source: Rather than making the information from a source sound like your own observations, it is often better to acknowledge where it came from. For example, "According to several eyewitness accounts, the protesters were in a cheerful and peaceful mood when the march began ..."

- Admit to uncertainty: In subjects like maths and science, most
questions have precise answers. But in history, dealing with uncertainties in our knowledge of the past is an important skill. There is no need to sound sure about something if the available evidence doesn’t allow it. Rather record the discrepancies. For example, “While sources differ on the number of protesters who joined in the protest that morning, it is estimated that between 6 000 and 10 000 participated ...”

1.2.2 The Truth and Reconciliation Commission hearings

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission hearings began early in 1996. Hearings were held across the country and were packed with spectators. They were broadcast to the nation on radio and television in all official languages. A special weekly prime-time television programme on each week’s hearings was broadcast by SABC-TV on Sunday evenings. The hearings of the Committee on Human Rights Violations (HRV) and those of the Committee on Amnesty were held separately.
The hearings of the Human Rights Violations Committee
The hearings of the HRV Committee began in the East London city hall on 16 April 1996. The commissioners chose an Eastern Cape city because they felt that the worst atrocities had been committed in this province. Before each hearing, witnesses met with the staff of the commission to make a written statement. During the hearings, the HRV Committee established the identity of the victims, their fate or present whereabouts, the nature and extent of the harm they had suffered, and whether the violations were the result of deliberate planning by the state or any other organisation, group or individual.

The hearings of the Human Rights Violations Committee were often highly emotional. White South Africans, who had in increasing numbers voted for the apartheid government, were for the first time confronted by the crimes that had been committed in their name.
During the next six months the HRV Committee heard evidence from the victims. The hearings were conducted by groups of commissioners travelling around the country to take testimony from those who had suffered human rights abuses and gathering information about the atrocities that had been committed. The hearings were held in community halls around the country, often in the townships where the violence had happened and where the victims and their families had lived. The settings were stark, but the testimonies were highly emotional.

Only a proportion of the victims could in fact appear in public hearings. Their participation was to an extent, symbolic. While 2 000 people told their stories in the public hearings, the commission processed more than 21 000 applications. These victim statements related to 38 000 incidents and the murder of 14 000 people. The TRC acknowledged the victim’s pain publically and for many being able to tell their stories, was the beginning of a process of healing and closure. In many cases, victims publicly forgave perpetrators.

The hearings of the Amnesty Committee
Amnesty hearings were conducted as a legal process. The Amnesty Committee consisted of judges, advocates and attorneys with a judge always sitting as chairperson. Unlike the hearings of the HRV Committee, witnesses, victims, survivors and applicants were entitled to legal representation and all evidence was tested through cross-examination. The Amnesty Committee was also able to subpoena witnesses.

The primary function of the Amnesty Committee was to ensure that applications for amnesty were done in accordance with the provisions of
the Act. Applicants could apply for amnesty for offences committed between 1 March 1960 and 6 December 1993. The cut-off date was later extended to 11 May 1994. There were 8 000 applicants to the Amnesty Committee, but not all applicants were granted amnesty. If someone was denied amnesty they were liable for prosecution. The TRC Act outlined the three preconditions to be met before amnesty could be granted:

- applicants had to make a full and truthful disclosure of events and actions around the act of violence for which amnesty was applied
- the applicant had to prove he/she had a political motive
- the act could not be out of proportion with the political objective (in other words, amnesty would not be granted to someone who had committed murder because of a political difference of opinion).

The Reparations and Rehabilitation Committee
The Reparations and Rehabilitation Committee was given the task of recommending a system of reparations for victims to the government. It also provided victim support to ensure that the TRC process restored the dignity of victims. A President’s Fund, funded by parliament and private contributions, was established to pay urgent interim reparations to victims in terms of the regulations prescribed by the President. There would also be recommendations for memorials or a monument to commemorate the struggle.
2 Debates concerning the TRC

The TRC was not a perfect process and debates as to whether it served its purpose or not have continued among academics, politicians and ordinary people.

Discuss and debate

What are some of the main debates concerning the TRC?

Work in groups to read and discuss the source and answer the questions. Afterwards, participate in a class discussion.

