

https://dspace.org/

The TRC: a project of public education

Williams, Carin

1999-06-14T11:40:33Z
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/8109

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

1999.

WILLIAMS, C

The TRC: a project of Public Education

Carin Williams

One of the main aims of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission[1] is nation-building. This is evident in the fact that the newly, democratically elected government of 1994 has given it its full support. My aim in this paper is to investigate the TRC and its mechanisms to see whether it can be interpreted as a project for public education. The term public education conjures up a picture of the formal school system, of which learning is the primary objective. People tend to think of public education as schooling provided by the government for its citizens. Paid for by the public purse, but in this paper I want to re-examine the widely accepted concept of public education and broaden its circumference.

The TRC has as part of its purpose to foster a shared identity. And the concept public seems to be at the forefront when it comes to the TRC because the workings of the commission is a public process. The TRC can provide a playing field, an educational experience and act as a sort of catalyst for nation-building insofar as it can pave the way for tolerance, multi-culturalist approach (given the plurality of our present society) and reconciliation.

This paper is written in three sections. The first section is essentially an effort to 'define' the type of truth commission the TRC is. In 'defining' the TRC it is hoped to bring out the characteristic which makes it a unique truth commission. The following section is on education and how the TRC correlates with education, especially as it occurs in a school setup and the term 'public' as in making public and who is the public. This is followed by a conclusion.

South Africa is not unique when it comes to truth commissions. From 1974 to 1994

alone there had been some twenty different truth commissions' In countries like Chile, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Argentina, etc. In South Africa alone there were quite a number of commissions already. From early twentieth century with Emily Hobhouse's efforts to establish a commission regarding the female victims of the Anglo-Boer War/ South African War, right up to our recent truth commissions like the *Skweyiya* Commission of 1992 as well as the *Motsuenyane* Commission of 1993. There was thus an articulation for the need for a truth commission which was enacted through the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act of 1995.

This is the TRC which is constituted by a Committee on Human Rights violations, Committee on Amnesty, and a Committee on Reparations and Rehabilitation. This commission was to deal with alleged violations that occurred during the period 1 March 1960 to 5 December 1993, which was later extended until 20 May 1994.

The aims of the TRC and, as such, the task that it perceives itself to be doing are:

> *To promote national unity and reconciliation in a spirit of understanding which transcends the conflicts and divisions of the past by:*
> *-establishing as complete a picture as possible of the causes, nature and extent of the gross violations of human rights which were committed in the above mentioned period, including its antecedents, circumstances, factors and context of such violations by conducting investigations and holding hearings.*
> *-facilitating the granting of amnesty to persons who make full disclosure of all the relevant facts associated with a political objective and comply with the requirements of Ponura*
> *-establishing and making known the fate and whereabouts of victims and by restoring the human and civil dignity of such victims by granting them an opportunity to relate their own accounts of the violations of which they are the victims, and by recommending reparation measures in respect of them.*

-compiling a report providing as comprehensive as possible to the activities and the

findings of the commission contemplated in the paragraphs above.[3]

So we have a TRC - what makes it different, what makes it distinctive from other truth commissions?

There are three main paths which can be taken by a country setting up a truth commission, namely: (1) legal trials, (2) purges and (3) a commission.[4] The choice of path, as well as the extent to which it can be followed, depends heavily on the character of the preceding dispensation, the manner of transition and the particular situation that the succeeding infant democracy would find itself in.[5]

Let me first consider the path of legal trials:[6] I refer briefly to the trial route which was attempted by Argentina, which was not a very successful exercise, in an attempt to show that there are definitely serious problems with this route. What is distinctive about trials is that someone is found guilty or innocent. It assumes that there are clearly distinguishable people or groups of people that are definitely the victims (those who were made to disappear or maimed) and those who are definitely perpetrators (the army, police officers, members of the death squads, etc.) But trials were a failure in Argentine for example where there was a powerful military which could put an end to the trials brought against them and even won pardons for those already convicted. Another example that comes to mind is the one of Bomber Harris, the British commander of the bombing of Dresden in World War II. He was never arraigned at the Nuremberg trials simply because he happened to be on the 'winning' side.

The trial strategy also assumes that there are these stark distinctions between guilty and innocent. What is supposed to happen in the cases where repression was broad based.[7] The Latin American experience may be contrasted with what happened in central Europe where repression was broad rather than deep. In Central Europe regimes were kept in power by a much larger number of people, than was the case

in Argentina, exerting covert repression and pressure on a much larger number of people. Lots of people were caught in the middle, no clear distinctions between victims and perpetrators, because suppression happened by means of everyday mendacity, conformity and compromise."

But, there are several crucial reasons why trials can be beneficial: (a) prosecution can lead to the punishment of the perpetrators of human rights violation. This may enhance the cause of the building or reconstructing of a morally just order insofar as it at least goes some way towards establishing a just order. Trials may help to heal wounds and repair the private and public damage the antecedent regime provoked. (b) Trials can help in establishing and upholding a young democracy that succeeds the authoritarian system. It can help to strengthen a fragile democracy such as we are experiencing at the moment. Prosecution is necessary to assert supremacy of democratic values and norms to encourage the public to believe in them. Failure to prosecute can lead to popular distrust and cynicism. (c) prosecution can help deter future transgressions by the military or security forces. (d) Trials can also exemplify and strengthen the rule of law and (e) they can contribute to public knowledge to some sense of wider catharsis."

On the other hand, trials might assume that 'all' the wrongs committed were by the previous regime. The 'winners' conduct and control trials under the assumption that everything they did must be beyond question because 'it' achieved the 'triumph' of democracy. Partisan justice, rule of law infringements, or human rights abuses always lurk in the background where there is always a hunger for power, political power, and prosecution can also have a destabilising effect on an immature democracy. Young democracies affirm that they highly value the rule of law and human rights, but post-transitional justice can involve a number of decisions that may trespass those very legal and moral principles. Prosecution can be a risky affair insofar as it can force a successor elite in its infancy to violate the principles that they

hold dear which they have fought for while they are judging the undemocratic behaviour of the past elite. Trails can even threaten the legitimacy of the young democracy. A young democracy is a frail construct which makes the tolerance of the handling of past abuses a prerequisite for the survival of the new democracy because of the risk of destabilisation which may occur when pursuing the route of trials in an attempt to deal with the past.

The argument that trials could serve to deter future transgressions by military and security forces is hardly applicable in a true, albeit new, democracy when law and order has been restored during the transition. Another problem with trials is also about *who* defines 'law and order'. Simply those currently in power?

It is also hard to say whether these trials can exemplify and strengthen the rule of law. Referring back to the case of trials contributing to some sense of wider catharsis, T.G. Ash cites the trial of Erich Honecker[iii] and concludes that such cases do not contribute much to any sense of popular catharsis, and as far as public knowledge is concerned, the thousands of pages of legal argument did little to illuminate the 'true' history of the past regime.

Purges or more neutrally put 'administrative disqualification' or lustrace implies both illumination and purification. There are a number of countries which used purges as a way to deal with their past, e.g. Poland, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, etc. But in purges, like in trials, there is a tendency that it can degenerate into focussing on (evil) individuals and they lose sight of collective consciousness. In countries there lustrace took place, there was also a strong suggestion that there are no short cuts - meaning that one has to disqualify all wrongdoers and perpetrators. Another question then arises; "what about the rights of the wrongdoers and perpetrators?" Arguments that these people have rights as well do come into the equation. E.g. you cannot take away somebody's livelihood, or even the pensions which they have

worked for. Even convicted murderers are not denied their pensions.

Purging or lustrace could also mean labelling people. To label or categorise people in any context is dangerous and contains in itself unjust criteria. Lustrace would be like retribution. If lustrace were to take place in South Africa, as the call at some stage had been, there would then have been the danger that we could be left with very few people in government, in the police, army and security forces, etc. Just imagine who would qualify to replace all people in the areas mentioned above - what criteria would be used? Who will qualify? The key point in the South African scenario is that "systems" actually trapped "individuals" in them on both sides of the conflict.

South Africa opted for the third option - the one of a truth commission. This path seems to be most suited to a post-apartheid country where the regime was kept in place by most of the people living in the country." One could go so far as to say that the regime was kept in power less by direct coercion than by everyday tissue of lies but that would be difficult to justify. Maintaining ANY political system requires telling the story in a particular way - and your political opponents can always find grounds for the accusation of deliberate deception.

