

H-Net Reviews

in the Humanities & Social Sciences



Long Night's Journey Into Day: South Africa's Search for Truth and Reconciliation. Iris Films.

Reviewed by Susanne Klausen

Published on H-SAfrica (January, 2002)

editor's note: H-SAfrica is pleased to present this review essay from Susanne Klausen, whose critique comes from the perspectives both of a historian of South Africa and a documentary film producer (she is co-producer, with Don Gill, of the documentary 'The Plywood Girls,' (1999)).—P.L.

<p> <cite>Long Night's Journey Into Day</cite> is a film documentary about the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC or Commission). The TRC was established in 1995 by the country's first democratically elected Parliament. According to former Justice Minister Dullah Omar, who introduced the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act (1995) that created the Commission, the TRC was envisaged as part of the bridge-building process designed to help lead the nation away from a deeply divided past to "a future founded on the recognition of human rights, democracy and peaceful co-existence."^[1] Its overarching mandate was to promote national unity and reconciliation. In order to fulfill it, the TRC set out to uncover "as complete a picture as possible" of the gross human rights violations committed between 1960 and 1994 (from the Sharpeville Massacre to the election of the first democratic government), in the belief that telling the truth about the violations from the various perspectives of those involved would lead to greater understanding and reconciliation between South Africans. Thus the TRC became popularly known as the Truth Commission. <p> One of the main tasks with which the Commission was charged was also one of the most controversial aspects of the process, namely to grant amnesty on a case-by-case basis to perpetrators of human rights crimes. This was a result of negotiations between the outgoing National Party (NP), responsible for the implementation of the racist apartheid policy (1948-1990), and the African National Congress (ANC) in the years preceding the shift from white minority to majority rule. Without the provision for amnesty, it is highly probable that powerful

elements within South Africa's security forces would have resisted the historic shift to democracy and the relatively calm transition would likely not have taken place. However, the NP lost its bid for a blanket amnesty for perpetrators. Instead, the terms of amnesty required applicants to meet three conditions: each must give full disclosure of all knowledge pertaining to gross human rights violations; provide a political objective for such violations; and demonstrate a proportional relationship between the political objective and the violations. Perhaps most controversial, the TRC required members of liberation groups as well as enforcers of apartheid to apply for amnesty or else face prosecution after the Commission's proceedings. During hearings held from 1996 to 1998, the Commission received over 7,000 applications for amnesty and has rejected more than 4,500. Though the Commission concluded proceedings in July 1998, the Amnesty Committee continues its deliberations on the remaining cases.^[2] <p> Another major objective of the TRC was to enable healing for the victims of human rights violations by providing them with an opportunity to tell their stories in a respectful public forum. Traumatic as it often was to revisit past acts of brutalization against themselves or loved ones, the Commission believed that public acknowledgement of hitherto untold suffering would help restore victims' dignity and assist them in healing emotionally and spiritually. Repeatedly, the term "cathartic" has been used by commissioners, participants and commentators to describe victims' experience in giving testimony. Commissioners also hoped survivors of slain individuals would gain some measure of peace from finally knowing the full truth about events surrounding

the murders. Ultimately, the TRC tried to promote reconciliation and forgiveness through face-to-face encounters between perpetrators of human rights crimes and those who suffered at their hands. By striving to exemplify "Ubuntu" (the Nguni term for humanness through community interdependence), it emphasized restorative over retributive justice in hopes of fostering a sense of community among all citizens in the new South Africa. Over 21,000 victims of apartheid gave testimony to the Commission.[3] <p> <cite>Long Night's Journey Into Day</cite> explores the Commission's proceedings and achievements, and captures some of the myriad moral and political difficulties posed by it. Though there is a burgeoning literature on the TRC, this is perhaps the first full-length, independent English language documentary on the Commission made outside of South Africa.[4] Creators Deborah Hoffmann and Frances Reid are veteran American filmmakers who specialize in exploring contemporary social issues in the United States, and they produced this documentary primarily for an American audience. Filmed over a period of two and a half years during which testimony took place, the film is organized around four cases, each chosen for the aspect of the Commission's work or moral problem that it highlights. In each story, both perpetrators as well as relatives of murdered individuals are interviewed. Thus one of the film's strengths is the variety of perspectives it presents on South Africa's recent past. This conveys to some extent the contested nature of the process of constructing a dominant version of South African history and society underway today. Interspersed between the four stories are brief clips of TRC commissioners, Chairperson Archbishop Desmond Tutu, and journalists who explain the Commission's mandate and procedures. For these and other reasons, the film would be valuable for those who teach South African history, a resource made richer by the accompanying study guide that includes essays and exercises developed for facilitators. <p> Moreover, the film will find an audience beyond those concerned with South Africa. Recently I attended a public screening of the film organized by the Centre for Dispute Resolution at the University of Victoria in British Columbia, Canada. Afterwards there was a discussion among the viewers, about thirty people, that I found revelatory. Almost none referred to South Africa; most made connections to the film that were either local or global in scope. Many spoke about the current struggles on the part of First Nations peoples in British Columbia who are engaged in a difficult, highly fraught process of treaty negotiations over land claims with the provincial and federal governments. One Native Canadian was moved to tears by parallels

