

**RECONCILIATION EFFORTS IN POST-CONFLICT SOCIETIES: A
COMPARISON OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN AND NIGERIAN TRUTH AND
RECONCILIATION COMMISSIONS**



**ABIEYUWA PEACE ADENOMON-OSAHON
ART2100486**

**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
FACULTY OF ARTS,
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN,
BENIN CITY.**

NOVEMBER 2025

**RECONCILIATION EFFORTS IN POST-CONFLICT SOCIETIES: A
COMPARISON OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN AND NIGERIAN TRUTH AND
RECONCILIATION COMMISSIONS**

BY

**ABIEYUWA PEACE ADENOMON-OSAHON
ART2100486**

**A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
HISTORY AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF BACHELOR OF ARTS (B.A.)
HONOURS DEGREE IN INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AND DIPLOMACY,
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN,
BENIN CITY.**

NOVEMBER 2025

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this work was carried out by **ABIEYUWA PEACE ADENOMON-OSAHON** in the Department of **HISTORY AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**, University of Benin, Benin City under my supervision.

Prof.E . A. Ifidon
Project Supervisor

Prof. J. C. Nwaka
Head of Department

Date

Date

DEDICATION

This research work is dedicated to the Almighty God. For giving me the strength to carry out this project work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost , I would like to thank GOD, my Father, for sustaining me, giving me strength, and encouragement through this journey, it's been God all the way .God Almighty has been my constant guide, and for this, I am forever grateful for his unconditional and endless love , mercy and grace.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my supervisor, Prof.E . A. Ifidon for his enthusiasm , patience, insightful comments and support throughout this research project. Your mentorship has been instrumental in my academic growth and your immense knowledge has enabled me to complete this research successfully.

My profound gratitude goes to my lecturers, Prof. Eddy Erhagbe, Dr. Frank Ikponwosa , Dr. Charles Osarumwense, Mrs Osewgie, amongst others.their impactful teaching which laid a critical foundation for this project.

To my family, special thanks to my wonderful family, thank you for the encouragement and understanding provided the foundation for my academic pursuits. I am especially grateful to my Dad Mr Adenom Osahon, and my Mom Mrs Adenom comfort and My Aunty, Aunty Sandra I am deeply grateful for the financial support, prayers , unwavering love and encouragement. I honor you all.

To my dear friends, Tolu and Obehi for the encouragement and unwavering support. Thanks for the laughter, memories and adventures shared. I Love You All.

I am deeply grateful to everyone who has contributed to the successful completion of this program.

May God Bless You All And Continue To Strengthen You In All You Do

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	i
Certification-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ii
Dedication-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iii
Acknowledgment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iv
Table of Content	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	vi

Chapter One: Background of the Study

Chapter Two: The Idea and Purpose of Truth Commissions

Chapter Three: The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission

Chapter Four: The Nigerian Truth Commission (The Oputa Panel): Purposes and Outcomes

Chapter Five: Comparative Analysis of the South African and Nigerian Truth and Reconciliation Commissions

Conclusion

Bibliography

Abstract

This study examines reconciliation efforts in post-conflict societies through a comparative analysis of South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and Nigeria's Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC), popularly known as the Oputa Panel. Both commissions were established to address decades of state-sponsored violence, promote national healing, and facilitate democratic renewal following systemic abuses apartheid in South Africa and military dictatorship in Nigeria. The research explores their legal foundations, operational frameworks, achievements, and limitations, assessing how political will, institutional design, and resource availability shaped their effectiveness.

Findings reveal that while the South African TRC operated under a robust constitutional framework with statutory powers to grant amnesty and recommend reparations, the Nigerian Oputa Panel functioned as an ad hoc presidential commission lacking legislative backing. Consequently, the TRC succeeded in fostering national dialogue and establishing an enduring historical record, whereas the Oputa Panel's impact was undermined by chronic underfunding, political interference, and weak enforcement mechanisms. The study concludes that truth commissions can serve as vital instruments for transitional justice and democratic consolidation, but their success depends on strong legal authority, sustained political commitment, adequate funding, and credible follow-through on recommendations. By comparing these two experiences, the research underscores essential lessons for post-conflict societies seeking lasting reconciliation, justice, and institutional reform across Africa.

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Introduction

Reconciliation is a multidimensional concept deeply rooted in the processes of restoring broken relationships, healing historical grievances, and rebuilding trust among individuals and communities that have experienced deep divisions, often due to violence, injustice, or oppression. At its core, reconciliation involves not only the cessation of hostilities but also the establishment of social harmony and mutual coexistence between former adversaries.¹ It requires a deliberate effort to confront the past, acknowledge wrongs, promote forgiveness, and foster inclusive dialogue aimed at societal transformation. As Worthington explains, reconciliation is both a rational and emotional process that may involve confession, forgiveness, justice, and the rebuilding of interpersonal and communal trust.²

In societies emerging from violent conflicts or authoritarian regimes, the pursuit of reconciliation becomes a vital component of nation-building and democratic consolidation. Post-conflict reconciliation efforts often take institutional forms through transitional justice mechanisms, including truth commissions, tribunals, reparation programs, and institutional reforms. Among these, truth commissions have emerged as significant tools for uncovering historical injustices, giving voice to victims, and creating a shared narrative that can facilitate healing and societal renewal.³ Transitional justice is designed to prosecute perpetrators, reveal

the truth about past crimes, provide reparations, and promote reconciliation, each of which contributes to restoring dignity and preventing the recurrence of violence.⁴

Truth commissions have been implemented in various post-conflict contexts with varying degrees of success. They are typically mandated to investigate patterns of human rights violations, provide a platform for victim and perpetrator testimonies, and recommend reforms for justice and reconciliation. Truth, confession, and forgiveness are intricately linked processes that underpin genuine reconciliation. However, these commissions must also contend with challenges such as limited resources, political interference, and contested narratives of the past. Despite these complexities, they remain essential in the broader framework of peacebuilding and transitional justice.⁵

Statement of the Problem

This study specifically undertakes a comparative analysis of reconciliation efforts in South Africa and Nigeria, focusing on two prominent truth commissions: the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and Nigeria's Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (Oputa Panel). Both commissions were established in the aftermath of long periods of repression and apartheid in South Africa and military rule in Nigeria. The South African TRC, established in 1995, is internationally renowned for its public hearings, restorative justice approach, and the principle of granting amnesty in exchange for truthful confessions.⁶ In contrast, Nigeria's Oputa Panel, established in 1999, was mandated to investigate human rights violations committed between 1966 and 1999, but its work was constrained by inadequate legal backing,

insufficient government support, and the absence of full implementation of its recommendations.⁷

By comparing these two commissions, this study seeks to evaluate their respective approaches to truth-seeking, justice delivery, and national reconciliation. Through this comparative lens, the research aims to assess the extent to which truth commissions can serve as effective instruments for healing historical wounds and fostering sustainable peace in diverse post-conflict societies. In the aftermath of violent conflict or authoritarian rule, societies often face the daunting task of rebuilding trust, ensuring justice, and promoting national reconciliation. Truth commissions have become widely recognized as vital instruments in transitional justice, offering platforms for victims to be heard, perpetrators to confess, and societies to reckon with painful pasts. However, the effectiveness of these commissions varies significantly across contexts, raising questions about what factors contribute to their success or failure.

South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) has been widely praised for its public hearings, the use of restorative justice, and its relatively inclusive process of national healing following decades of apartheid. In contrast, Nigeria's Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (Oputa Panel), though established with a broad mandate to address abuses committed during decades of military rule, struggled to achieve similar outcomes. It lacked legal enforcement power, suffered from poor governmental support, and saw limited implementation of its recommendations.⁸ These disparities reveal deeper challenges in how truth commissions function in different socio-political environments. The problem, therefore, lies in the inconsistent performance and outcomes of truth commissions in African post-conflict

societies. While some, like South Africa's TRC, appear to have advanced reconciliation and institutional reform, others, such as Nigeria's Oputa Panel, fell short of their potential. There is insufficient scholarly consensus on what structural, political, and cultural factors account for these differing outcomes, particularly in the African context. Moreover, limited comparative analysis exists that systematically evaluates the operations and impacts of these two significant commissions side by side. This research seeks to address this gap by providing a comparative analysis of the South African and Nigerian experiences. It aims to uncover the underlying dynamics that shaped the design, implementation, and effectiveness of their respective truth commissions and to evaluate their contributions to justice, healing, and reconciliation in their post-conflict societies.

Aim and Objectives

The aim of the study is to explore reconciliation efforts in post-conflict societies through a comparative analysis of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the Nigerian Oputa Panel. The specific objectives of the study are to:

1. Examine the concept, idea, and general purpose of truth commissions as tools for promoting reconciliation and justice in post-conflict societies;
2. Analyse the establishment, structure, and reconciliation strategies of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in the aftermath of apartheid;
3. Investigate the purpose, operations, and outcomes of Nigeria's Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (Oputa Panel) in addressing past abuses;

4. Compare the mandates, processes, and outcomes of the South African TRC and the Nigerian Oputa Panel with regard to their effectiveness in fostering reconciliation; and
5. Conduct a comparative analysis of the impact of the South African and Nigerian truth commissions on national healing, justice, and institutional reform in their respective post-conflict contexts.

Research Questions

1. What are the concepts, purposes, and roles of truth commissions in promoting justice and reconciliation in post-conflict societies?
2. How was the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) established, and what structures and strategies did it employ in addressing the legacy of apartheid?
3. What were the objectives, operations, and outcomes of Nigeria's Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (Oputa Panel) in addressing past human rights abuses?
4. In what ways do the mandates, processes, and outcomes of the South African TRC and the Nigerian Oputa Panel differ in terms of their effectiveness in fostering reconciliation?
5. What impact have the South African and Nigerian truth commissions had on national healing, justice, and institutional reform within their respective post-conflict contexts?

Scope and limitation of the Study

The study focus on reconciliation efforts in post-conflict societies, with specific emphasis on a comparative analysis of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and the Nigerian Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (Oputa Panel). South Africa

and Nigeria serve as the principal geographical regions under examination, and the TRC and Oputa Panel provide the institutional frameworks through which reconciliation strategies were implemented and assessed. The research is limited to the mandates, structures, operations, and outcomes of these two truth commissions, and it may overlook other transitional justice mechanisms or reconciliation efforts undertaken by civil society or religious institutions. The study concentrated exclusively on these two post-conflict interventions, and the conclusions may not be directly applicable to other countries or truth commissions that operate within different historical, cultural, or political contexts.

Literature Review

In the study conducted by Benyera, Everisto titled *South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission and Nigeria's Oputa Panel: Comparison, Lessons and the Future of Truth Commissions in Africa*,⁹ the author presents a comparative analysis of two prominent transitional justice mechanisms on the continent the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and Nigeria's Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (Oputa Panel). The chapter contrasts South Africa's relatively successful transition from apartheid with Nigeria's less effective transition from military dictatorship to civilian rule. Benyera emphasizes that while both nations face enduring challenges related to managing racial, ethnic, religious, and regional divisions, these issues have manifested in different forms. In Nigeria, the failure to adequately address these divisions has perpetuated a state of internal conflict, whereas in South Africa, the legacy of apartheid continues through ongoing social tensions such as xenophobia,

tribalism, and systemic discrimination. The study employs a dual-unit analytical framework to compare the structures, operations, and outcomes of the SA TRC and the Oputa Panel. Its four primary objectives are: to outline the historical contexts of the two commissions, to assess the Oputa Panel using insights from the TRC, to explain the reasons behind the Oputa Panel's limited impact, and to extract broader lessons for future truth commissions across Africa. The findings highlight the critical role of political will, institutional independence, and public engagement in determining the effectiveness of transitional justice processes. This study is highly relevant to this research as it not only provides a direct comparative framework between the South African and Nigerian experiences but also identifies key lessons that can inform the design and implementation of future truth commissions. Benyera's work contributes to a deeper understanding of the structural and contextual factors that influence transitional justice outcomes, thereby offering a solid basis for evaluating reconciliation efforts in post-conflict African societies.

In Ifaloye, Folarin, and Duruji's work, titled *Investigating the Challenges That Inhibited the Success of Nigeria's Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission*,¹⁰ the authors examine the structural and operational limitations that affected the effectiveness of the Oputa Panel. Mandated to investigate serious human rights abuses committed between January 15, 1966, and May 28, 1999, during Nigeria's prolonged period of military rule, the Commission was also tasked with recommending judicial, administrative, and legislative reforms to address such violations. While the Commission was theoretically well-positioned with a broad and significant mandate, the study finds that in practice, its work was undermined by inadequate

funding, insufficient legal authority, and a lack of sustained political will from the government. Using a qualitative methodological approach, the authors analyze the institutional and contextual factors that constrained the Oputa Panel's operations and reduced its overall impact. The paper emphasizes that these weaknesses limited the Commission's ability to foster accountability and national reconciliation. Among the key recommendations, the authors stress the need for greater domestic and international pressure and engagement by human rights organizations to ensure future truth commissions in Africa are empowered to function effectively. This study is especially relevant to this research as it provides critical insights into the structural and political challenges that undermined Nigeria's transitional justice efforts. By identifying the shortcomings of the Oputa Panel, the study offers a valuable foundation for assessing the comparative effectiveness of truth commissions in post-conflict societies, particularly in relation to promoting justice, accountability, and reconciliation.

In the research conducted by Thomas, titled *Refusing Transitional Time: Re-opening the Unresolved Truth and Reconciliation Commission Cases and the Future of Memory in Postapartheid South Africa*,¹¹ the author critically examines the aftermath of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), with a particular focus on the unresolved cases involving perpetrators who neither testified nor received amnesty. Using qualitative analysis of post-TRC political developments and civil society activism, Thomas reveals that since the release of the final TRC report in 2003, no apartheid-era perpetrators responsible for gross human rights violations have been held accountable. The study highlights the political suppression of unresolved cases concerning activists who were detained, tortured, and murdered

by the Security Police. A significant development discussed is the 2017 reopening of the inquest into the death of anti-apartheid activist Ahmed Timol, which overturned the original suicide ruling and confirmed his murder by the Security Police. This ruling not only reopens pathways for legal prosecutions but also challenges prevailing narratives of “postapartheid transitional time,” offering new perspectives on justice, memory, and impunity in South Africa. Thomas’s work is particularly relevant to this research as it sheds light on the limitations of transitional justice processes and the ongoing struggle for accountability, thus providing a critical framework for understanding how post-conflict societies negotiate memory, justice, and reconciliation over time.

In the work conducted by Kabwete, titled *Towards Justice and Reconciliation in Post-Conflict Countries: Meaningful Concepts and Possible Realities*,¹² the author provides a theoretical exploration of the interrelated nature of justice, truth, forgiveness, and reconciliation in post-conflict societies. The study emphasizes that knowledge of past violence is not an objective or universally accepted truth but rather a *negotiated truth* a blend of facts and interpretations shaped by historical, political, and emotional perspectives. This negotiated truth plays a dual role: it helps in understanding past atrocities and in laying the groundwork for rebuilding societies affected by conflict. Kabwete argues that confession is a crucial mechanism in post-conflict justice processes, offering twofold value it generates knowledge about past violence and provides a limited form of acknowledgment and healing for victims through the remorse expressed by perpetrators. The study also critically examines the concept of forgiveness, discussing its meaning, the actors involved, and its intended role in societal healing.

Reconciliation, as presented in the study, rests on two central pillars: the public declaration or symbolic affirmation that reconciliation has been achieved, and the tangible, everyday experiences of coexistence between victims and perpetrators. This study is particularly relevant to this research as it provides a conceptual foundation for understanding how truth, justice, and reconciliation function in post-conflict settings. Kabwete's nuanced approach to negotiated truth, confession, and the experiential dimensions of reconciliation offers valuable insights for analyzing the strengths and limitations of truth commissions such as South Africa's TRC and Nigeria's Oputa Panel in achieving meaningful justice and national healing.

In Steinø Nicolai, Marwa Dabaieh, and Karima Ben Bih's research titled *Post-conflict reconstruction in the Middle East and North Africa region: A bidirectional parametric urban design approach*,¹³ the authors explore innovative strategies for rebuilding war-affected cities in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region. Moving beyond the conventional aim of merely restoring pre-conflict conditions, the study proposes the adoption of new urban design formats that focus on enhancing both the quality of urban spaces and the processes through which they are conceived and built. The study introduces a hybrid design framework that integrates top-down and bottom-up planning approaches, supported by parametric urban design modeling. The top-down component addresses the need for large-scale coordination and strategic oversight, while the bottom-up aspect emphasizes participatory planning that involves local stakeholders, enabling inclusive and context-sensitive development. The authors argue that using parametric models allows for a dynamic combination of both approaches, ensuring that urban reconstruction is both coordinated and locally grounded. To illustrate the practical application of

this model, the city of Fallujah in Iraq is presented as a case study. This study is particularly relevant to this research as it offers a practical and theoretical framework for post-conflict reconstruction that balances centralized planning with grassroots involvement. The emphasis on inclusive, sustainable, and adaptive urban development provides valuable insights into how physical reconstruction can support broader reconciliation and social healing in post-conflict societies, including those undergoing transitional justice processes such as South Africa and Nigeria.

In the study conducted by Chinyonga, Bazel Coster, and Jeffrey Kurebwa. titled *Effectiveness of Transitional Justice Processes in Peacebuilding in Zimbabwe: The Case of the National Peace and Reconciliation Commission*,¹⁴ the authors evaluate the performance of Zimbabwe's constitutionally established transitional justice body, the National Peace and Reconciliation Commission (NPRC). As the first institution officially mandated to lead the country's transitional justice efforts, the NPRC was examined through a qualitative case study approach. The researchers employed purposive sampling to select participants from both the NPRC and relevant non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Data collection methods included key informant interviews and documentary analysis. The study's findings reveal that the NPRC has struggled to fulfill its constitutional mandate as outlined in the 2013 Constitution and the NPRC Act. Key transitional justice components such as reparations, prosecutions, and truth-telling have not been effectively pursued. The research identifies several significant challenges impeding the Commission's effectiveness, including inadequate financial resources, political interference, and limited visibility or engagement at the grassroots level. This study is highly

relevant to this research as it offers insight into the practical limitations and institutional barriers faced by truth commissions operating in post-conflict African contexts. By highlighting the operational weaknesses of the NPRC, Chinyonga and Kurebwa's work contributes to a comparative understanding of the conditions necessary for transitional justice mechanisms such as Nigeria's Oputa Panel and South Africa's TRC to be credible, inclusive, and effective in promoting peace and reconciliation.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative and comparative research design to examine reconciliation efforts in post-conflict societies through the experiences of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and Nigeria's Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (Oputa Panel). The qualitative approach is appropriate because the research focuses on understanding historical processes, institutional structures, and socio-political dynamics rather than measuring variables quantitatively. The study relies entirely on primary and secondary documentary sources. Primary sources include official commission reports, government documents, public hearing transcripts, policy papers, and archival materials from the TRC and Oputa Panel. These provide first hand evidence of the mandates, operations, and outcomes of the two truth commissions. Secondary sources consist of peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, conference papers, and reputable reports from non-governmental organizations and international bodies concerned with transitional justice and reconciliation. Relevant materials

were drawn from academic databases such as JSTOR, Google Scholar, and institutional repositories, as well as the uploaded research documents.

The study employs qualitative content analysis and comparative analysis to interpret and synthesize the data. Content analysis involved coding and categorizing information from reports, testimonies, and scholarly texts to identify recurring themes such as truth-seeking mechanisms, reconciliation strategies, and challenges faced by each commission. Comparative analysis was then applied to examine similarities and differences between the South African and Nigerian experiences. This method facilitated evaluation of how contextual factors political will, legal frameworks, public participation, and international involvement shaped their respective outcomes.

Significance of Study

This research holds considerable academic, practical, and policy relevance. First, it contributes to the scholarly literature on transitional justice and reconciliation by offering a detailed comparative analysis of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and Nigeria's Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (Oputa Panel). While many studies examine these commissions separately, few provide an in-depth, side-by-side evaluation of their structures, processes, and outcomes. By identifying the factors that enhanced or impeded their effectiveness, the study deepens understanding of how truth commissions operate in diverse African political and cultural contexts.

Second, the findings have practical value for policymakers and practitioners engaged in post-conflict peacebuilding. Lessons drawn from the successes and limitations of both the TRC and Oputa Panel can guide governments, international organizations, and civil society groups in designing and implementing future truth commissions. Insights into issues such as legal mandates, public participation, and government support will help stakeholders anticipate challenges and craft strategies that strengthen accountability, foster reconciliation, and prevent recurrence of violence.

Third, the study offers context-specific guidance for Nigeria and other African nations confronting legacies of political repression or communal conflict. By highlighting the institutional and political obstacles that undermined the Oputa Panel, the research underscores the need for strong legal frameworks, adequate funding, and genuine political commitment to ensure that truth-seeking bodies achieve their mandates.

Finally, the research is significant for societal healing and public awareness. A clearer understanding of how truth commissions contribute to national healing, justice, and institutional reform can inform public discourse, encourage civic engagement, and inspire initiatives that promote collective memory and reconciliation.

Endnotes

1. Andrew Schaap, *Political Reconciliation* (London and New York: Routledge, 2005).
2. Everett L. Worthington Jr., *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: Theory and Application* (New York and London: Routledge, 2006).
3. Priscilla B. Hayner, *Unspeakable Truths: Transitional Justice and the Challenge of Truth Commissions* (New York: Routledge, 2011).
4. Paul Van Zyl, “Promoting Transitional Justice in Post-Conflict Societies”, in *Security Governance in Post-Conflict Peacebuilding*, ed. A. Bryden and H. Hanggi (Geneva: Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, 2005), 209–31.
5. Charles Mulinda Kabwete, “Towards Justice and Reconciliation in Post-Conflict Countries: Meaningful Concepts and Possible Realities”, *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, 2021, 65–91.
6. Ruti G. Teitel, *Transitional Justice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).
7. James L. Gibson, “Does Truth Lead to Reconciliation? Testing the Causal Assumptions of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Process”, *American Journal of Political Science*, 48(2), 2004, 201–17.
8. Oluwatosin R. Ifaloye, Sheriff F. Folarin, and Moses M. Duruji, “Investigating the Challenges That Inhibited the Success of Nigeria’s Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission”, in *Proceedings of ADVED 2019 – 5th International Conference on Advances in Education and Social Sciences*, 2019, 931–36.
9. Everisto Benyera, “South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission and Nigeria’s Oputa Panel: Comparison, Lessons and the Future of Truth Commissions in Africa”, in *Nigeria–South Africa Relations and Regional Hegemonic Competence*, ed. Oluwaseun Tella, *Advances in African Economic, Social and Political Development* (Cham: Springer, 2019), 183–202.
10. Ifaloye, Folarin, and Duruji, “Investigating the Challenges That Inhibited the Success of Nigeria’s Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission”, 934.
11. Kylie Thomas, “Refusing Transitional Time: Re-opening the Unresolved Truth and Reconciliation Commission Cases and the Future of Memory in Postapartheid South Africa”, in *Remembering Transitions: Local Revisions and Global Crossings in Culture and Media*, ed. Ksenia Robbe (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2023), 137–58, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110707793-006>.

12. Kabwete, “Towards Justice and Reconciliation in Post-Conflict Countries: Meaningful Concepts and Possible Realities”, 70.
13. Nicolai Steinø, Marwa Dabaieh, and Karima Ben Bih, “Post-Conflict Reconstruction in the Middle East and North Africa Region: A Bidirectional Parametric Urban Design Approach”, *International Journal of Architectural Computing*, 2020, 1–18.
14. Bazel Coster Chinyonga and Jeffrey Kurebwa, “Effectiveness of Transitional Justice Processes in Peacebuilding in Zimbabwe: The Case of National Peace and Reconciliation Commission”, *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 15(2), 2023, 23–35.

CHAPTER TWO

THE IDEA AND PURPOSE OF TRUTH COMMISSIONS

Introduction

A truth commission, sometimes referred to as a truth and reconciliation commission or a truth and justice commission, is an official body established to investigate and disclose past wrongdoing by governments or, in some cases, non-state actors. The primary purpose of such commissions is to confront historical injustices and address unresolved conflicts that stem from past abuses. Truth commissions are typically established in societies emerging from periods of dictatorship, civil war, or internal unrest characterized by widespread human rights violations. Beyond their truth-seeking and reconciliatory roles, truth commissions inherently carry significant political implications. These commissions continually make choices in defining fundamental objectives such as truth, justice, reconciliation, memory, reparation, and recognition, while also determining how these goals should be achieved and whose needs should take precedence.¹ Several defining features of truth commissions: (1) they focus on past rather than ongoing events; (2) they investigate patterns of abuses that occurred over a specific period; (3) they actively engage with affected populations to collect testimonies and experiences; (4) they are temporary bodies, expected to conclude with a final report; and (5) they are formally authorized or empowered by the state under review.²

History of Truth Commissions

The earliest truth commissions did not initially adopt the title ‘truth commission,’ yet they pursued similar objectives of uncovering human rights violations, particularly under authoritarian and military regimes in Latin America and Africa. For example, Bolivia established the National Commission of Inquiry into Disappearances in 1982, aimed at uniting different sectors of society after the end of military rule. However, the commission was unable to complete its work or publish a report. An even earlier initiative took place in Uganda in 1974, officially known as the *Commission of Inquiry into the Disappearances of People in Uganda since 25 January 1971*. The first commission to make a substantial impact was Argentina’s National Commission on the Disappearance of Persons (CONADEP), created by President Raúl Alfonsín on 15 December 1983. CONADEP produced the influential *Nunca Más (Never Again)* report in 1984, documenting human rights violations under the military dictatorship known as the National Reorganization Process. This report laid the foundation for the *Trial of the Juntas* the first major war crimes trial since the Nuremberg proceedings after World War II and the first of its kind to be conducted by a civilian court.³

In Africa, Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni established the *Commission of Inquiry into Violations of Human Rights (CIVHR)* in 1986 to investigate atrocities committed during the regimes of Idi Amin and Milton Obote. Despite its significance, the CIVHR faced severe underfunding and delays, ultimately releasing its report only in 1994.⁴ Similarly, Chile created its *Truth and Reconciliation Commission* in April 1990, shortly after its transition to democracy, becoming the first body to explicitly adopt the name “truth commission.” This model would

inspire many subsequent commissions worldwide. Other notable early examples include commissions in Nepal (1990), El Salvador (1992), Guatemala (1994), and Ireland (1994).⁵ Since the end of the Cold War, post-conflict reconstruction strategies have increasingly emphasized three interrelated mechanisms: first, the promotion of peace; second, the management of conflict; and third, the pursuit of transitional justice. This third dimension integrates legal and social justice and extends to include memory, truth, healing, reparations, reconciliation, and the protection of human rights.⁶

Global Experiences with Truth Commissions

Australia: In March 2021, the state of Victoria announced the creation of Australia's first commission of inquiry to examine the "violent dispossession and genocide of Aboriginal people during colonisation".⁷ In the Australian context, the concept is framed as *truth-telling*. Calls for such a process had persisted well into the 21st century.⁸ The Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation, following nine years of community consultation, addressed the issue in its 2000 report, which explored pathways for Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians to coexist more harmoniously. Similarly, the *Referendum Council* emphasized truth-telling in its 2017 final report on constitutional recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.⁹ The *Joint Select Committee on Constitutional Recognition* reaffirmed this stance in 2018, recommending that the government support truth-telling processes in collaboration with local organizations, libraries, historical societies, and Indigenous associations, while ensuring national coordination where necessary.¹⁰

Canada: Canada's *Truth and Reconciliation Commission* operated between June 2008 and June 2015, investigating human rights abuses within the Indian residential school system. The system forcibly removed Indigenous children from their families in an attempt to assimilate them, a practice later described as cultural genocide.¹¹ The commission emerged from the settlement of a class-action lawsuit involving nearly 4,600 survivors. Its 2015 report documented widespread abuse and estimated that between 3,200 and 30,000 Indigenous children died in residential schools.¹³

Sweden: In March 2020, the Swedish government established a truth commission to examine abuses against the Tornedalians, Kvens, and Lantalaïset communities, which reported its findings in November 2023.¹³ Another commission was formed in 2022 to investigate the historical mistreatment of the Sámi, with a final report expected in December 2025. These initiatives follow decades of criticism over Sweden's *Swedification* policies, which sought to assimilate minority groups from the 1800s until the 1970s.¹⁴

Argentina: Argentina pioneered the modern truth commission model with the creation of the *National Commission on the Disappearance of Persons (CONADEP)* in December 1983, established by President Raúl Alfonsín. Investigating human rights violations during the “Dirty War,” the commission documented approximately 9,000 cases of forced disappearances, though estimates reach as high as 30,000. Its final report, *Nunca Más (Never Again)*, delivered in September 1984, paved the way for the *Trial of the Juntas*—the first major war crimes trial since Nuremberg and the first conducted by a civilian court.¹⁵

Chile: Following the return to democracy, Chile established the *National Truth and Reconciliation Commission* in 1990. Popularly known as the *Rettig Commission*, it investigated politically motivated deaths and disappearances under Augusto Pinochet's rule, releasing its report in 1991. Later, the *National Commission on Political Imprisonment and Torture* (the *Valech Commission*) investigated non-fatal abuses, including torture, and expanded its scope to include children of disappeared or killed individuals. Its 2004–2005 reports provided the basis for survivor pensions and other reparations.¹⁶

El Salvador: The *Commission on the Truth for El Salvador* was unique in that it was established by the United Nations as part of the *Chapultepec Peace Accords* (1992), rather than by the national government. It investigated atrocities committed during the Salvadoran Civil War, including the assassination of Archbishop Óscar Romero (1980) and the killing of six Jesuit priests in 1989.¹⁷

Philippines: In 2010, President Benigno Aquino III created the *Philippines Truth Commission* through Executive Order No. 1 to investigate corruption under his predecessor, Gloria Macapagal Arroyo. However, the Supreme Court invalidated the order, declaring it unconstitutional for violating the equal protection clause by singling out one administration. Justice Jose C. Mendoza described the commission as “a vehicle for vindictiveness and selective retribution”.¹⁸

Norway: In 2018, Norway formed a truth commission to investigate policies of *Norwegianization* targeting the Sámi and Kven minorities. In 2019, its mandate was expanded to include the Forest Finns. The commission submitted its report in June 2023, documenting the long-term cultural and social impacts of these assimilation policies.¹⁹

Mauritius

The *Truth and Justice Commission of Mauritius*, established in 2009, focused on the historical impact of slavery and indentured servitude. It investigated land dispossession and recommended reparations for descendants of enslaved and indentured peoples. Uniquely, it examined abuses spanning over 370 years, making it the longest historical scope ever attempted by a truth commission.²⁰

The Negotiation of Truth Commission

The pursuit of reconciliation has long been tied to the idealization of truth, particularly since truth commissions emerged as central mechanisms for addressing violent and traumatic pasts. By documenting atrocities and human rights abuses, truth commissions justified their own existence through the revelation of hidden histories. However, these commissions are not naturally occurring bodies; they are deliberately created through negotiation among key actors. In most cases, it is post-conflict governments that initiate their establishment, often working in collaboration with civil society organizations where such groups are active and willing to engage. International actors also frequently participate, offering support to both governments and local civil society in shaping the truth-seeking process.²¹ The composition and mandate of truth

commissions are therefore products of negotiation. Members are often drawn from the state, civil society, and, at times, international organizations. Deciding *which past events* should be investigated, and *how far back in history* the inquiry should reach, is influenced by the balance of power among these stakeholders. While consensus is the ideal scenario, in practice, compromises are often reached, reflecting differing priorities and interests. Even the naming of the commission whether framed around truth and reconciliation, truth and justice, or national unity carries symbolic weight, reflecting historical contexts and expectations about how knowledge of past violence will serve the present.²²

Since the stakes of truth-telling are high, commissions have devised varied mechanisms to encourage testimony from both victims and perpetrators. These include legal frameworks, security guarantees, confidentiality protections, material incentives, and forms of conditional amnesty or reduced sentences.²³ Despite such measures, perpetrators often resist disclosure. Their responses typically range from denial and distortion of facts to outright fabrication. Few have been willing to fully acknowledge their roles in past violence. Nonetheless, truth-seeking measures attempt to create conditions under which perpetrators feel secure enough to disclose their actions and knowledge.²⁴ Different contexts have employed different strategies. For example, Rwanda's Gacaca courts offered reduced sentences to perpetrators who confessed and demonstrated remorse, though concerns remained about the sincerity of such confessions.²⁵ Similarly, in both Rwanda and South Africa, early confessions often had a chain effect, encouraging others to come forward and testify, gradually expanding the collective narrative of

violence.²⁶ However, opportunities for amnesty or reduced sentences were not extended to those guilty of the most egregious crimes in cases such as South Africa, Côte d'Ivoire, and Rwanda.²⁷

The relationship between truth and justice has therefore been complex. Truth commissions often embody a delicate balance between restorative justice focusing on healing, acknowledgment, and reconciliation and retributive justice, which seeks accountability through punishment. In South Africa, for example, amnesty was offered in exchange for truth-telling, highlighting this trade-off.²⁸ Furthermore, the coexistence of international tribunals and truth commissions reflects the complementary nature of truth and justice: while tribunals create archives of legal accountability, truth commissions generate historical records that serve both judicial and societal purposes. Truth-seeking and prosecutions are not mutually exclusive but can function in a complementary relationship, advancing justice while preserving historical memory.²⁹

Truth-Seeking

At the core of truth commissions lies the task of uncovering and documenting past violence. While testimonies are often drawn from victims and witnesses, the most critical accounts are those provided by perpetrators, as their confessions contribute not only to the reconstruction of historical narratives but also to societal healing. Such admissions serve as a form of acknowledgement of guilt, helping societies confront painful truths about state violence and human rights abuses.³⁰ Because truth commissions are official, government-mandated bodies, they provide a form of “*official truth-seeking*” capable of countering denialism and legitimizing

historical memory. Increasingly, advocates have argued for a universal “right to the truth,” a principle that commissions are uniquely positioned to uphold.³¹ Despite this important role, truth commissions face criticism for fostering impunity by allowing perpetrators of serious crimes to escape punishment. Their effectiveness in this regard depends largely on their mandate, which varies widely across contexts.³² While commissions are often better suited to documenting large-scale patterns of abuse than criminal prosecutions, they are limited in their capacity to impose penalties. For this reason, some scholars argue that truth commissions should be complemented by criminal trials targeting top offenders, thereby balancing restorative and retributive justice.³³

Most truth commissions conclude their work by issuing a final report, which provides an authoritative account of past events and often challenges previously dominant or state-sanctioned versions of history. For example, Guatemala’s Historical Clarification Commission sought to counter the official military narrative, while the Truth and Justice Commission in Mauritius investigated the enduring legacy of slavery and indentured servitude. Similarly, the Commission for Reception, Truth and Reconciliation in East Timor developed a new national narrative to replace the version propagated under foreign occupation.

Reconciliation

Reconciliation is a central yet contested goal of truth commissions, as its meaning varies depending on the cultural, social, and political contexts in which it is pursued.³⁴ Broadly, reconciliation refers to the restoration of peaceful and amicable relationships between victims and perpetrators following conflict. This process combines both rational and emotional

dimensions, often involving perpetrators confessing their crimes and victims extending forgiveness, thereby rebuilding trust and affirming shared humanity.³⁵ Within the framework of transitional justice, truth commissions generally emphasize restorative justice over retributive justice. This approach prioritizes reconciliation within divided societies, seeking to repair relationships and acknowledge suffering rather than focusing exclusively on punishment. In some cases, commissions also adopt reparative justice measures, which may include financial compensation, official apologies, commemorative practices, or monuments to honor victims. For example, Morocco's Equity and Reconciliation Commission placed reparations at the center of its mandate.³⁶

Truth commissions have frequently emerged as part of peace settlements or political transitions, particularly where prosecutions were impossible or undesirable due to political compromises. Notable examples include El Salvador, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Kenya, where commissions provided platforms for testimony and reconciliation. Public hearings, where victims narrate their experiences and sometimes confront perpetrators, aim to foster societal healing and reconciliation.³⁷ Nevertheless, reconciliation efforts have not been without controversy. Some stakeholders including victims' associations, families of the disappeared, and even former perpetrators criticize truth commissions for promoting impunity, retraumatizing survivors, or offering only symbolic justice.³⁸ Criticism has also arisen where commissions had narrow mandates or where their recommendations were ignored. Examples include Chad's *Commission of Inquiry into Crimes of Hissene Habre*, which faced challenges of implementation, and the Philippines Truth Commission, criticized for selective justice. Similarly, the short-lived

Yugoslav Truth Commission collapsed without issuing a report due to the disintegration of the state, while in Rwanda, renewed conflict hindered the implementation of truth-seeking recommendations.³⁹

The Collection of Truth

The work of truth commissions culminates in the final reports they produce at the end of their mandates, which summarize the findings of their truth-collection processes. During this phase, commission teams comprising leaders, researchers, technicians, and assistants engage with witnesses to document accounts of past violence. These interactions may take different forms: sometimes perpetrators testify before the commission team, while in other cases both perpetrators and victims appear together. In certain contexts, a wider audience from the local community is invited to participate, and in some instances, hearings are broadcast to the public, as was the case with the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). Such public hearings are often seen as a symbolic beginning of reconciliation.⁴⁰ However, the testimonies collected by truth commissions are never exhaustive. Not all witnesses are contacted, prepared, or willing to testify, and in some cases, even willing participants are not approached by the commission.⁴¹ Furthermore, truth is shaped not only by the willingness of individuals to share their stories but also by the politics and feasibility of its collection.⁴²

This limitation highlights the continuing role of researchers after commissions conclude, as they seek to gather additional testimonies, analyze them, and reinterpret the historical record to enhance reconciliation and understanding. Beyond fact-finding, interpretation is crucial in

making sense of the fragmented accounts of the past. Minow underscores that testimonies must be interpreted to render them meaningful.⁴³ For example, the Rwandan *Gacaca* process demonstrated a form of “truth-shaping”, where national leaders, local judges, and witnesses together reconstructed the events of the genocide against the Tutsi. Further distinguishes between different types of truth, such as *legal truth* (facts established for judicial purposes) and *therapeutic truth* (personal and emotional narratives shared for healing).⁴⁴ Similarly, the South African TRC recognized multiple layers of truth: *factual or forensic truth, personal or narrative truth, social truth, and healing or restorative truth*.⁴⁵

Thus, truth collection requires both rigorous methodology and interpretive frameworks. Interpretation is vital for identifying silences, gaps, and biases in the narratives.⁴⁶ It also serves a deeper function: since the ideologies that justified past violence were themselves interpretations of history, the reinterpretation of the past after violence becomes a powerful tool to challenge those ideologies and construct a collective memory that promotes healing in the present and future.⁴⁷

Endnotes

1. Onur Bakiner, *Truth Commissions: Memory, Power, and Legitimacy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016).
2. Priscilla B. Hayner, *Unspeakable Truths: Transitional Justice and the Challenge of Truth Commissions*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2010), 11–12.
3. Eduardo González and Howard Varney, “What Are Truth Commissions?”, in *Truth Seeking: Elements of Creating an Effective Truth Commission* (Brasilia: Amnesty Commission of the Ministry of Justice of Brazil, 2013), 9–12, retrieved on 20 August 2025, from <https://www.amnesty.org>.
4. Ibid.
5. Joanna R. Quinn, “Constraints: The Un-Doing of the Ugandan Truth Commission”, *Human Rights Quarterly*, 26, 2004, 401–27.
6. Jannie Malan, “Understanding Transitional Justice in Africa”, in *Peace and Conflict in Africa*, ed. David J. Francis (London and New York: Zed Books, 2008), 133–47.
7. Calla Wahlquist, “Victoria Launches Truth Commission into Ongoing Effect of Violent Colonisation on Aboriginal People”, *The Guardian*, 10 March 2021, retrieved on 20 August 2025, from <https://www.theguardian.com>.
8. “Truth-Telling Central to Reconciliation Process”, *Reconciliation Australia*, 10 May 2018, retrieved on 20 August 2025, from <https://www.reconciliation.org.au/truth-telling-central-to-reconciliation-process/>.
9. “What Is ‘Truth-Telling’ and Why Does It Matter to Indigenous Australians?”, *ANTaR*, 4 February 2019, retrieved on 20 August 2025, from https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Former_Committees/Constitutional_Recognition_2018/ConstRecognition/Final_Report/section?id=committees%2Freportjnt%2F024213%2F26675#footnote10target.
10. Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, *Final Report: Joint Select Committee on Constitutional Recognition Relating to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples* (Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, November 2018), retrieved on 20 August 2025, from https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Former_Committees/Constitutional_Recognition_2018/ConstRecognition/Final_Report.
11. John Paul Tasker, “Residential Schools Findings Point to ‘Cultural Genocide,’ Commission Chair Says”, *CBC News*, 29 May 2015, archived on 20 August 2025, from <https://web.archive.org/web/20160518220713/http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/residential-schools-findings-point-to-cultural-genocide-commission-chair-says-1.3093580>.

12. Ry Moran, "Truth and Reconciliation Commission", *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, 5 October 2020, retrieved on 20 August 2025, from <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/truth-and-reconciliation-commission>.
13. Regeringskansliet, "'Som om vi aldrig funnits' (As If We Never Existed)", *Regeringskansliet*, 15 November 2023, retrieved on 20 August 2025, from <https://www.regeringen.se/rattsliga-dokument/statens-offentliga-utredningar/2023/11/sou-202368/>.
14. John Rogers and Marie C. Nelson, "'Lapps, Finns, Gypsies, Jews, and Idiots'? Modernity and the Use of Statistical Categories in Sweden", *Annales de démographie historique*, 1(105), 2003, 61–79.
15. González and Varney, "What Are Truth Commissions?", in *Truth Seeking: Elements of Creating an Effective Truth Commission*.
16. Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation, *Report of the Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation*, Vols. I–III (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press and the Centre for Civil and Human Rights, 1993).
17. Betancur Belisario, Figueredo Planchart Reinaldo, and Thomas Buergenthal, *Report of the UN Truth Commission on El Salvador* (1993), retrieved on 20 August 2025, from <https://www.derechos.org/nizkor/salvador/informes/truth.html>.
18. Maila Ager, "Davide Named Truth Commission Chief", *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, 29 June 2010, archived on 20 August 2025, from <http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/breakingnews/nation/view/20100629-278225/Davide-named-Truth-Commission-chief>.
19. "The Truth and Reconciliation Commission", *Stortinget*, 1 June 2023, retrieved on 20 August 2025, from <https://www.stortinget.no/en/In-English/About-the-Storting/News-archive/Front-page-news/2022-2023/the-truth-and-reconciliation-commission/>.
20. "Truth Commission: Mauritius", *United States Institute of Peace*, 2020.
21. Charles Mulinda Kabwete, "Towards Justice and Reconciliation in Post-Conflict Countries: Meaningful Concepts and Possible Realities", *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, 2021, 65–91.
22. Ibid.
23. David Whittaker, *Conflict and Reconciliation in the Contemporary World* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999).
24. Felix Mukwiza Ndahinda and Alphonse Muleefu, "Revisiting the Legal and Socio-Political Foundations and (Western) Criticisms of Gacaca Courts", in *African*

- Perspectives on Tradition and Justice*, ed. Tom Bennett, Eva Brems, Giselle Corradi, Lia Nijzink, and Martien Schotsmans (Cambridge: Intersentia, 2012), 149–73.
25. Timothy Longman, “Justice at the Grassroots? Gacaca Trials in Rwanda”, in Naomi Roht-Arriaza and Javier Mariezcurrena, eds., *Transitional Justice in the Twenty-First Century* (2006), 206–28.
 26. Paul Rutayisire, *Histoire des juridictions Gacaca, Tome II: La phase de l’expérimentation (2002–2005)* (Kigali: Service National des Juridictions Gacaca, 2013).
 27. Timothée Labelle and Jean-Nicholas Trudel, “Au cœur de la reconstruction ivoirienne: la réconciliation”, *Revue québécoise de droit international*, 25(1), 2012, 91–118.
 28. Naomi Roht-Arriaza, “The New Landscape of Transitional Justice”, in Naomi Roht-Arriaza and Javier Mariezcurrena, eds., *Transitional Justice in the Twenty-First Century* (2006), 1–16.
 29. Ibid.
 30. Priscilla B. Hayner, *Unspeakable Truths: Transitional Justice and the Challenge of Truth Commissions*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2010).
 31. Henrique Tavares Furtado, “The Monstrous and the Miscount: A Radical Theory of Accountability”, *Critical Military Studies*, 2023, 1–16,
 32. Lyal Sunga, “Ten Principles for Reconciling Truth Commissions and Criminal Prosecutions”, in José Doria, Hans-Peter Gasser, and M. Cherif Bassiouni, eds., *The Legal Regime of the International Criminal Court* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 1071–1104, retrieved on 20 August 2025, from <https://brill.com>.
 33. Daniele Archibugi and Alice Pease, *Crime and Global Justice: The Dynamics of International Punishment* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2018).
 34. Annelies Verdoolaeye, *Reconciliation Discourse: The Case of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2008).
 35. Yehudith Auerbach, “The Reconciliation Pyramid – A Narrative-Based Framework for Analysing Identity Conflicts”, *Political Psychology*, 30(2), 2009, 291–318.
 36. Luisa Fernanda Gómez, “¿Qué es la Comisión de la Verdad?”, *Colombia Check*, 4 December 2018, retrieved on 20 August 2025, from <https://colombiacheck.com>.
 37. Mark R. Amstutz, *The Healing of Nations: The Promise and Limits of Political Forgiveness* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005).

38. Henrique Tavares Furtado, *Politics of Impunity: Torture, the Armed Forces and the Failure of Justice in Brazil* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2022).
39. Furtado, “The Monstrous and the Mismatch: A Radical Theory of Accountability”, 1–16.
40. William A. Schabas, “The Sierra Leone Truth and Reconciliation Commission”, in Naomi Roht-Arriaza and Javier Mariezcurrena, eds., *Transitional Justice in the Twenty-First Century* (2006), 21–42.
41. Priscilla B. Hayner, *Unspeakable Truths: Transitional Justice and the Challenge of Truth Commissions*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2011).
42. Richard Wilson, *The Politics of Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa: Legitimizing the Post-Apartheid State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
43. Martha Minow, *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness: Facing History after Genocide and Mass Violence* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1998).
44. Phil Clark, *The Gacaca Courts, Post-Genocide Justice and Reconciliation in Rwanda: Justice without Lawyers* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
45. Wilson, *Politics of Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa*, 90.
46. Jennifer L. Burrell, *Maya after the War: Conflict, Power and Politics in Guatemala* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2013).
47. Nenad Dimitrijević, “Justice beyond Blame: Moral Justification of (the Idea of) a Truth Commission”, *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 50(3), 2006, 368–82.

CHAPTER THREE

THE SOUTH AFRICAN TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION

Introduction

The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), established to expose the violence of apartheid and promote national reconciliation, has often been hailed as a model for other societies confronting widespread human rights violations. Convening public hearings between 1996 and 1998, the TRC investigated abuses committed from 1 March 1960 to 31 December 1993, creating a forum where countless South Africans could share their experiences, hear victims' testimonies, and confront the painful realities of their country's traumatic past.¹ The National Unity and Reconciliation Act defined apartheid as a system in which "a small minority monopolized political power, which gave it access to all other kinds of power and privilege and maintained a vicious system of privilege by equally vicious and immoral methods".² Addressing the aftermath of large-scale brutality is vital for democratization, often more so than the traditional criminal law goals of deterrence and retribution.

Criminal trials, when pursued, should serve a pedagogical purpose, stimulating public discourse about past atrocities and fostering liberal values such as tolerance, moderation, and civic respect. Because truth commissions lack the authority to impose punishment, they frequently emphasize these educational and reconciliatory aims even more explicitly. There has been limited empirical research into whether legal institutions actually achieve these objectives. Public opinion surveys therefore remain an important tool for assessing the potential and limits

of legal institutions in shaping collective memory, building social solidarity, and cultivating respect for human rights.³ The South African TRC illustrates how legal institutions can influence the political culture of post-authoritarian societies. However, the acceptance of a truth commission's findings depends not only on the perceived fairness of its procedures but also on broader social dynamics. Societies in transition often experience a "cultural lag," where political and legal reforms outpace societal attitudes, complicating the process of reconciliation and the public's embrace of official truth.⁴

History of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC)

The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) emerged as a product of the historical compromise between the apartheid regime and the African National Congress (ANC).⁵ During the multiparty negotiations at Kempton Park, the apartheid government refused to transfer power to an ANC-led Government of National Unity without securing amnesty for its officials. In a last-minute agreement, a postamble was inserted into the Interim Constitution of 1993, mandating that the first democratic Parliament enact a law to define the mechanisms, criteria, and procedures for granting amnesty. Following extensive parliamentary debate, the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act (Act No. 34 of 1995) commonly known as the TRC Act was passed on 26 July 1995, establishing the legal framework for the TRC. Most political parties, including the former ruling National Party (NP), supported the legislation. Only the right-wing Freedom Front opposed it, while the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) abstained.⁶

The TRC's primary objective was to create as comprehensive a record as possible of gross human rights violations committed between March 1960, the month of the Sharpeville massacre and the beginning of the armed liberation struggle, and 10 May 1994, the date of Nelson Mandela's inauguration as South Africa's first democratic president.⁷ The Commission was tasked with investigating politically motivated human rights abuses committed by both the apartheid state's security forces and liberation movements. Under the TRC Act, gross violations were defined as "the killing, abduction, torture, or severe ill-treatment of a person" (TRC Act, S 1(1)(ix)). Consequently, systemic injustices of apartheid such as forced removals or prolonged arbitrary detention were excluded, directing the inquiry toward the excesses of apartheid while leaving the broader criminality of the regime largely unaddressed. To fulfill its mandate, the TRC operated through three sub-committees: the Human Rights Violations Committee, the Amnesty Committee, and the Reparation and Rehabilitation Committee.

The Human Rights Violations Committee conducted public hearings in more than 80 towns, where approximately 1,200 victims shared their experiences without being subjected to adversarial cross-examination.⁸ Their powerful testimonies broadcast nationally highlighted not only the violations themselves but also the profound psychological, physical, and social consequences for survivors and their families. Overall, the Commission collected 21,296 statements documenting over 36,000 gross human rights violations.⁹ A distinctive strength of the South African TRC was its authority to investigate the "causes, nature, and extent of gross human rights violations, including the antecedents, circumstances, factors, and context of such

violations” (TRC Act, S 3(1)(a)). This enabled the Commission to examine broader forms of complicity such as societal collaboration and institutional support for apartheid typically beyond the reach of criminal law. To this end, the TRC held institutional hearings that called to account key sectors including the media, business, legal system, health sector, and faith communities, all of which had faced criticism for their complicity in apartheid-era abuses.¹⁰

Achievements of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC)

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) employed a range of strategies and mechanisms to foster accountability and reconciliation in post-apartheid South Africa. Central to its approach was a strong emphasis on restorative justice, which prioritized repairing the harm caused by human rights violations and encouraging healing between victims and perpetrators. By providing a public forum where victims could share their stories and have their suffering officially acknowledged, the TRC facilitated a vital step toward both personal and national healing.¹¹ A defining feature of the TRC was its amnesty provision, which granted immunity from prosecution to perpetrators who offered a full and truthful disclosure of their crimes. Although controversial, this policy was viewed as a pragmatic means of encouraging perpetrators to come forward, accept responsibility, and contribute to the broader peacebuilding process.¹² The Commission also prioritized education and public awareness, recognizing that long-term reconciliation required broad societal understanding of the atrocities committed under apartheid. Through its hearings and outreach initiatives, the TRC sought to promote a shared historical memory and a culture of accountability among South Africans at large.¹³

Challenges of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC)

A 1998 study conducted by South Africa's Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation and the Khulumani Support Group, which surveyed several hundred victims of apartheid-era human rights abuses, revealed widespread disappointment with the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). The majority of respondents felt that the TRC had failed to achieve reconciliation between Black and White communities.¹⁴ Many believed that justice was a prerequisite for reconciliation rather than a substitute, arguing that the TRC favoured perpetrators of abuse.¹⁵ Because of these perceived shortcomings and the unaddressed grievances of many victims, advocacy groups along with NGOs and lawyers pursued TRC-related legal actions in both South African and U.S. courts during the early 2000s.¹⁶ The TRC also struggled with the translation of witness testimonies, where emotional nuances were often lost. A brief attempt to have translators mimic witnesses' emotions proved disastrous and was quickly abandoned.¹⁷

Tensions deepened when former president F. W. de Klerk appeared before the Commission. Although he reiterated his apology for apartheid's harms, many Black South Africans were angered by the amnesty granted to perpetrators of human rights violations. His refusal to acknowledge that National Party policies had effectively given security forces a "license to kill" despite evidence presented moved Commission chair Archbishop Desmond Tutu nearly to tears. While the BBC characterized such criticism as a misunderstanding of the TRC's mandate to uncover truth rather than punish crimes, critics insisted their objections were a rejection, not a misinterpretation, of that mandate.¹⁸ High-profile criticism also came from the

family of Steve Biko, the anti-apartheid activist killed by security police and memorialized in the film *Cry Freedom*. They denounced the TRC as a “vehicle for political expediency” that had “robbed” them of justice, opposing amnesty for Biko’s killers and challenging the TRC’s constitutionality in South Africa’s highest court.

Conversely, former apartheid State President P. W. Botha openly defied a subpoena to appear, dismissing the Commission as a “circus.” Although initially fined and given a suspended sentence, he successfully overturned these penalties on appeal.¹⁹ Playwright Jane Taylor, creator of the acclaimed *Ubu and the Truth Commission*, offered a cultural critique, observing that the TRC’s influence was uneven across South Africa. In rural communities, she noted, the Commission’s presence in local church halls drew significant attention, while in large urban centers it was easily overshadowed by other social and economic activities.²⁰

Impact of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC)

In recent decades, many newly democratic nations have struggled with how best to address the **gross** human rights violations of past regimes.²¹ South Africa’s first democratic government responded to the atrocities of apartheid by enacting the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act, which established the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). This Act provided for reparations to victims of human rights abuses and offered amnesty from prosecution to perpetrators who fully disclosed their crimes. Importantly, the legislation embraced a philosophy of restorative justice over retributive justice.²² This approach reflected both a political compromise a negotiated settlement between representatives of the outgoing

apartheid government and the new democratic leadership and a recognition of the limited prospects for successfully prosecuting perpetrators. Beyond political pragmatism, the planning and execution of the TRC were driven by a belief in the power of bearing witness to the past and fostering national reconciliation through truth-telling and forgiveness.

The Act explicitly stated the Commission's objective was "to promote national unity and reconciliation in a spirit of understanding which transcends the conflicts and divisions of the past," achieved by allowing victims to share their experiences and granting amnesty to perpetrators who provided full disclosure. As TRC vice chairperson Dr. Alex Boraine observed, "South Africa has decided to say no to amnesia and yes to remembrance; to say no to full-scale prosecutions and yes to forgiveness".²³ The TRC's emphasis on reconciliation and forgiveness sharply contrasted with the Nuremberg trials and other post-World War II de-Nazification measures. South Africa's first coalition government chose forgiveness over prosecution and reparation over retaliation.²⁴ Debate continues over the effectiveness of restorative justice as employed by the TRC compared with the retributive model exemplified by Nuremberg.

A survey study evaluated the TRC's impact across several dimensions: its ability to uncover the truth about apartheid-era abuses, its contribution to feelings of reconciliation, and its broader political and economic benefits for South Africa both domestically and internationally.²⁵ Research by Orlando Lentini compared perceptions among three ethnic groups English-speaking White South Africans, Afrikaners, and the Xhosa and found that while all agreed the TRC was effective in exposing the truth, their views varied by group.²⁶ Differences in perception reflected how participants interpreted the process: some questioned its accuracy, believing that individuals

might have lied to gain amnesty, while others felt the hearings only reopened traumatic memories they sought to forget. Consequently, the TRC's overall effectiveness in fulfilling its mandate of truth, reconciliation, and healing remains a subject of debate.²⁷

Endnotes

1. Madeleine Fullard, “Dis-Placing Race: The South African Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and Interpretations of Violence” (Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, 2004), accessed September 17, 2025, <https://www.csvr.org.za/docs/racism/displacingrace.pdf>.
2. Desmond Tutu, *No Future Without Forgiveness* (New York: Doubleday, 1999).
3. Mark Osiel, *Mass Atrocity, Collective Memory, and the Law* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1997).
4. Stephan Welch, *The Concept of Political Culture* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1993).
5. Raylene Keightley, “Political Offences and Indemnity in South Africa”, *South African Journal on Human Rights*, 9(3), 1993, 334–57.
6. Emily Hahn-Godeffroy, *Die südafrikanische Truth and Reconciliation Commission* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1998).
7. Peter Parker, “The Politics of Indemnities, Truth Telling and Reconciliation in South Africa/Ending Apartheid Without Forgetting”, *Human Rights Law Journal*, 17, 1996, 1–13.
8. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa, *Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa*, Vols. 1–5 (Cape Town: Juta, 1998).
9. Ibid.
10. James Cochrane, John W. de Gruchy, and Stephen Martin, eds., *Facing the Truth: South African Faith Communities and the Truth & Reconciliation Commission* (Cape Town: David Philip, 1999).
11. Paul Gready and Simon Robins, “From Transitional to Transformative Justice: A New Agenda for Practice”, *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 9(1), 2015, 1–22.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.
14. Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, “Survivors’ Perceptions of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and Suggestions for the Final Report” (2006), accessed

- September 17, 2025, from <https://web.archive.org/web/20060925181412/http://www.csvr.org.za/papers/papkhul.htm>.
15. Peter Storey, “A Different Kind of Justice: Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa”, *The Christian Century*, 1997.
 16. William Kentridge, “Director’s Note”, in Jane Taylor, ed., *Ubu and the Truth Commission* (Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press, 2007), viii–xv.
 17. Rita Kesselring, *Bodies of Truth: Law, Memory and Emancipation in Post-Apartheid South Africa* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2017).
 18. Greg Barrow, “South Africans Reconciled? Special Report”, *BBC*, October 1998, accessed September 17, 2025, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/special_report/1998/10/98/truth_and_reconciliation/142673.stm.
 19. Alistair Boddy-Evans, “Quotes From PW Botha, Prime Minister of South Africa”, *Thought Co.*, 2021, accessed September 17, 2025, <https://www.thoughtco.com/quotes-pw-botha-43577>.
 20. Jane Taylor, *Ubu and the Truth Commission* (Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press, 2007).
 21. Alex Boraine and Janet Levy, *The Healing of a Nation?* (Cape Town: IDASA, 1995).
 22. Kader Asmal, Louise Asmal, and Ronald Suresh Roberts, *Reconciliation Through Truth: A Reckoning of Apartheid’s Criminal Governance* (Cape Town: David Philip, 1996).
 23. Alex Boraine, *Justice in Cataclysm: Criminal Tribunals in the Wake of Mass Violence* (Lecture in Belgium, 1996).
 24. Ginger Thompson, “South African Commission Ends Its Work”, *The New York Times*, 22 March 2003, ISSN 0362-4331, accessed November 7, 2022.
 25. Jay A. Vora and Erika Vora, “The Effectiveness of South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission: Perceptions of Xhosa, Afrikaner, and English South Africans”, *Journal of Black Studies*, 34(3), 2004, 30.
 26. Ibid.
 27. Ibid.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE NIGERIAN TRUTH COMMISSION (THE OPUTA PANEL): PURPOSES AND OUTCOMES

Introduction

Nigeria remained under British colonial rule until its independence in 1960. In the years that followed, the nation faced profound internal conflicts that hindered political consolidation. Deep religious and ethnic divisions sparked mass killings and culminated in a civil war that lasted until 1970. Political instability persisted as a series of military coups began with the 1966 Nigerian coup d'état, placing the country under successive military dictatorships. One of the most turbulent periods began in 1983 when General Ibrahim Babangida seized power. His annulment of the 1993 presidential election widely regarded as fair triggered nationwide riots, forcing him to resign. He was succeeded by Defense Minister Sani Abacha, whose regime became infamous for widespread human rights abuses. After Abacha's death in 1998, Nigeria transitioned to civilian rule with the election of Olusegun Obasanjo, who initiated democratic reforms, including the establishment of the Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC), commonly known as the Oputa Panel.¹

The long history of severe human rights violations under these authoritarian governments raised critical questions about how to address past atrocities and provide justice to victims.² Transitional measures to confront such abuses can include compensation to victims, criminal prosecution of perpetrators, the creation of a truth commission, or other forms of reparative justice, depending on a state's objectives.³ Scholars warn that when past injustices remain

unacknowledged or uncorrected, it undermines public confidence in new governments and peacebuilding efforts, fostering resentment and the potential for renewed violence.⁴

History of the Nigerian Truth Commission (Oputa Panel)

The Nigerian Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC), popularly known as the Oputa Panel, was established in 1999 shortly after the inauguration of President Olusegun Obasanjo's democratic government. Seen as a symbol of hope and a decisive break from nearly three decades of military rule, the Commission initially enjoyed strong public support and a positive media reception.⁵ Created as part of Nigeria's transition from military dictatorship to democracy, the Oputa Panel was mandated to investigate and report on severe human rights violations committed between 15 January 1966, when the military first overthrew the democratic government, and 28 May 1999, when civilian rule was restored.⁶ It was also tasked with recommending compensation for victims of abuses. During the long years of military decrees, human rights and civil liberties were frequently violated: citizens were killed, tortured, kidnapped, harassed, and denied political participation.⁷ In response, more than 10,000 petitions were submitted to the Commission from across Nigeria's six geopolitical zones.⁸

Although the Commission held a theoretically powerful mandate, it lacked the necessary resources to fulfill it. The federal government failed to provide adequate budgetary support, instead allowing the Commission to seek external donations to finance its activities.⁹ In its final report, the Commission stated that this lack of government funding seriously hindered its work.¹⁰ External donations proved insufficient, forcing the Commission to suspend operations at times

and ultimately limiting it to addressing only 150 cases out of the 10,000 petitions received. Nigeria's return to civilian rule after nearly 30 years of military dominance was highly anticipated, and the HRVIC was viewed as a test of the new administration's commitment to democracy and its ability to remain independent of military influence. While President Obasanjo retired several high-ranking military officers, such as Olagunsoye Oyinlola and Barnabas Gemade, to reduce the risk of military interference, many of these officers retained significant financial resources and political influence.¹¹

With no legal restrictions preventing their participation in politics, many entered the political arena.¹² Some became influential "godfathers" to civilian politicians, while others sought office themselves for example, Prince Olagunsoye Oyinlola later became governor of Osun State, and Barnabas Gemade served as a senator granting former military elites both executive and legislative power.¹³ Ultimately, President Obasanjo's commitment to the HRVIC waned. Despite receiving the Commission's final report, which recommended the prosecution of senior military officers implicated in abuses, the president annulled the commission and failed to implement its recommendations.¹⁴ This ambivalence undermined the Commission's potential impact and revealed the enduring influence of Nigeria's military class on the nation's democratic trajectory.

Achievements of the Nigerian Truth Commission (Oputa Panel)

The Community-Driven Development (CDD) program in Nigeria employed a variety of strategies to foster peace and development. At its core, the program was community-led,

enabling local communities to identify their own development priorities and collaborate on projects that directly addressed those needs. This participatory approach not only empowered communities but also fostered a strong sense of ownership, investment, and commitment to the program's success.¹⁵ A central feature of the CDD program was its emphasis on tackling the root causes of conflict, particularly poverty and limited access to resources. By addressing these underlying grievances through targeted interventions, the program succeeded in reducing violence and enhancing social cohesion within participating communities. Furthermore, transparency and accountability were built into the process, with community members actively engaged in every stage of decision-making and implementation.¹⁵ In Nigeria, the CDD program thus provided a practical model of how community-led development initiatives can contribute to peacebuilding. By linking socio-economic empowerment with inclusive participation, the program demonstrated the importance of addressing economic and social grievances as a pathway to reducing conflict and promoting sustainable development.¹⁷

Challenges of the Nigerian Truth Commission (Oputa Panel)

Since gaining independence, Nigeria has faced persistent challenges that have constrained its ability to realize its full potential as one of Africa's most influential states. Among these are a flagrant disregard for human dignity, contempt for citizens' rights, and difficulties sustaining democratic accountability and legitimacy.¹⁸ In response, the newly elected President Olusegun Obasanjo, at the start of the Fourth Republic in 1999, announced the creation of a truth commission to confront the nation's history of military-era abuses. During his

inauguration, Obasanjo emphasized that the commission would demonstrate his administration's commitment to healing the wounds of the past through truth-telling and reconciliation.¹⁹ The resulting Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC) commonly known as the Oputa Panel was mandated to investigate human rights abuses committed under military rule from 15 January 1966, when the first coup displaced the democratic government, to 28 May 1999, when civilian governance was restored.²⁰

Its responsibilities included identifying individuals and institutions responsible for severe violations, determining whether abuses stemmed from state policies or individual misconduct, and recommending judicial, administrative, and institutional reforms to prevent future abuses. Despite its theoretically powerful mandate, the commission faced significant structural and political obstacles. Critics argued that its expansive mandate was unrealistic within the initial one-year timeframe.²¹ The judiciary long influenced by decades of military rule posed additional hurdles, as former military leaders often defied the commission's orders with impunity. High-profile figures such as Generals Muhammadu Buhari, Ibrahim Babangida, Brigadier Halilu Akilu, and Abdulsalami Abubakar ignored subpoenas without facing legal consequences.²² General Babangida even filed a lawsuit challenging the panel's authority and won, a decision that angered the public and weakened the commission's credibility.²³

Ultimately, the Supreme Court ruled that the federal government lacked constitutional authority to establish such a commission, declaring that only state governments could do so. Citing this verdict, President Obasanjo annulled the commission despite receiving its final report.

Budgetary constraints compounded these legal challenges. Although the HRVIC was granted a broad mandate, the Obasanjo administration failed to allocate sufficient funds, instead allowing the commission to seek external donations.²⁴ The external funding it secured proved inadequate, forcing operational delays and fueling public skepticism about its legitimacy.²⁵ These financial limitations meant that out of more than 10,000 petitions submitted nationwide, the commission could address only about 200 cases.²⁶ Moreover, the original three-month reporting deadline was woefully short given the commission's expansive task.²⁷ Operations did not begin until a year after its creation, causing further delays, diminishing media attention, and eroding public interest.²⁸ Despite these constraints, the Oputa Panel achieved some notable successes. It helped resolve the Modakeke–Ife conflict in Osun State and facilitated reconciliation among members of the Maroko community in Lagos State.²⁹ Nonetheless, inadequate funding, limited legal authority, and lack of strong government support significantly undermined the commission's ability to fulfill its mandate and provide comprehensive justice for the victims of decades of military rule.³⁰

Impact of the Nigerian Truth Commission (Oputa Panel)

Chaired by Justice Chukwudifu Oputa, the Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC) was mandated to investigate human rights abuses committed between 15 January 1966, the date of Nigeria's first coup, and 29 May 1999, when the country transitioned to democratic rule.³¹ Its establishment was met with high public expectations, symbolizing Nigeria's long-awaited break from decades of authoritarian military governance.³² The Oputa

Panel received over 10,000 petitions detailing abuses such as torture, unlawful detentions, assassinations, disappearances, intimidation, and communal violence.³³ To ensure transparency and inclusivity, the Commission conducted public hearings across all six geopolitical zones, with proceedings broadcast nationally, giving ordinary Nigerians an unprecedented platform to testify about past violations. After extensive investigations, the Commission produced an eight-volume report spanning approximately 15,000 pages, documenting widespread abuses and recommending institutional reforms, reparations, and in some cases criminal prosecutions of military leaders implicated in gross human rights violations.³⁴

A key finding of the final report underscored the systemic nature of state-sanctioned violence, concluding that “the data and evidence... very indisputably show that the military is primarily responsible for the persistence of human rights violations in the country”.³⁵ The Commission also highlighted the often-overlooked issue of conflict-related sexual violence (CRSV), documenting cases of rape, sexual slavery, and forced marriages during both the Biafran War and the Niger Delta conflicts. Evidence showed that security forces used sexual violence as a weapon of repression, humiliation, and control.³⁶ However, despite acknowledging these crimes, the Panel failed to recommend specific reparations for survivors of sexual violence, leaving a critical gap in redress for victims.³⁷

Endnotes

1. Priscilla B. Hayner, *Unspeakable Truths: Facing the Challenge of Truth Commissions*, vol. 21 (New York: Routledge, 2002).
2. Bonny Ibhawoh, *Human Rights in Africa* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).
3. H. C. Rivera, “Transitional Justice, Human Rights and the Restoration of Credibility: Reconstructing Mexico’s Social Fabric,” *Mexican Law Review* 7, no. 1 (2014): 57–81.
4. Albrecht Schnabel and Hans G. Ehrhart, “Post-Conflict Societies and the Military: Challenges and Problems of Security Sector Reform,” in *Security Sector Reform and Post-Conflict Peacebuilding*, ed. S. Albrecht and H.-G. Ehrhart (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2005).
5. Hakeem O. Yusuf, “Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission, the Oputa Panel (Nigeria),” in *Encyclopedia of Transitional Justice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 161–65.
6. Bonny Ibhawoh, “From Rights Commissions to Truth Commissions: Human Rights and the Politics of Regime Legitimation in Africa,” in *Expanding Perspectives on Human Rights in Africa*, ed. R. Izarali, O. Masakure, and B. Ibhawoh (New York: Taylor and Francis, 2019).
7. Daniel E. Gberevbie and F. O. Oviasogie, “Women in Governance and Sustainable Democracy in Nigeria, 1999–2012,” *Economics & Sociology* 6, no. 1 (2013): 89–107.
8. Ezekiel Zwanbin, “The Challenges of Transitional Justice in Nigeria: Echoes from the Oputa Panel, 1999,” *Journal of Language, Technology & Entrepreneurship in Africa* 8, no. 2 (2017): 73–91.
9. Hakeem O. Yusuf, “The Judiciary and Constitutionalism in Transitions: A Critique,” *Global Jurist* 7, no. 3 (2007).
10. Priscilla B. Hayner, *Unspeakable Truths: Facing the Challenge of Truth Commissions*, (2002).
11. Said Adejumobi, “Guarding the Guardian? The Obasanjo Regime and Military Reform in Nigeria,” *Development Policy Management Network Bulletin* 13, no. 3 (2001): 17–19.
12. P. O. Agbese and E. I. Udogu, “Taming of the Shrew: Civil-Military Politics in the Fourth Republic,” in *Nigeria in the Twenty-First Century: Strategies for Political Stability and Peaceful Coexistence* (2005).

13. Olu O. M. Folarin and Sheriff F. Folarin, "A Strategic and Prescriptive Approach to Nation-Building and National Development in Nigeria," *Astra Salvensis* (2018).
14. Victor E. Dike, *Nigeria and the Politics of Unreason: A Study of the Obasanjo Regime* (London: Adonis & Abbey, 2003).
15. Michael Shank and Jos Boonstra, *Community-Driven Development: Myths and Realities* (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2014).
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Olu O. M. Folarin and Sheriff F. Folarin, *Astra Salvensis* (2018).
19. Hakeem O. Yusuf, *Global Jurist* 7, no. 3 (2007).
20. Everisto Benyera, "South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission and Nigeria's Oputa Panel: Comparison, Lessons and the Future of Truth Commissions in Africa," in *Nigeria-South Africa Relations and Regional Hegemonic Competence* (Cham: Springer, 2018), 183–202.
21. Oluwatosin R. Ifaloye, Sheriff F. Folarin, and Moses M. Duruji, "Investigating the Challenges That Inhibited the Success of Nigeria's Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission," *Proceedings of ADVED 2019: 5th International Conference on Advances in Education and Social Sciences* 21, no. 23 (2019): 931–36.
22. Iyiola Solanke, "Accountable Judges and Their Role in Prosecuting Serious Violations of Human Rights," *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 6, no. 2 (2012): 366–73.
23. Bola A. Akinterinwa, "Nigeria: Oputa Panel: Sacred Cows and Immunity," *ThisDay*, August 13, 2001, <http://allafrica.com/stories/200108130346.html>.
24. Sheriff F. Folarin, "Olusegun Obasanjo's Policy Scoresheet: Challenge of Leadership and Continuity," *Journal of Opinion on World Affairs* 25, nos. 5–6 (2007): 124–40.
25. Priscilla B. Hayner, *Unspeakable Truths: Facing the Challenge of Truth Commissions*, (2002).
26. David D. Adeyemo, "Transitional Justice after the Military Regimes in Nigeria: A Failed Attempt?" Master's diss., University of the Western Cape, 2013.

27. Helen Scanlon and Suren Pillay, "Peace versus Justice? Truth and Reconciliation Commissions and War Crime Tribunals in Africa," Policy Advisory Group Seminar, Centre for Conflict Resolution (Cape Town, 2007).
28. Espen Guåker, *A Study of the Nigerian Truth Commission and Why It Failed* (Master's thesis, University of Bergen, 2009).
29. Ezekiel Zwanbin, "The Challenges of Transitional Justice in Nigeria: Echoes from the Oputa Panel, 1999," *Journal of Language, Technology & Entrepreneurship in Africa* 8, no. 2 (2017): 73–91.
30. Oluwatosin R. Ifaloye, Sheriff F. Folarin, and Moses M. Duruji, *Proceedings of ADVED 2019*: (2019): 931–36.
31. Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC), *Final Report, Volume One* (2002a), accessed September 17, 2025, <http://atjhub.csvr.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Oputa-Panel-Report-ume-1.pdf>.
32. Espen Guaaker, *A Qualitative Analysis of the Oputa Panel and the Factors Which Explain the Failure of the Commission* (Master's thesis, University of Bergen, 2007).
33. Suren Pillay and Helen Scanlon, "Peace Versus Justice? Truth and Reconciliation Commissions and War Crime Tribunals in Africa," Policy Advisory Group Seminar Report (Cape Town: Centre for Conflict Resolution, May 17–18, 2007).
34. Hakeem O. Yusuf, "Travails of Truth: Achieving Justice for Victims of Impunity in Nigeria," *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 1 (2007): 268–86.
35. Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC), *Final Report, Volume Three: Research Reports* (2002b), accessed September 17, 2025, <http://atjhub.csvr.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Oputa-Panel-Report-ume-3.pdf>.
36. A. Odoemene, "The Nigerian Armed Forces and Sexual Violence in Ogoniland of the Niger Delta Nigeria, 1990–1999," *Armed Forces and Society* 38, no. 2 (2012): 225–51.
37. Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC), *Final Report, Volume Seven: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations* (2002d), accessed September 17, 2025, <http://atjhub.csvr.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Oputa-Panel-Report-ume-7.pdf>.

CHAPTER FIVE

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN AND NIGERIAN TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSIONS

Introduction

Transitional justice has become a central concern for countries emerging from periods of authoritarian rule or violent conflict. In Africa, where many nations have experienced protracted human rights violations, truth commissions are a vital mechanism for confronting the past and laying a foundation for sustainable peace. This study presents a comparative analysis of two landmark truth commissions: South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and Nigeria's Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC), popularly known as the Oputa Panel. Both commissions were created in response to decades of state-sponsored violence and systemic abuses apartheid in South Africa and military dictatorship in Nigeria and sought to establish accountability, document violations, and promote national healing.

The primary purpose of this comparative analysis is to examine how these two commissions approached the challenge of addressing gross human rights violations within distinct political and historical contexts. By exploring their mandates, operational strategies, achievements, and limitations, this study aims to identify the factors that influenced their effectiveness in promoting truth, justice, and reconciliation. A comparative lens makes it possible to highlight both convergences and divergences in their methods such as South Africa's emphasis on restorative justice and amnesty versus Nigeria's struggles with political interference

and resource constraints and to evaluate the broader lessons they offer for post-conflict societies seeking to confront legacies of abuse.

Assessing the South African TRC and Nigeria's Oputa Panel together is particularly important for understanding transitional justice in Africa. Both countries are regional leaders whose approaches have shaped continental and global discourse on how societies reckon with past atrocities. Their experiences illustrate the opportunities and challenges facing African truth commissions, including questions of political will, resource mobilization, public participation, and the balance between reconciliation and accountability. Insights from this comparison not only enrich scholarly debate but also provide practical guidance for other African nations pursuing transitional justice as part of democratic consolidation and long-term peacebuilding.

Legal Mandates and Establishment

Both the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and Nigeria's Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC), widely known as the Oputa Panel, were created as state-sanctioned mechanisms to confront decades of human rights violations. Despite their shared goal of addressing systemic abuse, the legal frameworks underpinning their establishment, as well as the scope and strength of their authority, differed in significant ways. The South African TRC was established under the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act No. 34 of 1995, passed by the country's first democratic Parliament. This Act implemented the post-amble of South Africa's 1993 Interim Constitution, which required a mechanism to grant amnesty and foster reconciliation as part of the negotiated settlement that

ended apartheid. The Act granted the TRC a constitutionally recognized mandate to investigate “gross human rights violations” committed between 1 March 1960 and 10 May 1994, to recommend reparations, and to provide conditional amnesty to perpetrators who made full disclosure of politically motivated crimes.

Nigeria’s HRVIC was created by Presidential Instrument No. HRVIC/1999, signed by President Olusegun Obasanjo shortly after the return to civilian rule. Its mandate was to investigate serious human rights abuses perpetrated between 15 January 1966 and 28 May 1999, a period spanning successive military regimes. Unlike South Africa’s commission, the HRVIC did not have an enabling Act of Parliament or constitutional backing. It functioned primarily as an ad hoc presidential commission of inquiry. The South African TRC enjoyed broad investigative powers defined by statute. It could subpoena witnesses, compel the production of documents, and hold public hearings whose findings carried legal weight. Crucially, it had the authority to grant amnesty an enforcement mechanism that encouraged perpetrators to testify truthfully in exchange for immunity from prosecution. Its scope included killings, torture, abductions, and severe ill-treatment, and it was empowered to examine the social, political, and institutional contexts of apartheid-era crimes.

By contrast, the Nigerian Oputa Panel’s authority was more limited and contested. Although empowered to summon witnesses and recommend prosecutions or reforms, its lack of constitutional or legislative foundation weakened its legal standing. Former military leaders successfully challenged its subpoena power in Nigeria’s Supreme Court, which ruled that only state governments, not the federal government, could create such investigative bodies. This

decision curtailed the commission's ability to compel testimony and undermined the enforceability of its recommendations. The TRC's capacity to grant amnesty was a unique enforcement tool that balanced truth-seeking with incentives for disclosure, while its recommendations on reparations and institutional reform were formally presented to Parliament for action. In contrast, the Oputa Panel had no direct enforcement mechanism. It could only recommend prosecutions, reparations, and policy changes to the federal government, which ultimately ignored many of its findings and failed to implement its key recommendations.

Organisational Structure and Composition

The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and Nigeria's Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC), known as the Oputa Panel, each developed organisational frameworks intended to carry out broad truth-seeking mandates. Yet their internal composition, substructures, and resources differed in ways that significantly affected their performance and outcomes.

South African TRC

The TRC was a statutory, multi-committee body created under the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act (1995). It operated as a *quasi-judicial institution* and was headed by Archbishop Desmond Tutu as Chairperson, with Dr. Alex Boraine as Deputy Chairperson. Key structural features included:

Three specialist committees:

1. **Human Rights Violations Committee (HRVC):** investigated gross violations, gathered testimonies, and held public hearings.
2. **Amnesty Committee:** reviewed applications for amnesty, applying clear legal criteria and conducting its own hearings.
3. **Reparation and Rehabilitation Committee:** formulated reparations policy and recommended victim support programs.

Support Secretariat: legal teams, researchers, statement takers, psychologists, and regional offices ensured nationwide reach.

This design enabled the TRC to combine investigative, quasi-judicial, and reparative functions within a single commission, while maintaining national visibility through televised hearings.

Nigerian HRVIC (Oputa Panel)

The Oputa Panel was a presidential commission of inquiry chaired by retired Supreme Court Justice Chukwudifu Oputa, with six other commissioners drawn from legal practice, civil society, the clergy, and academia. Organisational characteristics included:

Single-panel format: no standing sub-committees for amnesty, reparations, or prosecutions.

Six zonal hearing panels to reflect Nigeria's geopolitical diversity, enabling regional outreach.

Small secretariat with limited professional investigators and administrative staff, reliant on short-term external funding.

This lean structure reflected its ad hoc creation and the absence of statutory permanence, limiting its investigative capacity and administrative stability.

Table 1: Comparative Strengths and Weaknesses of Institutional Design

Aspect	South African TRC	Nigerian Oputa Panel
Legal-structural foundation	Established by Act of Parliament with constitutional backing; clear division of labour across committees.	Created by presidential fiat; lacked legislative grounding; single-panel structure vulnerable to political and legal challenges.
Specialisation	Three committees ensured focused work on violations, amnesty, and reparations.	No dedicated committees for reparations or amnesty, diluting focus and follow-through.
Resources & Staffing	Large multidisciplinary secretariat; regional offices; international donor support.	Underfunded; limited professional staff; dependence on irregular external funding.
Public Engagement	Highly publicised hearings broadcast nationally; extensive victim participation.	Public hearings held across zones but fewer resources for outreach and media coverage.
Enforcement Capacity	Amnesty powers and subpoena authority gave leverage over perpetrators.	Subpoena power overturned by Supreme Court; recommendations non-binding.

Source: Author's Compilation

Strengths

TRC: Robust statutory framework, specialised committees, and strong public visibility enabled wide participation and a detailed historical record.

Oputa Panel: Geographic spread of hearings fostered inclusivity in a multi-ethnic federation; respected chairmanship lent credibility despite constraints.

Weaknesses

TRC: Complex committee system sometimes caused bureaucratic delays and uneven reparations implementation.

Oputa Panel: Absence of legislative backing, chronic underfunding, and lack of enforcement mechanisms sharply limited its ability to investigate or ensure follow-up on recommendations.

Objectives and Purposes

Both the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and the Nigerian Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC/Oputa Panel) were transitional justice mechanisms created to confront decades of authoritarian rule and widespread human rights abuses. While they shared the overarching aim of promoting national healing and democratic consolidation, their specific goals, political contexts, and approaches diverged in notable ways.

South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC)

Established under the *Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act of 1995*, the TRC sought to:

1. **Uncover the Truth:** Investigate and create an authoritative record of gross human rights violations committed between 1 March 1960 and 10 May 1994, including killings, abductions, torture, and severe ill-treatment.
2. **Facilitate Reconciliation and National Unity:** Promote healing through public acknowledgment of abuses and by fostering dialogue between victims and perpetrators.

3. **Grant Amnesty in Exchange for Full Disclosure:** Encourage perpetrators to confess politically motivated crimes in return for conditional amnesty, balancing restorative and retributive justice.
4. **Recommend Reparations and Institutional Reform:** Provide a framework for victim compensation and systemic reforms to prevent future abuses.

The TRC thus combined truth-seeking, restorative justice, and nation-building, positioning reconciliation as a cornerstone of South Africa's democratic transition.

Nigerian Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC/Oputa Panel)

Created by presidential order in 1999, the Oputa Panel was mandated to:

1. **Investigate Human Rights Violations:** Examine serious abuses from 15 January 1966 (Nigeria's first coup) to 28 May 1999, covering military coups, civil war atrocities, and repression under successive regimes.
2. **Identify Perpetrators and Causes:** Determine whether violations stemmed from state policy or individual misconduct, and identify responsible institutions and actors.
3. **Recommend Redress and Reforms:** Propose measures for victim compensation, judicial or administrative reforms, and mechanisms to prevent future violations.
4. **Foster National Healing and Democratic Legitimacy:** Reassure citizens of the new government's commitment to democracy and human rights after decades of military rule.

Unlike the TRC, the Oputa Panel lacked a statutory mandate for amnesty or prosecutorial power, focusing instead on documentation and recommendations for reform and reparations.

Table 2: Comparative Arrangement and Difference

Dimension	South African TRC	Nigerian Oputa Panel
Core Aim	Truth-telling for reconciliation and nation-building.	Truth-telling for accountability, redress, and democratic legitimacy.
Justice Approach	Strong emphasis on restorative justice , conditional amnesty for perpetrators who confessed.	Investigative and reform-oriented , no amnesty or prosecution powers.
Time Frame of Inquiry	1960–1994 (apartheid era).	1966–1999 (military coups to democratic transition).
Reparations Focus	Recommended reparations and memorialization as part of healing.	Recommended reparations but faced funding and implementation constraints.
Political Context	Negotiated settlement between apartheid regime and liberation movements required balancing justice with peace.	Civilian government sought to distance itself from military rule and strengthen democratic institutions.

Source: Author’s Compilation

Operational Processes and Methodologies

The operational methods of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and the Nigerian Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC), popularly known as the Oputa Panel, illustrate both commonalities and divergences in transitional justice practice across Africa. While both bodies were designed to uncover past abuses and promote reconciliation, the structures, mechanisms, and effectiveness of their operations were shaped by their political contexts and institutional capacities. Both commissions placed a strong emphasis on public hearings as a means of truth-telling and reconciliation. In South Africa, the TRC’s hearings (1996–1998) were extensively publicised and broadcast nationwide, allowing victims and perpetrators to present their narratives in an open forum. The

hearings not only provided recognition for victims but also enabled perpetrators to confess crimes in exchange for amnesty, creating a space for restorative justice.

Similarly, the Oputa Panel conducted hearings across Nigeria's six geopolitical zones (2000–2002), many of which were broadcast nationally. These hearings gave citizens a rare opportunity to testify about abuses ranging from torture and unlawful detention to assassinations and communal violence, marking a critical break from the culture of silence under military rule. However, a significant divergence lay in the justice mechanisms employed. The TRC incorporated an amnesty-for-truth provision, whereby perpetrators who made full disclosures of politically motivated crimes could be granted amnesty. This controversial but pragmatic mechanism encouraged participation from perpetrators and allowed for a broader uncovering of historical truth. In contrast, the Oputa Panel had no amnesty mechanism and no prosecutorial powers. Its role was primarily investigative and advisory, recommending reforms and reparations but lacking authority to enforce prosecutions. This limitation reduced its effectiveness in holding perpetrators accountable. In terms of institutional design, the TRC benefitted from a multi-committee structure comprising the Human Rights Violations Committee, the Amnesty Committee, and the Reparation and Rehabilitation Committee.

This allowed for a division of labour and more focused investigations. The Oputa Panel, by contrast, operated as a single commission with an expansive mandate. While it received more than 10,000 petitions and compiled an eight-volume report of nearly 15,000 pages, resource constraints and a diffuse structure limited its ability to fully investigate or act on most petitions. Another area of comparison is resource and logistical support. The TRC, backed by the

Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act, had significant institutional legitimacy and government funding, despite facing criticism. The Oputa Panel, although theoretically powerful, suffered from chronic underfunding and inadequate government support. At several points, operations were suspended due to lack of resources, and in the end, the Commission addressed only about 150 cases out of the thousands submitted. Despite these differences, both commissions shared a common feature: they sought to create a collective historical record of abuses and to build a foundation for reconciliation. The TRC's work is often celebrated as a model of transitional justice, though not without shortcomings, while the Oputa Panel's efforts exposed the systematic nature of military-era violence in Nigeria but were ultimately undermined by weak political will and institutional constraints.

Findings, Reports, and Recommendations of the South African TRC and the Nigerian Oputa Panel

The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and the Nigerian Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (popularly known as the Oputa Panel) both emerged as post-conflict mechanisms to document gross human rights violations and propose reforms for national healing. Yet, the scope of their findings, the dissemination of their reports, and the follow-through on their recommendations reveal both shared ambitions and striking contrasts. The TRC concluded that apartheid constituted a crime against humanity and that gross violations including torture, extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearances, and systematic racial oppression were perpetrated by state security forces and, in some cases, liberation movements.

Between 1996 and 1998 it collected more than 21,000 victim statements and nearly 7,000 amnesty applications, creating one of the most comprehensive records of political violence in Africa. Its five-volume report, released between 1998 and 2003, provided a meticulous narrative of abuses and institutional complicity, examining not only the acts of individuals but also the role of business, the media, religious institutions, and the legal system in sustaining apartheid.

The TRC recommended a combination of reparations, such as monetary compensation, memorials, and community rehabilitation projects, alongside institutional reforms in policing, the military, and the judiciary. It endorsed conditional amnesty for perpetrators who gave full disclosure, while encouraging prosecutions where applicants withheld the truth. Although implementation was partial and many victims received only modest compensation, the TRC succeeded in establishing a widely recognised historical record and fostered a public discourse on reconciliation that continues to influence global transitional justice models. The Oputa Panel, inaugurated in 1999 to investigate human rights abuses committed under Nigeria's military regimes from the first coup in 1966 until the return to civilian rule in 1999, also undertook an ambitious inquiry. It received over 10,000 petitions alleging torture, unlawful detention, assassinations, disappearances, and political persecution. Public hearings were held across Nigeria's six geopolitical zones and broadcast nationwide, giving ordinary citizens a rare platform to share their experiences.

The Commission produced an eight-volume report of roughly 15,000 pages that documented systemic state-sponsored violence and highlighted the pervasive impunity of Nigeria's military rulers. It recommended comprehensive reforms, including the prosecution of

named perpetrators, reparations for victims, and restructuring of security services and judicial institutions. The report also addressed conflict-related sexual violence, such as rape and sexual slavery during the Biafran War and Niger Delta conflicts, but offered few concrete reparative measures for survivors. Despite these extensive findings, the Oputa Panel's impact was limited. A Supreme Court decision questioning the federal government's authority to establish the commission weakened its legal standing, and the Obasanjo administration failed to release the full report or implement most recommendations. Chronic underfunding and political resistance meant that only a fraction of the petitions received were formally addressed, leaving many victims without justice or reparations and undermining public trust in the process.

In comparative perspective, the TRC and Oputa Panel both sought to uncover historical truths, acknowledge victims, and recommend measures for redress and institutional reform. However, South Africa's commission benefited from stronger legal grounding, broader political consensus, and more consistent public engagement, enabling at least partial implementation of its recommendations and the creation of an enduring national narrative of reconciliation. Nigeria's commission, by contrast, was hampered by legal challenges, limited resources, and insufficient political will, resulting in a rich but underutilised record of abuses and minimal progress toward accountability. The divergent outcomes underscore how political commitment and institutional support are critical for translating the findings and recommendations of truth commissions into lasting reforms and meaningful reconciliation.

Comparative Reflections: Key Similarities, Key Differences, and Broader Implications

The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and the Nigerian Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (Oputa Panel) were both conceived as post-conflict mechanisms to confront histories of political violence and state repression. Their shared purpose was to document past atrocities, acknowledge victims, and recommend reforms that could foster national healing and democratic consolidation. Each drew heavily on international transitional justice models, operated in a fragile political environment, and sought to balance the often-conflicting demands of truth, justice, and reconciliation. Both commissions relied on public hearings, encouraged victim testimony, and generated extensive written records that now stand as essential archives of their countries' turbulent pasts. Yet their mandates and operations reveal important differences shaped by distinct political settlements. The TRC emerged from a negotiated transition between the apartheid regime and the African National Congress.

Enshrined in the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act of 1995, it possessed a strong legal foundation and explicit authority to grant conditional amnesty in exchange for full disclosure. This statutory basis empowered the TRC to subpoena witnesses, conduct nationwide hearings, and recommend reparations and institutional reforms with significant political backing. By contrast, the Oputa Panel was created by a presidential order rather than a constitutional or legislative act, leaving it vulnerable to legal challenge and ultimately undermined by a Supreme Court ruling that questioned its federal authority. Its mandate was investigative and advisory only, lacking the power to compel testimony, prosecute perpetrators, or guarantee implementation of its recommendations.

Operationally, the TRC benefited from more robust funding, broader international support, and a defined three-year timeframe. It recorded over 21,000 victim statements and nearly 7,000 amnesty applications, producing a widely disseminated multi-volume report that shaped public discourse on reconciliation and informed partial reparations and policy reforms. The Oputa Panel, while ambitious in scope and geographically inclusive, struggled with chronic underfunding and political resistance. It gathered more than 10,000 petitions and produced an eight-volume report documenting systemic abuses, including conflict-related sexual violence, but the federal government neither released the report widely nor implemented most of its recommendations. The outcomes therefore diverged sharply. South Africa's process, though imperfect and criticised for limited prosecutions and inadequate reparations, created an enduring historical record and a model of conditional amnesty that influenced truth commissions worldwide. Nigeria's process, despite revealing widespread military-era atrocities and offering a platform for victims, failed to achieve comparable impact because of weak legal authority, limited enforcement powers, and lack of political will.

These contrasts offer important lessons for the design of truth commissions in post-conflict societies. First, a clear constitutional or legislative mandate is critical to insulate commissions from legal challenges and to ensure that their findings carry binding weight. Second, adequate funding and sustained political commitment are essential for effective operations and for translating recommendations into reforms and reparations. Third, while public testimony and victim participation remain vital for building a collective memory, commissions must balance truth-telling with mechanisms for accountability whether through prosecutions,

reparations, or conditional amnesties so that reconciliation does not become synonymous with impunity. Ultimately, the TRC and Oputa Panel illustrate both the promise and the limits of truth commissions. They show that such bodies can help societies reckon with violent pasts and lay foundations for democratic renewal, but only when supported by strong legal frameworks, genuine political will, and follow-through on their recommendations. Their comparative experience underscores that truth commissions must be carefully tailored to local political realities yet anchored in principles of transparency, victim-centred justice, and enforceable reform if they are to achieve lasting reconciliation.

Conclusion

This study set out to examine reconciliation efforts in post-conflict societies through a comparative analysis of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and Nigeria's Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission, popularly known as the Oputa Panel. Both commissions were conceived as mechanisms of transitional justice, designed to help deeply divided nations confront histories of state-sponsored violence, acknowledge victims, and lay the foundation for democratic renewal. Their experiences highlight both the promise and the limits of truth commissions as tools for healing societies scarred by authoritarianism and political violence. The South African TRC emerged from a negotiated settlement that required balancing the competing imperatives of truth, justice, and peace. Backed by the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act of 1995, it enjoyed a strong constitutional mandate and the authority to grant conditional amnesty in exchange for full disclosure. Through extensive public

hearings and thousands of victim statements, the TRC produced a multi-volume report that documented apartheid as a crime against humanity, recommended reparations, and promoted a national dialogue about reconciliation. Although implementation of reparations and prosecutions was uneven, the TRC succeeded in shaping South Africa's collective memory and became an influential model for truth commissions worldwide.

The Nigerian Oputa Panel, by contrast, was created by presidential order in 1999 without firm legislative or constitutional backing. It courageously investigated human rights violations from the country's first coup in 1966 to the return to civilian rule in 1999, gathering over 10,000 petitions and producing an extensive eight-volume report. Yet chronic underfunding, legal challenges, and a lack of political will undermined its work. The government failed to release its findings widely or to implement key recommendations, leaving many victims without reparations or a sense of justice and limiting the commission's long-term impact on Nigeria's democratic consolidation. Comparing these two commissions reveals clear lessons for post-conflict societies. Strong legal authority, adequate resources, and sustained political commitment are essential for any truth commission to achieve lasting influence. Equally important is a carefully calibrated balance between restorative and retributive justice: truth-telling and public acknowledgment can foster healing, but without credible follow-through whether through prosecutions, reparations, or institutional reforms reconciliation risks becoming synonymous with impunity. The South African and Nigerian experiences demonstrate that truth commissions can play a pivotal role in national healing and democratic transition, but they are not self-executing solutions. Their success depends on political context, institutional design, and the will

of both government and society to transform the revelations of the past into concrete reforms. For African states and other post-conflict societies seeking to address historical injustices, these cases underscore that reconciliation requires not only the courage to confront painful truths but also the practical commitment to translate those truths into enduring justice and structural change.

Bibliography

Books

- Adejumobi, Said. *Guarding the Guardian? The Obasanjo Regime and Military Reform in Nigeria*. Development Policy Management Network Bulletin 13, no. 3 (2001): 17–19.
- Agbese, P. O., and E. I. Udogu. *Nigeria in the Twenty-First Century: Strategies for Political Stability and Peaceful Coexistence*. 2005.
- Amstutz, Mark R. *The Healing of Nations: The Promise and Limits of Political Forgiveness*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005.
- Archibugi, Daniele, and Alice Pease. *Crime and Global Justice: The Dynamics of International Punishment*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2018.
- Asmal, Kader, Louise Asmal, and Ronald Suresh Roberts. *Reconciliation Through Truth: A Reckoning of Apartheid's Criminal Governance*. Cape Town: David Philip, 1996.
- Bakiner, Onur. *Truth Commissions: Memory, Power, and Legitimacy*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.
- Benyera, Everisto. "South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission and Nigeria's Oputa Panel: Comparison, Lessons and the Future of Truth Commissions in Africa." In *Nigeria–South Africa Relations and Regional Hegemonic Competence*, 183–202. Cham: Springer, 2018.
- Boraine, Alex, and Janet Levy. *The Healing of a Nation?* Cape Town: IDASA, 1995.
- Boraine, Alex. *Justice in Cataclysm: Criminal Tribunals in the Wake of Mass Violence*. Lecture in Belgium, 1996.
- Clark, Phil. *The Gacaca Courts, Post-Genocide Justice and Reconciliation in Rwanda: Justice without Lawyers*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Dike, Victor E. *Nigeria and the Politics of Unreason: A Study of the Obasanjo Regime*. London: Adonis & Abbey, 2003.
- Hahn-Godeffroy, Emily. *Die südafrikanische Truth and Reconciliation Commission*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1998.

- Hayner, Priscilla B. *Unspeakable Truths: Facing the Challenge of Truth Commissions*. Vol. 21. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Hayner, Priscilla B. *Unspeakable Truths: Transitional Justice and the Challenge of Truth Commissions*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Ibhawoh, Bonny. *Human Rights in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Kesselring, Rita. *Bodies of Truth: Law, Memory and Emancipation in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2017.
- Minow, Martha. *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness: Facing History after Genocide and Mass Violence*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1998.
- Osiel, Mark. *Mass Atrocity, Collective Memory, and the Law*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1997.
- Rutayisire, Paul. *Histoire des juridictions Gacaca, