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Abstract
For much of the late 19th and 20th centuries, South Africa was a land characterized by a heightened level of intolerance and discrimination. The formation of the Union of South Africa in 1910 did not ease matters; instead, the union government put in place measures which sought to ensure that South Africans never shared the resources of the land equally. Indeed, the very foundation of the Union of South Africa was premised on intolerance of cultural diversity and increasing racial discourse. In this chapter I assume that the reader knows something of the history of South Africa in the past two centuries, and so, I focus on how South Africans, after the fall of Apartheid in 1994, have dealt with the remnants of intolerance and discrimination. The chapter specifically looks at the constraints that faced the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the debates that ensued after the life of the Commission.

Introduction
David Harvey, in his book entitled, *The Condition of Postmodernity*, suggests that the end of the 20th century was characterized by what he termed, "time-space compression". For Harvey, "this has had a disorienting and disruptive impact upon political – economic practices, the balance of class power, as well as upon cultural and social life". In this chapter I explore some aspects of the present discomfort, that is, how time and space, in the way Harvey uses them, influenced the proceedings of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission [TRC] in South Africa. I look at how the present conceptions of time impose constraints and limitations on our ability to imagine our lives as individuals, groups and nations. I contend that by conceiving itself as an ephemeral structure the TRC undermined its long-term vision of nation building and reconciliation. This conception of time, in the light of its long-term objective, affected the outcome of its work.

The TRC had cut-off dates and an official time to end its work. These dates stimulated heated debates on exactly what was the appropriate day on the calendar to be considered. I argue that these debates were not just about political ‘point scoring’, but they were engaged with and mediated by time and space. Implicit in the debates was a full understanding that these seemingly neutral concepts, in this case the fixing of dates, are by no means innocent, that they carry with them power to shape people’s lives, and that these concepts are constructed through debates and negotiations.

One of the mechanisms that the TRC depended upon was the performances, theatre, drama and the poetics of the public hearings. This was particularly done through the print and electronic media. The hearings were broadcast in almost all eleven official languages, in part to speed up the process and reach as large an audience as was possible. For the TRC, the listeners and spectators were not just audiences; they were a nation that had joined the journey to the past.
This seems to be in contrast to Anthony Avani’s assertion that “the trouble with the past is that we have no direct dialogue with it”. In attempting to “deal with the past”, the expression that was used throughout the “life of the TRC”, South Africans, those who journeyed to the past, were trying to negotiate and enter into dialogue with their past. Part of the dialogue with the past involved the digging of skulls and the reversal of power positions (that is, the face to face interaction between the perpetrator and victim), in the theatre and drama of the TRC public hearings, allowing South Africans to communicate in various ways with the past. The conversations were intended to begin a search for the truth, which, as I show later, had to be abandoned and replaced by a reassuring sense of optimism – hope – in the face of rising unemployment and grinding poverty.

**Contesting Spaces, 1986 – 1994**

The public protests that intensified in 1984 signalled a new contest for the control of space(s) in South Africa. These were nationwide protests against the hegemonic control of the State. They took place predominantly in small towns, cities and townships. Most of the public rallies and gatherings were organized by the United Democratic Front (UDF), Trade Unions affiliated with the Congress of South African Trade Unions (Cosatu) and civic organizations including churches linked to the South African Council of Churches (SACC). However, these public marches were not the first in South African history; nor did the organizers have a new political objective. But what distinguished these rolling mass actions from the previous protests was a clear intention from the general public to contest public spaces with the South African State. These demonstrations were met with a very determined force from the State security forces. And it soon responded by declaring a State of Emergency in June 1986, which was extended to 1990. This gave the Security Forces “extraordinary powers of arrest, detention, censorship regulations and control of public assembly”. The definition of public assembly included public gatherings, funeral gatherings and marches. Reporting and talking publicly about the “unrest” was banned. Some newspapers like the “New Nation” and “Weekly Mail” were closed through the State of Emergency regulations. The UDF was restricted from organizing its activities, and Cosatu was banned from taking part in political activities.

Seeing all the restrictions imposed on organizations to organize public meetings, the UDF and Cosatu formed a broad public based movement called Mass Democratic Movement (MDM). In late 1980s it was the MDM that organized rent and bus boycotts in the Townships, and consumer boycotts against white owned businesses. In 1989 the MDM organized a “defiance campaign against segregated facilities and restrictions on meetings”. As Pampalis writes:

> from August, black patients were organized to present themselves for treatment at white hospitals; most were, in fact, given treatment. This was followed by similar challenges to the segregation of schools, transport, workplace facilities, beaches and other public amenities.

The period between 1986 and 1990 was a crucial period or an intense moment of contests for control of public spaces. It was in these spaces that the politics of South Africa in the late 1980s was staged and dramatized. The collapse of the system of Apartheid in 1990 signalled a ‘new’ beginning, and the freeing of spaces was a visible prediction of what has since been referred to as a new South Africa, a new space.

The unbanning of all political organizations opened a space for negotiations to take place. These negotiations took place over a period of three years. Formal negotiations began in December 1991, when 228 delegates from nineteen political organizations gathered at the World Trade Center, Kempton Park, Johannesburg. The negotiations included participants from the home-
lands. The participants in these negotiations called themselves the Convention for a Democratic South Africa – [CODESA].

However, even this space was not yet free and was once seized by the Afrikaner W eerstandbewiging (AWB). This group of right-wing “neo-Nazi storm troopers attacked blacks caught in the building.” This attack, which was beamed across the country during prime time, and the clear understanding that the anti-apartheid movements had not won the struggle through arms led to a need for a compromise. It was this political compromise that has made the South African political situation very engaging, challenging, and at certain moments it has presented interesting dilemmas. It made this new space ready for refashioning. This moment also bequeathed constraints and limitations.


One of the points that were agreed upon during the negotiations for an interim constitution was, among others, a clause that would give amnesty to the perpetrators of gross human rights violations and restore dignity to the victims. It was this clause which paved the way for the all race elections, which took place from 26 - 29 April 1994. This is the clause that has sustained a highest level of debate both in South Africa and internationally to this day. It reads:

The adoption of this Constitution lays the secure foundation for the people of South Africa to transcend the divisions and strife of the past, which generated gross human rights violations, the transgression of humanitarian principles in violent conflicts and a legacy of hatred, fear, guilt and revenge.

These can now be addressed on the basis that there is a need for understanding but not for vengeance, a need for reparation but not for retaliation, a need for ubuntu [the African philosophy of humanism] but not for victimization.

In order to advance such reconciliation and reconstruction, amnesty shall be granted in respect of acts, omissions and offences associated with political objectives and committed in the course of the conflicts of the past. To this end, Parliament under this Constitution shall adopt a law determining a firm cut-off date which shall be a date after 8 October 1990 and before 6 December 1993 and providing for mechanisms, criteria and procedures, including tribunals, if any, through which such amnesty shall be dealt with at any time after the law has been passed.

The first and second sections of the clause seek to deal with the experience, psychological and material effects the past has had on people’s lives. This clause also suggested a cut-off date that was later to be a point of serious debate.

In 1995, soon after the 1994 elections, the Justice Portfolio Committee was entrusted to draft the appropriate legislation. Its work entailed, inter alia; the fixing of cut-offs. Some political parties like the Freedom Front, the Afrikaner W eerstandbeweging [AWB] and the Democratic Party had their own views about the appropriate dates. For the AWB, any date before 6 December 1993 as a cut-off date would exclude its members from benefiting from the Amnesty process, and therefore it asked for the extension of the date to April 1994. And if the process was to be inclusive it had to accommodate the AWB’s concerns. In its submission to the Portfolio committee, the AWB, through its leader, stated:

[…] if the shifting of the date can bring peace – then you must shift the date with every day on the calendar. If justice rules … I will talk peace … because that is all that I am … a simple farmer from Westra for who has come to you to put my case.

The statement not only suggests a link between the cut-off date and peace, it also introduces justice, and how these three terms have been intrinsically connected to the calendar system. The
conventional meanings of justice in this process as I have highlighted before, were suspended in search of a nation. The new space was made ready for remaking.

The AWB’s concerns on the cut-off date were accepted. And the government changed the date from March 1993 to May 1994.

**Historical Window**

It was not only the cut-off date that was debated, but also the span of time under consideration. The year 1960 was raised as a possibility. This was the year when the Sharpeville march took place. During this march a number of people were killed, which constituted one of the reasons put forward for the date.