There might be similarities between the ways in which a number of countries dealt with their pasts and the TRC, and even though the TRC seems to be modelled on the Chilean example, there is a stark difference. The TRC hearings are 'public' and not private as was the case in Chile. South Africa, after much deliberation and consultation decided on a truth commission that would be a benefit to all the citizens of South Africa. A commission that would : restore dignity to those who suffered, grant amnesty upon a full disclosure, bind people and make all feel part of the 'new' South Africa, eradicate divisions in South African society, enhance the democratic state South Africa wants to settle into, etc.

The survival of democracy, as is the case in South Africa, partly relies on a combination of equality and quality. In other words respect for fellow human beings. This respect is a respect that combines critical rationality on the one hand and a sense for those forces in people and life which reach beyond the merely given on the other hand. This respect can be realized through education.

The question: "why do we educate?", I feel, is an appropriate question to start with. The word why is not only a stimulating term, but it is also a complex little word. Education has to do with our physical organism, our communal life and ethical motives inherent in our cultures. These three aspects are interconnected and not separate departments of our real world, as suggested by the previous sentence. Thus even when there is talk about three logical categories, namely biological, sociological and ethical points of view, these are actually related, connected parts of our complex living world.

Most of human activities can be reduced by force and by tricks of logic to a survival tendency, and what immediately comes to my mind are those pre-historical parents who lived in the Ice Age. They had to teach their children a new 'curriculum' in how to fish whereas they themselves had only to learn how to hunt mammals and fend off the sabre tooth. This was done to prepare their children for survival in an age where mammals were getting scarcer and the weather patterns were changing. But that does not prove self-preservation to be the primary and conscious motivation for all actions.[12]

Halt. This sounds suspiciously like education is for mere survival alone. This is not true, there is more to education than mere survival. The essence of being human lies in the desire for life, not only as a biological datum, but as something which is worth having and which provides a reality which she/he can love for its inherent wealth and value. Something like self-realisation which can be almost anything under the sun. This self-realisation is found through the media of innumerable motives.

attachments, actions as well as the feelings that accompany them. Many of these afore-mentioned factors can run counter to the tendency of self preservation or survival.[13] Thus human society presupposes not merely passive reaction to natural 'laws' like self preservation which assumes instincts, but spontaneous co-operation and, on higher levels, will, intellect and choice.

Education in its wider sense is going on everywhere, even in times when people are not aware of it. People are educated by landscape (natural and political) and architecture, by people they meet, by their treatment of others and vice versa, by their play, work, leisure, by the disguised and open propaganda that surrounds them, and by the latent and overt ideals and ideologies of the society in which they live. In other words, in this view all of life is educational with no exemptions.[14]

This bring me to a point where I want to mention the functions and aspects of formal education. Formal education such as schooling provides/enables efficiency in learning. In present society most of our children, if deprived of the services of formal educational institutions such as schools, would be exposed to greater moral danger and neglect than the children of medieval peasants.

Formal education also extends horizons insofar as schooling also means teaching the child to recognise interests that transcends the individual, to know its duty in the community, and know its part in co-operative undertakings. The child learns to respect children of different social classes, all of whom are supposedly given a fair chance to learn and compete with each other. The child then has the opportunity to grow socially as well as individually.

Formal education also provides training for full use of human resources. However, full human potential and resources in this sense does not mean training to steal as education also has a moral/ethical side attached to it which lends itself to positive

outcomes which are not to the detriment of the society. I should just mention now that formal education in this sense is a lot like people think of when confronted with the term public education.

Public education, for the average person means schooling. However, this is a rather impoverished idea of education. Not all of schooling is education. There are lots of learning that take place and as societies modernise schools are set up to promote learning. Only some aspects of schooling is educational and most of the activities in schools are learning in preparation for the adult world that children will enter into at the end of their school careers.
But that type of public education, funded by the public purse, governed by the public, whether it is private or public schools, is not the type of education I am talking about when I use the term public education. Public education is the education of people. Education with the aim to see themselves as e.g. belonging to a nation, a community, with a civil duty, to foster unity, to create a sense of belonging to an "imagined" community.

Let us take a look at a hospital. Hospitals has a formal aim of treating sick people which defines it as an institution. Likewise one gets legal courts, prisons, etc., which formal aims defines it as an institution. This formal aim distinguishes it from other institutions and attached to these formal aims are its functions, all working co-operatively to make the institution what it is. But let me take a closer look at the example of a hospital whose formal aim is to treat people merely suggests just an aspect of a hospital and its function. There is also a preventative treatment that is attached to the formal aim of treating illnesses and symptoms. Hospital staff might also educate mothers to feed their children with a well-balanced diet. This is not part of the formal aim of hospitals, but it contributes to the formal aim and is not separated from the formal aim.[15] It thus results in people who are better educated in terms of health procedures and preventative measures. In other words, the formal

aim of the hospital has a byproduct.

The TRC is a transitional, temporary setup, and not a permanent institution like a legal court or a hospital, with a pre-specified life. The TRC was essentially a commission of inquiry that was pre-specified , through Ponura[16], insofar as its lifespan and period of inquiry was concerned. But the TRC exhibits characteristics which make it appropriate to think of it as an institution. An institution with essential purposes which constitutes its formal aim. In its efforts to realize its aims which are stipulated in Ponura, the TRC exhibits crucial aspects of education. But it bears a semblance to the educational aspects exhibited by hospitals, etc. The TRC is not constituted of educators but in effect they can be viewed as educators. They might not be educational experts, but they act in a similar capacity as the nurse teaching the mothers to feed their children properly. The educational aspect is then a type of by-product.

In other words one can then agree that the TRC is engaged in a project of public education. But who is the public that they are educating? Public in terms of *who* is normally presented as the other of the official. Official would in this case be state institutions, commissions, etc. This type of reasoning results in a sense of public as located outside of official state institutions. The TRC attempts to break down this divide between public and official in its endeavours. To fulfill its aims, the TRC, an official state commission, was commissioned to produce the official history of South Africa's recent past alongside the public history gained through public intervention.

The public was invited my means of posters to be part and parcel of the proceedings in the writing of South Africa's official history of its recent past.[17]
The public (in lieu with the TRC's aims and its defining/distinctive characteristic) is the general public who was urged to participate and share in the official mechanisms set up by the TRC.[18] The TRC claimed to be 'giving voice to the voiceless"[19] and thus

tried to involve all people to participate in the proceedings. In fact they made it nearly impossible to remain silent or 'voiceless' by granting all citizens of South Africa the opportunity to assume their subject positions in the 'new' South Africa it was trying to create

For Alex Boraine, deputy chairperson of the TRC and the Human Rights Violations Committee voiceless meant not only the inability to speak, but it also meant to be heard by the state. For him the TRC presented a space/ a public space for making the voiceless air their memories. In the introduction, done by Alex Boraine, to a Human Rights Violations Committee hearing into the disappearance of Siphiwe Mthimkulu and Topsy Madaka of Wednesday, June 26, 1996, his view of voiceless was clearly spelt out :

> *"[...] you have travelled to East London [to appear at the Human Rights Violation Committee's first hearings in April 1996]. You and your husband were excited, at last you were going to have a chance to talk to a presidential commission, to the nation at large about [the poisoning and disappearance] of Siphiwe. This was denied you by a court interdict. You had no chance. We met with you and you very graciously agreed that you will come to the Port Elizabeth hearing [in May 1996] and you came, you sat over there and we waited and once again you were muzzled [by a court interdict], you couldn't speak. All of us were every angry and very upset, but you were remarkable. You too were upset, but you understood, because you knew that one day you would have an opportunity, and today is that day [...]"*

to Joyce Mthimkulu, mother of Siphiwe. For Desmond Mpilo Tutu, the chairperson of the TRC, voiceless meant the ones who "have never received any attention from the authorities or the media"[1]

But what happened in reality was a totally different case - the TRC selected those subjects that could capture and hold the national interest, those that were newsworthy. In other words those who were most eloquent and articulate to speak

for themselves as well as for the rest of South Africa - the nation.

The commissioners who conducted the hearings, where the 'voiceless' could speak, also controlled what the 'voiceless' person would make known to the rest of South Africa. There was an unequal interaction between "witnesses" (the 'voiceless') and the commissioners. The commissioners would lead witnesses and subjugate their testimonies, their stories to the national public memory that the TRC was entrusted to create as stipulated by Ponura regarding the final report. The author/creator of memory/public history/official history/official, public narrative/ the teacher is thus the TRC and not the 'voiceless' public.