1. Would you agree that the TRC posed a ‘moral and political’ dilemma for the following in South Africa in the late 1990s? Use evidence to support your reasoning.
   1. victims of apartheid
   2. perpetrators of violence and human rights abuses.

2. Explain what is meant in SOURCE 16 by choosing the ‘logic of peace’ above that of ‘the logic of war’.

3. Discuss why, according to Boraine, the TRC was the only option open to South Africans in the late 1990s.

4. What were some of the challenges facing the TRC in dealing with issues such as justice, forgiveness, amnesty and respect?

Source 16 A view on the TRC debates

In his book, *A Country Unmasked: Inside South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission*, TRC Vice Chairperson, Alex Boraine, wrote about the need for a particular kind of peace after the conflict in Northern
In his book, A Country Unmasked: Inside South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission, TRC Vice Chairperson, Alex Boraine, wrote about the need for a particular kind of peace after the conflict in Northern Ireland and South Africa. He wrote this in 1999:

... I send you the words of the Polish activist and co-editor of the foremost newspaper in Eastern Europe, Adam Michnik. He spent years in prison under the Communist regime in Poland and spoke with deep feeling when he was with us in South Africa. ‘The image of the enemy is a moral and political burden because you are negotiating with someone whom only yesterday you called an oppressor, a murderer or a terrorist. You promised your followers that this person would be severely punished as a reward for the oppression they had lived through. Your followers, meanwhile, are telling you justice requires punishment. They ask: “how can you negotiate and talk to a person who is responsible for all the disasters of our people?”... I am negotiating because I have chosen the logic of peace and abandoned the logic of war. This means my enemy of yesterday must become my partner and we will both live in a common state. He may still be my opponent but he is an opponent within peace, not within war.’ In Northern Ireland and in South Africa we simply have to learn to live together, otherwise we will continue to kill one another. This is the stark choice. We don’t have to like each other, but we have to coexist with mutual respect.

2.1 Positive aspects: TRC as an instrument of reconciliation

The TRC process did serve the purpose of confronting the evils of apartheid, allowing transition from apartheid to democracy to happen in a peaceful, non-violent way. The media played a critical role in this process. The public hearings, which were broadcast daily on television and radio, included the testimonies of both victims and perpetrators. This ensured that South Africans could not deny their violent past, even if some white South Africans claimed that they did not know that gross human rights violations were happening.

For some of those who testified, the experience of being able to tell their stories and hear the confessions was a positive, *cathartic* experience. It began a process of forgiveness and healing between victims and perpetrators. Being able to know how their loved ones died, and where their remains were buried, brought closure to many families. For a few, mainly white Afrikaners, there was a deep sense of guilt and soul-searching. During apartheid, Afrikaners were the ruling group and their own people had committed horrendous crimes. However, many whites accused the TRC of being a witch-hunt and of stirring up hatred that they said would make reconciliation impossible. Death threats were sent to Archbishop Tutu and to other TRC commissioners.

Another important aspect of the TRC process is that it placed the truth on record. It was not the whole truth, but enough to establish beyond question that the apartheid regime had been engaged in evil: the systematic torturing of prisoners, the state-sponsored death squads, the lying and cover-ups and the systematic corruption of the justice system.
Discuss and debate

What is the meaning of reconciliation?
First work in your group and then work alone.

1. Analyse **SOURCE 17**. Use all possible clues in the source to identify the message and meaning of the cartoon. Indicate what Zapiro’s views are about the process of achieving reconciliation in South Africa.

2. Extended writing: Write a paragraph of about one page to explain why reconciliation was so difficult to achieve, despite the efforts of the TRC.

**Source 17 A cartoonist’s view on reconciliation**

*This cartoon by Zapiro was used on the cover of Truths Drawn in Jest by Wilhelm Verwoerd, 2000, Claremont: David Philip Publishers*
2.2 Amnesty provisions and problems with amnesty

The provision of amnesty in return for full and truthful disclosure raised both moral and legal issues. Amnesty for torture is prohibited by an international treaty, which South Africa signed in 1993. Did this not mean that perpetrators should have been tried in a court of law? Could there be justice with amnesty?

Many South Africans felt that amnesty for perpetrators of gross human rights violations during the apartheid era was morally unjust and yet many also accepted that amnesty was the price that the country needed to pay in order to have a peaceful transition to democracy.

While a process of healing had begun for many victims and their families, for others it had been infuriating to see the guilty granted amnesty and able to walk free. Particularly problematic was that many of the top apartheid leadership did not apply for amnesty and refused to take responsibility for their apartheid abuses. Although the Amnesty Commission used its power to subpoena some of these leaders, such as PW Botha, they still refused. In the case of PW Botha, he was sentenced to a year in prison or a R10,000 fine for refusing to appear before the TRC. However, the Appeal Court overturned this sentence on a technicality. The ANC leadership and command structure of MK, as well as the leadership of the UDF also did not apply for amnesty, although they accepted full responsibility for the gross human rights abuses perpetrated by their members. IFP leader, Mangosuthu Buthelezi also refused to seek amnesty for his actions under apartheid.
These types of situations have raised questions about whether amnesty was truly a road towards reconciliation. By focusing on individuals in the government structures who committed gross human rights abuses, it was possible for ordinary citizens to refuse to accept responsibility for the decades of apartheid. While there were many whites South Africans who did not accept apartheid and worked against it, the majority supported the NP government, voting it into power. The TRC process enabled these beneficiaries of the apartheid system to see themselves as victims of the system and to say that they did not know what was happening when they voted the NP into power.

**Discuss and debate**

**Did amnesty help or hinder reconciliation?**
Do you think amnesty was necessary to achieve reconciliation or was it a stumbling block or hindrance? Share your ideas with the rest of the class.

**2.3 The TRC focus on human rights abuses**

The TRC’s mandate was to gather information and investigate gross human rights violations during South Africa’s apartheid past. To carry out this mandate they had to examine individual cases of violence such as murder and torture. The TRC therefore looked at apartheid through the experience of a minority of political activists and state security forces. This was an important task, but the damage that apartheid did to generations of South Africans was ignored. This damage was long term and went much deeper than individual acts of violence. The psychological legacy is still with us.
Apartheid conditioned South Africans into believing that they were either superior or inferior human beings. The psychological damage, particularly to those who were made to feel inferior, was enormous. The apartheid system that divided and destroyed the lives of millions economically as well as psychologically was not put ‘on trial’ during the TRC process. It ignored the 16 million people arrested for pass law ‘violations’, the millions of victims of forced removals and the millions who went through Bantu Education.

2.4 Reparations
Possibly the greatest weakness of the TRC process was the failure of government to implement the recommendations of the Reparations Committee. The Reparations Committee made two suggestions. The first was urgent interim relief for victims. This has been implemented to some extent. The second suggestion was that by the end of the Commission’s term, the government should have given every victim monetary compensation that would be sufficient to make a qualitative difference to their lives. In the years since the end of the TRC process, the victims have not received this compensation. Government has admitted that this has been a failure – that there are no mechanisms in place to assist victims. Its argument is that all black South Africans suffered under apartheid and to pay reparations to the few victims who went through the TRC process (about 17 000) would be unjust. This absence of meaningful reparation has seriously challenged the model of restorative justice.
3 Responses of political parties to the TRC

A unique aspect of South Africa’s TRC was the publication of the TRC’s final report. It was contained in five volumes of findings on gross human rights violations, in line with the terms of the mandate. In terms of its findings:

- Apartheid was judged to be a crime against humanity.
- The NP government of PW Botha was found responsible for murder, torture, arson, abduction and sabotage.
- FW de Klerk’s government was criticised for the activities of a third force in an attempt to disrupt the pre-1994 negotiations.
- The ANC – although not judged by the same terms as the apartheid government – was criticised for the civilian casualties in MK operations, the use of violence against opponents, and the torture and executions in camps in exile. The PAC too was found guilty of gross human rights violations.
- IFP leader, Mangosuthu Buthelezi, was judged responsible for atrocities committed by his followers. (During the 1980s there had been a bloody war for supremacy between the ANC and the IFP in KwaZulu-Natal, which left 14 000 people dead.)
- South African society as a whole was regarded as damaged by apartheid and was in need of healing.