The Democratic Party (DP), concerned with the length of time the Commission had to consider, proposed that the starting date should be 16 June 1976. The party reckoned:

> This would not only shorten the Commission’s area of research by sixteen years but would have a symbolic resonance, because it ushered in the famous cycle of resistance and oppression.

For the Democratic Party to deal with “four decades, and to look not only at disappearances, as in Chile, but at other gross violations such as murder, kidnapping, torture and severe ill-treatment, was an impossible workload.”

The DP statement on the date is telling, as it shows that the process was not about establishing a full picture of what happened, but was symbolic, or a historical window and therefore it had to concentrate on the “famous cycle of resistance and oppression”. The phrasing, “famous cycle of resistance” begs some consideration. This idea was at the very core of the TRC. The TRC was designed to be a spectacle, which sought to capture public imagination through pictures, theatrical performances displayed in the ephemeral spaces created by the public hearings. This explains the urgency that characterized the process leading to the creation of the TRC.

**The Hour**

The debates on the TRC legislation were severely constrained by time, and the participants seized on the opportunity presented by the media to create an impression that there was “progress” in the debates. This media mania, perhaps, represents what Harvey calls the “mediatization of politics”. Krog writes:

> One morning a note is sent to the media: Don’t leave too soon – promise to provide you with a row and an underhand ANC deal.

Just before the TRC was established the definition of time was clear, it was that of productive time, getting as many things done in as short a time as possible. The debate proceeded as though they were in competition. Simply put, this was a race against time. Time was the great concern of the Portfolio Committee members, as Krog writes:

> De Lange is adamant. We still have eight draft bills to discuss. We argued this agenda last week for more than an hour. We have accepted it. I will allow no discussion. I am putting it to the vote. Read my lips: I am putting it to the vote. Whereupon the ANC outvotes the other parties by fifteen to seven.

The whole process of debating the legislation was later seen, not in its content, but in the amount of time spent on it.

The Justice Portfolio Committee spent six and half-hours on the Truth Commission Bill before any public submission was made. It listened for more than twenty hours to submissions and it discussed, compiled and drafted the various clauses of the bill in 100 hours and 53 minutes. Many a time the civil
servants turned up at the meeting with red eyes and wrinkled clothes, having worked through the night to prepare a new discussion document. In total, the Committee spent 127 hours and 30 minutes on the Truth Commission Bill.

Time, the present conception of time, has conditioned our lives, to the extent that it has become natural. The civil servant became impatient about the whole process. For her the process was taking too long. She could not take it any longer. Her views and feelings might have been a reflection of a sizable number of the civil servants who had to write the day to day proceedings of the TRC Bill debate. The civil servant stated:

[...] if I personally had to draft this legislation, it would have been a lean, simple law – completed weeks ago. But because this has to be a process, it is developing into a hell of a unique, but impossibly complex law.

The speed with which the debates were conducted invited vicious criticism. The bill itself was seen as a flawed piece of legislation. However, those who advanced this argument saw no alternative to the process. The Truth Commission Bill was signed into law on 19 July 1995. And soon after that the nominations for people who would comprise the Commission started, culminating in the seventeen members elected to form the Commission. The Commission was divided into three committees, the Committee on Human Rights Violations, Amnesty Committee and the Committee for Rehabilitation and Reparation.

At the heart of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, I suggest, was an attempt to imagine a nation. However, it had to be constructed out of the ashes of the old. This was attempted by travelling to the past, as the TRC put it, “to another country.” The public hearings were given a priority. These public hearings were intended to take the South African public back to specific spaces where certain events under the Commission’s mandate occurred.

The public stage, during the TRC hearings, was a space, or as the TRC puts it, a “forum for many voices that had previously been silenced.” One observer acutely noted:

The public TRC hearings provided spaces for singing where we could sing sad songs for some of the biggest tears in our mortal dress, where we could lament some of the scars in our body politic.

Here the two spaces, the old and new, were made to interact simultaneously, and yet the spaces were ephemeral.

THE DILEMMAS OF IMAGINING A NATION

The first public hearing took place in April 1996. The hearing was held at the East London City Hall, in the Eastern Cape. The venue was chosen for its historical resonance. As the report put it:

The choice of a centre in the Eastern Cape was no accident, but a deliberate decision to focus attention on an area which had borne the brunt of some of the heaviest repression by the security forces of the previous government, in direct response to some of the most militant resistance.

The planning of the first public hearing is worth quoting in full, for not only does it provide backstage information on the reworking and construction of spaces, it also alludes to the most important aspect of the TRC, that is, a concerted effort to use the latest means of communication, so that it could get full publicity of the hearings. To ask why the TRC was so preoccupied with publicity would be to question, these days, the obvious. The report states:

The selected venue was the East London Hall in April, an imposing Victorian-style building in the centre of the city. Stringent security measures had to be put in place, and were provided and maintained by the South African Police Services (as at subsequent public hearings). Provision had to be made for the media. Food and accommodation had to be provided for deponents and for at least some
of their families who attended to support them. Transport had to be arranged, entailing heavy costs and considerable logistical difficulties, and interpretation services had to be arranged for simultaneous translation into all the languages to be used. The placing of tables for the witnesses and for Commission members received careful attention – witnesses were to take pride of place and there was to be no suggestion of their being ‘in the dock’ as in a court. They were also always to be accompanied by a Commission ‘briefer’ and, if they chose, by a family member or other supporter. The deponents were brought together during the weekend before the hearings in order to prepare them.

The hall was packed to full capacity by people who came to join the journey to the past, the national and international media representatives “filled to overflowing the room”. This was the atmosphere in most of the TRC initial hearings. They drew large public attention and most of the hearings were broadcast on radio and television, and were covered by the latest electronic means of communication including the internet. Through this media attention, the TRC hoped that the vast South African landscape would be compressed into a single whole, and its inhabitants travel together to the past. As the TRC itself was later to claim that the “live radio and television broadcasts made the Commission so much a part of the South African landscape.”

Krog describes the back stage scene during the preparation of the items for the news headlines in the first hearing. She writes:

We pick out a sequence. We remove some pauses and edit it into a 20-second sound bite. We feed it to Johannesburg. We switched on a small transistor. The news comes through: “I was making tea in the police station. I heard a noise, I looked up ... There he fell ... Someone fell from the upper floor past the window ... I ran down ... It was my child ... my grandchild, but I raised him”.

We lift our fists triumphantly. We’ve done it! The voice of an ordinary cleaning women is the headline on the o’clock news.

The present became the past, and the past that was brought into the present was expected to inform the future. Jeremy Cronin has noted that the TRC was a bridge, designed to take people from the past to the future. All this was possible through the manipulation of time and space or – as Harvey puts it “through the annihilation of space through time”. One of the Commissioners acknowledged this in the TRC hearings in Durban:

We commend the radio for ensuring that thousands, if not millions, especially of the so-called ordinary people, are being reached.

Not only the nation was imagined, also the audience was imagined. They were expected to be watching and soul searching. However, it does not seem that the imagination was all that accurate as will become apparent below.

The venues the TRC chose had to be justified by invoking the past, as we have seen with the East London Town Hall. The choice of venue for the Durban hearings was also no accident, it had historical meanings. This venue in particular allowed the TRC to make some connections to the recent 20th-century failure of humanity to be human – the Holocaust. The TRC Commissioner explained:

It seems in a different kind of way particularly appropriate that the venue should be a Jewish one, given their peculiar capacity to remember.

To help the imagining, the individual testimonies were transformed into a shared story, in search of a nation. As one of the Commissioners stated in the victims’ public hearings in East London:

The 27th of June 1985 is a day which will be indelibly printed in your minds and in your hearts and in the minds of many, many thousands and hundreds of thousands of people in South Africa. Many people within this hall and many of us sitting at this table knew your husbands well, had met them, we had worked with them and like you we heard with horror of the gruesome killing of those four, the Cradock Four.
Their husbands were not heroes. They worked and mingled with the many, many thousands and hundreds of thousands of people in South Africa.

And also again in the Durban hearings similar words were uttered to demonstrate the public nature of the proceedings. In this case it was not only the South African public that was imagined, but the world as a whole:

A particularly warm welcome to those who will be testifying, and to their families. Thank you for your generosity, and in this province particularly, your courage in coming forward and exposing your pain to the gaze of the world.