Thus, the TRC claims to be giving voice to the voiceless, but those who were heard at the hearings were not ordinary people by everyday means and neither were they voiceless. In an article in the Cape Argus, Steven Robins argues that the TRC "privileged the experiences of a relatively small number" of people " by concentrating on issues of murder, kidnapping, detention and torture."[2] Also the testimonies of the so-called voiceless were mainly concerned with the fate of the victims of apartheid atrocities.

Another factor that one should also take cognisance of was that most of those who fell victim to the apartheid security forces were not victimised randomly. Those victims were usually prominent figures in their own communities (even if they were not acting in the official state discourse) because the security forces had a strategy which was one of identifying, isolating, victimising and eliminating political leaders in the struggle against apartheid. This also shows that these victims were not voiceless in their own communities. In fact these people were often revered in their own communities.

Thus what happened at the TRC hearings was that the 'stories of known, prominent

figures in the struggle were portrayed as the stories of the voiceless public'. In other words only the prominent activists were given a pedestal from which to speak while others, who might have suffered the same fate, were denied the opportunity by the TRC. This could easily have been the case that many people who were harassed by the security forces were harassed solely because they might have been seen together with these prominent political activists.

What does it then mean to be voiceless. According to Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, the voiceless means those who cannot speak, those who are subaltern.[3] The subaltern is thus an epistemological category of people marginalised to the extent of being denied a subject position from which to speak. Their stories are always told by others who speak on their behalf. The TRC obliterated Spivak's assertion of what it really means to be voiceless. But, still, even though the TRC claims to be providing a space for the voiceless to be heard, they retained the right to "carefully" select those who were given subject position from which to speak at the public hearings. These were usually the ones whose stories were of regional or national significance rather than individual stories.

Bear in mind that in an educational setting there is also an inherent unequal relationship between learner and facilitator/teacher. There is also a selection of materials which are suitable and desirable to include in the curriculum. The government in its selection of commissioners, made sure that they are 'suitable teachers' who were morally equipped for the job.

Furthermore, the commissioners went so far as to lead the testimony of those who were given a space to be heard so that it would fit in with the 'new' national narrative. The commission decided what was important for the national identity and the nation state and not the witnesses. This selection of who was allowed to tell their stories had to intersect with the 'new' nation, the narrative of pain that was being constructed by the TRC. This is evident in the utterances of the chairperson of the TRC,

Archbishop Desmond Tutu when he claims that 'all of us, we are a nation in need of healing'. Even the perpetrators of gross human rights violations were portrayed as victims.

What thus comes to light is that the TRC, in its aims to unify the new democratic nation, to build a new nation, created the illusion of having the 'voiceless' tell their own stories, which was 'authentic' stories, and of the new nation which wold be characterised by all citizens being victims of some sort. This had reverberations in some of the literary works on the TRC that has since seen the light. For example , I cannot help but think of Antjie Krog's Country of my skull which, when one reads through it, portrays the author as feeling ashamed, feeling partly responsible, feeling like a victim, even if she was not directly involved with the perpetration of gross human rights violations.

This is just but one part of the public that was referred to thus far. Those who were given a voice by the TRC. There is also another part to the issue of who is the public, which leads me to the public out there. Those who were not directly involved with the TRC. There is always the feeling by some members of the public that they are not part of the public sphere. To mention just one example one, just has to think of the Muslim community in Athlone who did not feel part or wanted to partake in the public spectacle which was the TRC.[4] The Haron family (Imam Haron who died in custody) for instance refused to become part of the TRC spectacle and did not support the TRC in its endeavours. They also influenced quite a number of people. This was thus a 'negative' reaction and as such one can argue that they withdrew from the public sphere if one follows Jürgen Habermas's notion of the public sphere. But Nancy Fraser's critique of the Habermassian notion of a public sphere, I feel, is a more appropriate way of defining the public sphere. It represents a more encompassing model which includes even those people who exclude themselves from the 'public sphere'. The mere fact that they show a reaction towards the TRC means that they

are affected by it, and even if they were in opposition to it, they can still be regarded as part of the public sphere. The so-called counter public.[5]

One can thus conclude that the TRC in the fact that it was a public process, reached the public out there through the mass media.

Public Education as in the view of the average person is also meant for the public and it is questionable whether everybody goes through the system, but that everybody is in one or the other way affected by it, is undeniable. The impact that the TRC will have is already felt and will continue to be felt by the citizens of South Africa. Jacques Derrida, in a public lecture, held at the University of the Western Cape on 10 August 1998, titled "Forgiving the Unforgivable" implicitly suggests that the final report on the TRC will not be the shutting down of a chapter of South Africa's 'dark past', but rather that it will and should be open for criticism and even further investigation and re-interpretation. He also stressed that further debate must continue. He also further mentioned that the TRC took on an impossible task because forgiveness is not unlimited, but it can be understood, and if it (the TRC) does achieve anything at all, it would be of psychological value to some people only.(Almost similar to therapy).

When one examines the correlations that the TRC has with an educational project, I feel strongly that the TRC should be regarded as an object of study which is amenable to being interpreted as a project of public education. It can transform people into rational, independent thinking citizens. The TRC cannot guarantee 'healing', unity, reconciliation etc. Similar to an educational project that does not guarantee you a soft job and settle you for life, but it can put you in a better position to achieve your aims. Similarly the TRC can facilitate nation-building when interpreted as a project for public education.

---

[1] Hereafter referred to as TRC.

[4] See T.G. Ash "The Truth About Dictatorship" in New York Review of Books. February 19, 1998.

[2] Hereafter referred to as Ponura.

[3] This is a short summary of the task of the TRC as set out in Ponura. For more details refer to Ponura.

[4] See T.G. Ash "The Truth about Dictatorship" in the New York Review of Books, February 19, 1998.

[5] If democracy is the outcome of transition.

[6] I will refrain from going into a detailed exposition about how trials were implemented in other countries as this will detract from the main focus of this paper which is not to make a comparative study. I will however mention a few examples in an effort to illuminate the TRC.

[7] I am using the term coined by Tina Rosenberg where she mentions that in the Latin American experience repression was deep and in Central Europe it was broad repression. See Tina Rosenberg in The Haunted land: Facing Europe's Ghosts After Communism (first edition), Random House, New York, 1995

[8] In such a case the question would be who does one put on trial.

[9] See T.G. Ash in New York Review of Books, p.37

[10] The trial of Erich Honecker was abandoned on the grounds of his ill health. He then flew off to spend his last months quietly in Chile.

[11] See Steven Robins, 'No-name people who kept cogs of Apartheid oiled', Cape Times, Wednesday, August 6, 1997.

[12]For example, just imagine parents watching children at play and work. They delight in the children's happiness, participate in their efforts, and are concerned with their welfare when they shall be left to their own devices and decisions. The parents' thoughts then turn to the familiar subject of education. What can they do to make *their children independent, self-supporting, happy and familiar with the values and* utilities of civilisation (or whatever level of civilisation their society is at).

[13] One just has to think of a parachutist, a diver, a soldier, etc. They risk their lives in *their jobs - 'occupational hazard'*

[14] This is reminiscent of the view held by advocates of lifelong learning.

[15] *Mothers feeding their children with well-balanced meals will ensure that the* children will not be disease prone or suffer from malnutrition, kwashiorkor, marasma, etc.

[16] Act 34 of 1995

[17] Think here of posters such as "Revealing is Healing", The Truth Hurts, Silence Kills, Revealing is Healing: Come and listen as people tell their stories.

[18] Here I am referring to the Human Rights Violations Committee especially.

[iv] See Greame Simpson in "providing a voice for the voiceless of SA" in the Weekend Argus, Sunday, December 16/17 1995.

[i] Tutu cited in Antjie Krog's Country of my Skull, Random House, 1998, pp.22-23.

[ii] See Steven Robins, "True national reconciliation is imperilled: TRC highlights the plight of the few, but the masses go begging", Cape Argus, Monday, February 17, 1997.

[iii] See Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak", in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds.) Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture, MacMillan Press, London, 1998, pp. 271-313.

[v]See Rehana Rossouw "Cape activists resist truth hearings" in Mail And Guardian, 26 April - 2 May 1996. Also see Ryan Cresswell "Group was focussed on discrediting TRC" in Cape Times, Wednesday, February 18, 1998..

[vi]See Nancy Fraser in Calhoun, C. (Ed.) Habermas and the Public Sphere, The MIT Press, Massachusetts, 1996, for a full discussion.