The handing over of the final report to President Mandela in Pretoria was scheduled for 29 October 1998. However, the ANC and the NP were dissatisfied with the final TRC report and tried to block its publication. The IFP rejected the TRC’s findings.
ANC responses to the TRC The ANC’s lodged an appeal in the courts to stop the handing over of the report to President Mandela just before that was to happen. What the ANC objected to was the risk that the liberation struggle would be criminalised. They felt that the liberation war should not be seen as a gross violation of human rights in the same way as the apartheid regime had been. The report was rejected in parliament by the then Deputy President, Thabo Mbeki. Archbishop Tutu was furious with the ANC action. The court dismissed the application and the handover went ahead. The TRC report did not, in fact, equate the liberation struggle with the apartheid regime.

National Party responses to the TRC The TRC stated that because the NP government State President, De Klerk, sat on the State Security Council (SSC) together with other high-ranking politicians in the NP government, such as the Minister of Defence (Magnus Malan) and the
Minister of Law and Order (Adriaan Vlok), he would have had knowledge about the activities of the SSC. However, De Klerk claimed that political killings were undertaken by ‘rogue’ elements in the police and security forces, without his knowledge. He therefore brought an urgent action in the Cape High Court, asking it to forbid the findings against him from being included in the Commission’s Report. The hearing took place on 28 October 1998, the day before the report was due to be published. The court found in favour of De Klerk and the Commission had to remove the paragraph. The report had already been printed, so all copies of Volume 5 had to be reprinted. The Commission insisted on reprinting them with a black square where the paragraph on De Klerk had been, to show that they had been forced to remove something from the report.

**Inkatha Freedom Party responses to the TRC** The IFP under the leadership of Buthelezi, was found to have been the main perpetrator of human rights violations between 1990 and 1994. As an ally of the apartheid state, the IFP was also found guilty of conspiring with the SADF to train and deploy hit squads, which led to gross violations of human rights, for which Buthelezi was held accountable in his capacity as the responsible leader.

The IFP criticised the Commission’s Report and suggested that the work of the Commission had been negatively affected by its bilateral origins as a political accommodation between the ANC and NP. The IFP also said that the Commission’s main source of information came from the ‘twisted’ confessions of people seeking amnesty who had told the Commission what it wanted to hear. They asserted that 37 findings contained in the Report – which implicated them in gross human rights violations – were not based on factual and objective information.
Activity 3  Essay-based activity: Assessing the success of the TRC

**History skill:** Organise evidence to substantiate an argument, in order to create an original, coherent and balanced piece of historical writing.

Work alone. Answer either Question 1 or 2 and write a response of about 2½ pages. Your teacher will use the Department of Basic Education rubric for analytical essay writing to assess your essay.

Question 1: Discuss the successes and failures of the TRC.  (50)

Question 2: How successful was the TRC in achieving its aims?  (50)

[Total marks: 50]
Unit 2 How has South Africa chosen to remember the past?

After the advent of democracy, South Africa had to consider how to heal the wounds of not only the terrible abuses of human rights due to apartheid as a system, but also due to the violence committed on all sides in the struggle against apartheid. For this reason, South Africa established the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act of 1995). It used a system of restorative justice to enable perpetrators and victims of violence to meet and, through reparations and amnesty, work towards forgiveness, closure and reconciliation. Although the TRC was quite successful as an instrument of reconciliation on an individual level, it did not manage to address the abuses of apartheid at a structural level, and many of the apartheid government leaders responsible for implementing and maintaining apartheid did not appear before the Commission.

Another post-apartheid issue that needed to be addressed was how the country would deal with remembering apartheid and the struggle against it. A means was needed that would honor those who had made sacrifices to bring us freedom and remind us of our united destiny, protected by a constitution that guarantees our human rights. Monuments and memorials, such as Freedom Park and the Thokoza Monument were constructed as a result, although they have not been without controversy, because different groups remember the past differently.
Unit 2 How has South Africa chosen to remember the past?

Key terms

- amnesty
- heritage
- memorial
- monument
- reconciliation
- reparation
- restorative justice
- retributive justice

Key question: Why did South Africa choose a Truth and Reconciliation Commission and how has the struggle against apartheid been remembered?

To answer these key questions, in this unit you will learn about:

- various forms of justice
- debates concerning the Truth and Reconciliation Commission
- responses to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission
- how the struggle against apartheid has been remembered.