However, there was another side to the TRC’s imaginings of a public glued to their television sets and listening to the victims’ stories. In the Northern Province while the hearing was taking place inside the hall people, the South African public, were going about their normal chores. Krog observed:

By late morning a cricket match commences on the field next to the hall. And it is clear that more things change on this side of the Soutpansberg, the more they stay the same. While the Commission listens to testimony of human rights violations, cheerful white families with their Tupperware, their sunhats and their small-town familiarity spend the day picnicking on the grass outside. Their children chase each other around the bakkies. Caught between the field and the hall, we in the media sit listening to bitter crying and choked words, interspersed with cheering and applause from an enthusiastic cricket crowd. The division carries through to the policemen patrolling the showgrounds. The white policemen loll about, watching cricket, while their black colleagues stand solemnly in the door-ways of the hall listening to the testimony. My hands on the laptop keyboard are numb with contradiction.

Metaphors About the Past

Besides the planned proceedings and eloquent speeches that were intended to draw public attention to the process, I suggest here that it was also metaphors about the past and the sight of exhumed bodies that kept some people’s emotions in the past. Metaphors are in themselves empty, but it is in their emptiness that their potency lies. For this reason everyone tries to search for meanings in these metaphors. The South African past, that is – history as experience – has emerged as dark, brutal and as a beast. Perhaps, it was in trying to condense and describe decades of human interaction in the shortest possible time, that the TRC saw the South African past as bloody and the country itself as “soaked in blood”. The TRC Commissioner once asserted that the present situation in South African society “requires a huge regional ablution ceremony to get through the era of blood”. But depending on this kind of emotive language at times ignores crucial details. Perhaps one has to remember, as Njabulo Ndebele has suggested, that “if today they sound like imaginary events it is because, as we shall recall, the horror of day-to-day life under apartheid often outdid the efforts of the imagination to reduce it to metaphor.

For these metaphors, powerful as they were, failed to stimulate the imagination. For most people a brutal past, as it will be clear below, is better to be forgotten than kept in people’s memories.

Time to Move On

As I have demonstrated earlier in the chapter, the TRC from the start faced various limitations, constraints and dilemmas. First the negotiators who drafted the TRC bill, later the commissioners and the public at large, as I shall try to demonstrate below, confronted similar challenges partly due to how they conceived time during the whole process. The ephemeral nature of the TRC created a situation in the minds of the South African public that it was something that would come and
go. The process would come to an end. As one journalist who took part in the TRC hearings, put it with all good intentions:

The Truth Commission provided counselling and I was advised to stop. But I don’t want to. This is my history, and I want to be part of it – until the end.

Here lies one of the great dilemmas; a nation or the imagination of a nation that would come to an end. Nations are not ephemeral and imagining them can not be a piecemeal process. The journalist innocently shows the flaws and limits to imagination that riddled the negotiators of the TRC bill and the structure that came as a result of the debates.

The life span of the TRC was eighteen months, with the exception of the Amnesty Committee that continued with its work after 1998, but it does not enjoy same media coverage as was the case with victim hearings. In this space of time the TRC was expected to provide as full a picture as possible of the gross human rights violations. However, this proved impossible as the TRC later conceded that it had to complete an “enormous task in a limited time”. This is convincing in light of the period it had to consider and time made available to it. However, at the core of the debates around the time that was made available to the TRC lies a reality, that the TRC itself might threaten the fragile political, economic and human relations, and that it would disturb the quietness of a neo-natal space. Justifying its short life span, the TRC stated:

It would also have been counterproductive to devote years to hearing about events that, by their nature, arouse very strong feelings. It would have rocked the boat massively and for too long.

So rather than “devote years to hearing events that arouse strong feelings”, the whole process had to be a sign, to use a metaphor. Commentators on the TRC process just before it finished its work had started to complain about the length of time. And they felt it was “time to move on”. This sense of impatience which permeates through the fabric of South African society from the law-makers, public commentators, and no doubt to ordinary citizens is in line with Harvey’s concerns about the disruptive impact of the postmodern condition in every sphere of life. Such views are well captured in the following comment, “we should move forward as a country rather than continue to wallow in the past”. No doubt the metaphors that characterized the TRC public hearings made the period between 1996 and 1998, for some, a dark period.

**CONCLUDING COMMENTS**

At the core of the dilemmas was the tension between productive time and the imperatives of imagining a nation or, as Anderson suggests, that to imagine a nation requires a certain conception of time which is immemorial, an immemorial past. Faced with material and imaginative constraints the TRC put much emphasis on temporal spectacles and emotive language. As a result the process remained locked at the level of accusations and counter-accusations.

Nations are imagined through heroes, who live in a timeless space. However, for the TRC every South African was a victim. Jeremy Cronin has observed:

We are asked to recognize the little perpetrator in each of us, but we are nowhere asked to recognize the little freedom fighter, the collective self-emancipator that we all could be.

Recognizing that things did not go as planned the Commission stated, “with its short life-span and limited mandate and resources, it was obviously impossible for the Commission to reconcile the nation”. I have suggested in this chapter that it was partly due to the conception of time that the TRC later found it hard to accomplish its objective of nation building and reconciliation. And this constraint of imagination was inherited from the negotiations and debates that
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The TRC was created in an attempt to reconcile the past and present, but faced challenges in maintaining the delicate balance between past and present. The South African society was facing issues of rising inequality and crime, which made the goal of creating a peaceful nation seem daunting. Despite these challenges, the process of reconciliation began with the creation of the TRC. The TRC was meant to be a momentary委会 to address the past, but it lasted longer than anticipated, from 1998 to 2008.

Notes

1. I have been inspired by a number of authors who have tried to think through the South African experience since 1994. The sub-title of this chapter is taken from Njabulo Ndebele, who is generally described as a prophet of the post-apartheid condition through his collection of essays entitled South African Literature and Culture: Rediscovery of the Ordinary, Manchester 1994. And, more recently, his book entitled Fine Lines from the Box: Further Thoughts about our Country, Johannesburg 2007. In one of his essays he writes, “at the time when Berlin walls of various kinds are falling, I am aware of a wall that is as formidable as ever. It is the wall of ignorance. At this time when the spirit of reconciliation is supposed to bring South Africans together, South Africans don’t know one another as a people”, p. 151.


3. Ibid., p. 284.

4. This study is neither a critique of the noble objectives of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission nor an assessment of its monumental work. My partial metaphorical use of space in this paper is taken from Stuart Hall, David Held, Don Hebert and Kenneth Thompson, who suggest that “places remain fixed; they are where we have roots. Yet space can be crossed in the twinkling of an eye – by jet, fax, or satellite”. S. Hall, D. Held, D. Hebert, K. Thompson, Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies, Massachusetts 1996, p. 205. Here I think of the tension between a linear understanding of time as was used by the drafters of the TRC bill, in short, time as progress or productive time, and nonlinear time of “travelling to the past” that was later used by the TRC. This tension was never resolved throughout the life of the TRC. Since the dead were not transformed – this question of time was never resolved.

5. My understanding of a nation is taken from Benedict Anderson’s book, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the origin and Spread of Nationalism, London 1991. According to Anderson, “a nation is an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion”, p. 6.

6. In this chapter I refer to the TRC as an independent body, for once it was created it functioned as a semi-autonomous structure under the guidelines of the TRC Act proclaimed by the Government of National Unity on 16 June 1995.


8. The truth leaves deep scars, electronic “Mail & Guardian”, 12 December 1997. See also the TRC final report, foreword by Chairperson, vol. 1, chapter 1, p. 4.


11. As Njabulo Ndebele has acutely observed that “only now has South Africa succeeded in becoming metaphor, in becoming a true subject of philosophy”, in S. Nuttal, C. Coetzee, Negotiating the past: The making of memory in South Africa, Cape Town 1998, p. 20.


13. Since the formation of the Union of South Africa in 1910 different kinds of protests have taken place in various corners of South Africa. These protests culminated in the 1956 women’s demonstrations at the Union Buildings in Pretoria against pass laws, the Sharpville march in 1960, the Durban Workers strike in 1973 and the Soweto uprisings in 1976.


16. Ibid.

17. Ibid., p. 290.
From that time ordinary citizens could occupy the spaces that they had, hitherto, been prevented from occupying by law.

Homelands or Bantustans were enclaves within the Republic of South Africa that were created in the early 1970s to contain Africans’ aspirations to power. Then the process of imagining a nation was not only a reconciliation between races, it was also an attempt, I think, to get people from these eight Bantustans to imagine themselves as a nation.

The implication here is that a “nation” was progressing.

Who knows, the dead might come to haunt the living.

See Truth and Reconciliation Commission Final Report, Foreword by Chairperson, vol. I, chapter 1. There lies a contradiction and an attempt to distance itself from the past. Implicit in the statement is that the past does not belong to the present, and yet people are asked to travel to it.

We, as South Africans, have chosen to see and to hear, “Cape Argus and Independent Newspapers”, 2 November 1998.

TRC, Human Rights Violations proceedings held at Durban, 7 May 1996, p. 2.

One of the great difficulties that faced the TRC and South Africa as a whole is the dearth of unknown heroes who live in a timeless space. Each section of the South African population has its own hero. This has been one of the problems that have placed limits and constraints to imagination. Even in the quote above the “Cradock Four” are not heroes, they were and are still ordinary South Africans.
Maintaining Discriminations or Fostering Tolerance?

TRC, Human Rights Violations proceedings held at Durban, 7 May 1996.

Krog, *Country of My Skull* cit., p. 195. However, contrast this with the following article – notwithstanding its ironic tone. Angela Johnson writes “I have found the Rainbow Nation. It has taken me more than two years, but yes, I can unequivocally proclaim that President Mandela's multiracial dream is alive and kicking under the bustling new Sundome Casino on the outskirts of Johannesburg”. She talked to some of the daily gamblers, one of them Arnold Ramaphakela from Tembisa. Ramaphakela stressed “I am here for money. I spend to get more, ... Whites, they have money and they come here to get more. I spend all money here and then it's over”. Johnson continues “all racial groups were represented; from Muslim women to high-flying business people betting thousands of Rands at the poker and roulette tables”. Angela Johnson’s article, *In search of the elusive pot of gold*, appeared in the electronic “Mail & Guardian”, Johannesburg, South Africa. 5 November 1998.

TRC Final Report, Foreword by Chairperson, vol. 1, chapter 1, p. 1.

Mgojo, *After the TRC: Can Reconciliation Come to KwaZulu Natal?* cit., p. 2.


See Anderson, *Imagined Communities* cit., pp. 11 and 22 - 23.

TRC Final Report, Foreword by Chairperson, vol. 1, chapter 1, p. 1.

Ibid., p. 2.


Harvey, *Condition of Postmodernity* cit., p. 284.

Nyatsumba, *After the TRC* cit.

Anderson, *Imagined Communities* cit., p. 11.

Piers Pigou, one of the former TRC investigators said the Commission failed to do its work, and cited the under-reourced and poorly managed investigators. “Pigou also blamed a lack of direction plagued by organizational, managerial and bureaucratic problems, enormous efforts were inevitably wasted in attempts to get the investigative unit to operate as a unit and in a focused manner”, wrote David Beresford of the “Mail and Guardian”, electronic “Mail & Guardian”, *Truth Commission's failed, says a former star investigator*, Johannesburg, South Africa, 28 April 1998, 1.


However, such issues must wait for another telling.
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BOOKS


Tshabalala’s birth at the dawn of post-apartheid South Africa places her squarely on the front lines of what legendary South African cleric and theologian Desmond Tutu named the ‘Rainbow Generation.’ They are the first cohort of modern black, biracial and other ethnic groups who would not live under the legal and political system crafted by South Africa’s white minority—a largely descendants of late 17th century Dutch colonialists known as Afrikaners—which sanctioned racial segregation and economic discrimination against non-whites. The Kommandokorps survivalist group in South Africa organizes camps during school holidays for young white Afrikaner teenagers, teaching them self-defense against a perceived black enemy. With the end of apartheid in 1994 the people of South Africa anticipated profound social and economic change. Yet twenty-one years later, much of the remains. In Brief by Matthias Matthijs December 28, 2020. Apartheid was a political and social system in South Africa during the era of White minority rule. It enforced racial discrimination against non-Whites, mainly focused on skin colour and facial features. This existed in the twentieth century, from 1948 until the early-1990s. The word apartheid means “distantiation” in the Afrikaans language. Racial segregation had existed in Southern Africa for centuries. In the elections of 1948 the National Party took power and in the next few years made new South Africa has been the only country in recent history to have practised race discrimination and race domination on an institutionalised basis. Because of this policy, race discrimination and race domination were entrenched in all walks of life— including land allocation, residential restrictions, health services, job reservation, religious service, education and sport. This study was designed to investigate the biometric parameter of some selected fish from doma dam, Nassarawa State. Samples of Hydrocynus breves, Alestes dentex, Hydrocynus forskali, and Brycinus leuciscus were collected from landing sites and the corresponding morphometric measurement and meristic count were recorded Results reveals significant differences in twelve of thirteen morphometric