he identified between poverty-stricken Africans and his own community. Others discussed the timeliness and relevance of the film in light of the bombing of Afghanistan in response to September 11. Only a South African exchange student and I situated the film's contents in the context of South Africa itself. <p> These kinds of international linkages to the TRC are precisely what the film producers are hoping for. Inspired by South Africans' attempt to deal with their past through truth telling, they are evidently hopeful Americans can learn from the experience, and made the film at least in part to prompt consideration of replicating the process at home. This is made explicit in their study guide that is organized with the intention of sparking discussion about race relations in American history and contemporary society, and includes comparative essays on the United States and South Africa, along with observations on various models of justice and dispute resolution. With their documentary, Hoffmann and Reid aim to do more than simply chronicle events in South Africa; they want to promote social justice wherever possible. They hope viewers will "begin an exciting, illuminating path of discovery and action for you and your community - a journey toward greater understanding, healing and transformation." [5] <p> <cite>Long Night's Journey into Day</cite> has received a great deal of recognition and appreciation from the mainstream American film industry. Most notably it won the Grand Jury Prize for Best Documentary at the Sundance Film Festival and received an Oscar nomination for Best Documentary. The film's website cites enthusiastic comments by Oprah Winfrey and Alice Walker, among many others. California Newsreel, a non-profit documentary production and distribution center representing the film, calls it, somewhat prematurely, "the definitive record of one of the most ambitious and innovative attempts at social reconciliation without precedent in human history." [6] It is repeatedly praised as "powerful" by enthusiastic critics. As someone who used to watch the weekly review of TRC proceedings on Sunday nights on South African public television, I believe it would be difficult not to produce a powerful film on this topic. Every week, it seemed, one witnessed the suffering of victims physically overcome by painful emotions. Sometimes a perpetrator, like Brian Mitchell for example, attempted to reconcile with a community he had murderously brutalized. By its very nature, South Africa's recent history as played out through the TRC is intensely emotional and dramatic. And with its cast of characters representing good, evil, and the moral grey zone in between, and the staging of proceedings as political theatre, the TRC provides great appeal to audiences

(this is discussed further below). As a subject matter it is perfect for a visual medium like film. <p> Much of the film's appeal lies in its emphasis on inspiring aspects of the Commission's work. This is exemplified by the first story which deals with the amnesty applications of the four young black men who murdered Amy Biehl, a white American student who was in South Africa to support the struggle to end apartheid and give birth to democracy. She was stoned, beaten and stabbed to death in 1992 in the Cape Town township of Guguletu after driving a friend home, just a day before she was scheduled to return to the United States. The men who were convicted and imprisoned for her murder argued at their TRC hearing that the killing was a political act; they thought Amy Biehl was a South African and therefore saw the opportunity to kill her as a way to strike out against apartheid. The filmmakers focus on the response to this atrocity on the part of her parents, who chose not to oppose the amnesty applications. <p> In fact Linda and Peter Biehl did more than merely withhold protest; they openly and wholeheartedly endorsed the TRC by participating in the amnesty hearing in support of the applicants. The segment also includes the emotional meeting that occurred between the Biehls and Evelyn Manquina, the mother of one of the killers, who had previously expressed to them deep grief and sympathy over the death of their daughter. Almost unbelievably, we witness the parents of victim and victimizer embrace and comfort one another. Through this story we see the kind of forgiveness and reconciliation promoted and attainable through the TRC process. <p> The second segment is about the 1985 murder by police of the Cradock Four, a group including Matthew Goniwe and Fort Calata, two black leaders of the liberation struggle in a rural area. It centres on the attempt by Eric Taylor, a former member of the South African Security Police, to gain amnesty and receive forgiveness for his part in the killings from the widows of the two slain activists. Taylor is an example of a white perpetrator of a gross human rights violation who appears genuinely haunted by what he has done and sincerely desirous to be forgiven. Like the Biehls, Taylor is a model of moral courage and his story is also uplifting and hopeful. What is more interesting about this segment, however, are the responses to his plea by the widows of Goniwe and Calata. Mrs. Goniwe refuses to absolve Taylor, saying it was not her responsibility to ease his conscience. Nomonde Calata is more open to doing so—as much for her own sake as for his, explaining she too “wants to overcome this thing. I don't want to live with it my whole life.” However, sickened and angered by new revelations about events surrounding the brutal murder

of her beloved husband, Mrs. Calata shows us that the struggle to forgive can be extremely difficult and painful, and one whose outcome is by no means predictable. <p> The next segment focuses on an act of extreme violence committed in the struggle to overthrow apartheid, namely the 1985 bombing of Magoo's Bar in Durban by a member of the armed wing of the ANC. The attack killed three white women and injured sixty-nine others. The man mainly responsible, Robert McBride, was convicted of the bombing and initially sentenced to death, but was pardoned as a result of negotiations between the ANC and the NP in the run up to the democratic transition. His application for amnesty was opposed by the sister of one of the victims. This woman is an ambiguous and interesting subject. At first during interviews she states that the bombing shook many whites out of their cocoon of ignorance and complacency regarding life under apartheid, implying an openness of mind about her country's past. But further on she appears completely closed to the TRC process, and unwilling to view events from McBride's point of view. She comes across as someone unable to acknowledge her white privilege and, sadly, goes so far as to deny the implicit support apartheid received from most whites during its forty-two years' existence. <p> This portion of the film is also notable for McBride's critique of the TRC, as he is the only person featured in the documentary who directly criticizes the Commission. He cites the popular opinion of many ANC members and supporters that the even-handed approach towards apartheid's supporters and opponents is problematic. He points out that comparing the members of the regime to anti-apartheid activists is like comparing World War Two allies to the Nazis. In other words, the TRC morally neutralized the difference between the two sides fighting over the future of South Africa, thereby insulting those who risked their lives in order to create a more just and humane society. As he himself points out, McBride has spent more time in jail than any apartheid minister, and though he has apologized to the families of his victims, “no one has apologized to me yet,” for either oppressing him as a “Coloured” South African or benefitting from his oppression. Yet regardless of his stance, McBride decided to participate in the process, for “with all its faults, the TRC is really the only institutional vehicle that addresses the issue of reconciliation.” <p> The final section of the film is about the murder of the Guguletu Seven, a group of young black men shot to death in an apparently premeditated attack organized by Vlakplaas, a South African special police unit, and members of the Cape Town police. Through investigation of this event and interviews with mothers of the dead

youth, viewers see aspects of how deeply South African society was divided and disfigured by the systematic segregation of “races” geographically, socially, economically and politically until 1990. Moreover, the camera silently and succinctly sums up the ongoing extreme economic disparity between whites and blacks by scanning streets with plain, small homes in a crowded black township and the spacious, lovely houses (complete with black maids) located on clean, tree-lined streets in white neighbourhoods. <p> Through this case we also witness once again the effort made by some perpetrators to find redemption in the post-apartheid era, and the attempt by survivors of the dead-parents (most often mothers), wives and sisters– to forgive. Particularly poignant are the scenes of a private meeting between Thapelo Mbelo, the black constable and member of Vlakplaas seeking forgiveness for his role in the massacre, and the mothers of the dead boys. The way Mbelo humbly faces the mothers, the look of suffering in his eyes as he accepts what the women have to say, the mothers’ rage at his betrayal of his own people, are stunning to see. Furthermore, after hearing his answers to their questions, a number of the women announce they forgive him. At the public screening I attended, there were few dry eyes in the room after this scene. Here, and indeed throughout the film, African mothers emerge as the moral centre of the TRC process. Perhaps, given their consistent sensitivity to the untold suffering of African mothers, the feminist filmmakers are even suggesting that these women are the moral centre of South Africa as a whole. <p> <cite>Long Night’s Journey Into Day</cite> will be a rich, useful pedagogical resource in classrooms and community centres today. Certainly, a film of such high quality and constructed with such palpable passion for their project will enhance non-South Africans’ knowledge of the country’s turbulent past and understanding of present attempts at reconstruction. Nevertheless, there are two aspects of the film that are problematical. The first problem is how Hoffman and Reid framed their project. After a very brief introduction of a few minutes in which to establish the context of the TRC, the film plunges into the first of the four stories: the murder of Amy Biehl. It also ends with reference to Ms. Biehl. This case literally encircles the documentary. In the introduction to the guide to their film, the filmmakers explain why they chose the story: <p> “Knowing that our primary audience would be American, we wanted a case that had an American connection. The Amy Biehl case was, in fact, the only TRC case involving an American. But more important than that, we found both Amy Biehl’s parents, Peter and Linda, and Mongezi Manquina’s mother, Evelyn, to be

inspiring people, and we were looking for stories that inspired and showed the heights of human behavior – especially since apartheid had been an example of the depths to which people can sink.” [7] <p> Unquestionably, the Beihls’ remarkable ability to forgive their daughter’s killers is deeply moving and a great example of the possibility for reconciliation. What is questionable, however, is the privileging of this story over all others. Given the millions of black South Africans who were systematically denied their civil rights and the thousands killed under apartheid, it is hard not to conclude that the filmmakers would have done better to at least begin the narrative with a more representative example of the human rights crimes committed in South Africa. One also wonders about the need to engage American audiences via the story of a slain compatriot. Audiences of documentaries tend to be curious about the world, including people, places and events radically different from anything they have personally experienced. I suspect Reid and Hoffman underestimated the arresting quality of the tragic stories of common, everyday South Africans and their ability to spellbind viewers anywhere, including the United States, who are interested in the TRC. Like the history of Nazism, South Africa’s apartheid past is endlessly thought-provoking, disturbing and fascinating; lifting up the sole American case before the TRC above the thousands of others was inappropriate and doubtless unnecessary. <p> The filmmakers’ comments cited earlier regarding the Biehl case leads to the second criticism. In their admiration for South Africa’s experiment in restorative justice and their laudable quest for stories that can inspire social change, Hoffmann and Reid present a relatively uncritical and too optimistic view of the TRC and its achievements. In effect we are presented with the official story of the TRC, and this has resulted in an overly simplified interpretation of events. In other words, the desire to inspire drained from the film too much of the complexity of the Truth Commission and watered down many South Africans’ intense ambivalence towards it. Viewers would have been better served by a harder look at the TRC’s weaknesses and complexities, and at South Africa’s profoundly challenging attempt to achieve reconciliation. <p> In his introduction to the TRC Report, Chairperson Tutu, in trademark honest, forthright fashion, acknowledges some of the criticisms that have been levelled at the Commission. For example, he writes of the concern of many South Africans that the amnesty provision might “encourage impunity because it seemed to sacrifice justice.”[8] He responds by pointing out that amnesty applicants must admit responsibility for their crimes “in the full glare of publicity,”

leading some perpetrators' families and communities to learn that apparently decent men were in fact involved in heinous acts of torture and murder. Thus, he writes, "there is...a price to be paid. Public disclosure results in public shaming, and sometimes a marriage may be a sad casualty as well." [9] Yet many have asked whether this price is high enough. <p> Tutu is doubtless correct when he states that the TRC embodied a necessary political compromise. He writes, <p> "There is no doubt that members of the security establishment would have scuppered the negotiated settlement had they thought they were going to run the gauntlet of trials for their involvement in past violations. It is certain that we would not, in such circumstances, have experienced a reasonably peaceful transition from repression to democracy. We need to bear this in mind when we criticise the amnesty provisions in the Commission's founding Act." [10] <p> Wise words. However, the anger and bitterness that the amnesty provision has caused is downplayed too far in the film. Some of the interviewees, from commissioners to family members of victims, do refer to their difficulty in accepting the amnesty process. But the filmmakers tend to follow such scenes with more uplifting images or comments referring back to the need for forgiveness. For example, when the mothers of the Guguletu Seven meet face to face with Thapelo Mbelo, it is clear at the outset that many are consumed with pain and fury. Yet the scene ends when a mother apparently forgives him. This ideal ending is underlined, in visual terms, with slow motion scenes of a mother hugging Mbelo, leaving us with a wonderfully hopeful, positive picture of South Africans resolving their past differences and moving together into a brighter future. In effect we are provided with the obligatory happy ending. We apparently witness closure, as psychologists would say. Yet, however moving and comforting such scenes might be to some viewers, what is seriously in question is how representative they are of the mass of victims of apartheid. <p> Another major problem some observers found with the TRC was its limited focus on gross human rights violations. The Commission was concerned solely with violations of bodily integrity rights, such as the right to life, security of the person, freedom from torture, and freedom from inhuman treatment. Yet, as the TRC Report itself agrees, these are not the only fundamental human rights of citizens. Subsistence rights – the right to food, shelter, basic health care and so on – are equally important. As the Report states, "when subsistence rights are violated . rights to political participation and freedom of speech become meaningless." [11] But violations of subsistence rights committed during apartheid – such

as, for example, forced removals from traditional lands and relocations into barren bantustans, or the deliberate development of second-rate "bantustan education" – and their longterm costs were beyond the Commission's purview. <p> It is true that we must remember that the TRC is but one instrument of transformation in the new South Africa. Yet its narrow focus has been criticized and warranted scrutiny in the film. So does the argument that without wealth redistribution in South Africa, a country still notorious for its vast disparities in material wealth along class lines, meaningful reconciliation is a fantasy. As the filmmaker's study guide points out, South Africa's income disparities were the fourth largest in the world during the late 1990s, with the bottom 20% of the South African population receiving less than 3% of the nation's total income and the top 20% receiving almost 65%. It would have been useful to include this sobering reference in the film and to ask how fair it is to urge the vast, mainly black poor to reconcile with those who are still benefitting from the past. <p> There are numerous other aspects of the TRC that South African commentators found problematic, even objectionable, none of which are touched upon by the filmmakers. Nthabiseng Motsemme and Kopano Ratele write about some of them. For example, they note how the TRC, coloured with a well-intended nationalism, "sought to celebrate a heroic and selfless past that gave birth to the new South Africa" through individuals' testimony. But by analysing the process through a gender lens, they highlight how women's testimonies reveal a different version of the liberation struggle from men's, thereby demonstrating that there are competing and uneven recollections of the past at odds with the aims of nation-making. [12] <p> Motsemme and Ratele critique how the TRC "appropriated familiar tropes of black women [as powerful matriarchs] and their painful words of injustice to inscribe a specific national consciousness," a process they say marginalizes black women even further in South African society. They, Belinda Bozzoli, and many others have also discussed the TRC as performance ritual and political theatre, which raises further important points. For example, in situating its proceedings within Christian discourse and symbols of forgiveness and healing, the TRC set out to transform individuals' resentment, anger, hatred and guilt into acceptance, wholeness, forgiveness, and confession. Set in churches and community halls and with Archbishop Tutu presiding, the TRC "permitted pain to be revealed but...discourage[d] anger and vengeance to be demonstrated." [13] This privileging of Christian notions of forgiveness and healing over all others, including indigenous African ones, has been

challenged,[14] as has the idea that all crimes are ultimately forgivable.[15] <p> Finally, the film is not explicit enough regarding the refusal of many white South Africans to accept the TRC process as legitimate. While it does show numerous white perpetrators asking for amnesty, the creators do not clearly enough explain that many were doing so out of fear of the alternative: prosecution and imprisonment. <p> The film does not allude to unpleasant truths such as the refusal, despite subpoenas and threats of prosecution, of former state president and chairperson of the State Security Council P.W. Botha to present himself to the Commission. This kind of arrogance and refusal to acknowledge the vast damage done under apartheid is probably the least inspiring aspect of the whole TRC story. In his introduction to the TRC Report, Tutu states, "...the greatest sadness that we have encountered in the Commission has been the reluctance of white leaders to urge their followers to respond to the remarkable generosity of spirit shown by the victims.[16] This reluctance, indeed this hostility, to the Commission has been like spitting in the face of the victims." My sense is that the film suggests South Africans are generally reconciling. Sadly, the reality, though certainly hopeful, is less edifying than implied in <cite>Long Night's Journey Into Day</cite>. <p> Notes <p> [1]. 26 July 1995, "The Mandate," <cite>The Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report</cite> (Cape Town: The Commission, 1998) vol. 1, ch. 4, p. 1. <p> [2]. "TRC: The facts," BBC Online Network, Wednesday, Oct. 28, 1998. See: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/special\\$<cite\\$>\\$report/1998/10/98/truth\\$</cite\\$>\\$and_r ecconciliation](http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/special/$cite$>$report/1998/10/98/truth$</cite$>$and_r ecconciliation) <p> [3]. Ibid. <p> [4]. Some titles in this rapidly growing field include: <p> Kader Asmal, Louise Asmal and Ronald Suresh Roberts, <cite>Reconciliation Through Truth: A Reckoning of Apartheid's Criminal Governance</cite> (Cape Town: D. Philip ; Bellville: Mayibuye Books, 1996) <p> Belinda Bozzoli, "Public Ritual and Private Transition: The Truth and Reconciliation Commission in Alexandra Township, South Africa 1996," <cite>African Studies</cite>, vol. 57 (2), 1998, pp. 167-96 <p> A. Brink, <cite>Reinventing a Continent</cite> (London: Seeker & Warburg, 1996) <p> Karin Chubb and Lutz van Dijk, <cite>Between Anger and Hope: South Africa's Youth and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission</cite> (Johannesburg, 2001) <p> <cite>Facing the Truth: South African Faith Communities and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission</cite>, eds. James Cochrane, John de Gruchy, Stephen Martin (Cape Town: D. Philip; Athens: Ohio University Press, 1999) <p> David Dyzenhaus,

Truth, <cite>Reconciliation and the Apartheid Legal Order</cite> (Kenwyn, 1998): Published in the UK as <cite>Judging the judges, judging ourselves.</cite> (Oxford : Hart Publishing, 1998). <p> Brandon Hamberg, "Dealing with the Past and the Psychology of Reconciliation: The Truth and Reconciliation Commission, a Psychological Perspective," (Johannesburg, Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (CSVR) 1995) <p> Brandon Hamber, Tlhoki Mofokeng and Graeme Simpson, "Evaluating the Role and Function of Civil Society in a Changing South Africa: The Truth and Reconciliation Commission as a Case Study," (Johannesburg, CSVR,1998) <p> <cite>After theTRC : Reflections on Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa</cite>, eds. Wilmot James and Linda Van De Vijver (Athen, OH: Ohio University Press, 2001) <p> Antjie Krog, <cite>Country of My Skull</cite> (Johannesburg: Random House, 1998) <p> Mahmood Mamdani, <cite>When Does Reconciliation Turn into a Denial of Justice?</cite> (Pretoria: HSRC Publishers, 1998; am Molutshungu memorial lectures; no. 1) <p> Monique Marks, "Community Policing, Human Rights and the Truth Commission," (Johannesburg, CSVR,1995) <p> L. Marx, "Slouching Towards Bethlehem: Ubu and the Truth Commission," <cite>African Studies</cite>, vol. 57 (2), 1998, pp. 209-20 <p> Piet Meiring, <cite>Chronicle of the Truth Commission: A Journey through the Past and Present into the Future of South Africa</cite> (Vanderbijlpark: Carpe Diem Books, 1999) <p> Martin Meredith, <cite>Coming to Terms: South Africa's Search for Truth</cite> (New York: Public Affairs, 1999) <p> Nthabiseng Motsemme & Kopano Ratele, "Losing life and re-making nation at the Truth and Reconciliation Commission," in eds. N. Duncan et al. <cite>Discourses on Difference and Oppression in South Africa</cite> (Cape Town, forthcoming) <p> <cite>Negotiating the Past: the Making of Memory in South Africa</cite>, eds. Sarah Nuttall & Carli Coetzee (Cape Town: Oxford University Press, 1998) <p> Wendy Orr, <cite>From Biko to Basson: Wendy Orr's Search for the Soul of South Africa as a Commissioner of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission</cite> (Saxonwold, SA: Contra Press, 2000) <p> Graeme Simpson, "A Brief Evaluation of South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission: Some Lessons for Societies in Transition," (Johannesburg, CSVR, 1998) <p> <cite>Confession and Reconciliation: A Challenge to the Churches in South Africa</cite>, ed. C.W. du Toit (Pretoria: Research Institute for Theology & Religion Unisa, 1998) <p> <cite>Truths Drawn in Jest: Commentary on the TRC

<https://networks.h-net.org/h-safrica>

URL: <http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=15017>

Copyright © 2002 by H-Net, all rights reserved. H-Net permits the redistribution and reprinting of this work for nonprofit, educational purposes, with full and accurate attribution to the author, web location, date of publication, originating list, and H-Net: Humanities & Social Sciences Online. For any other proposed use, contact the Reviews editorial staff at hbooks@mail.h-net.org.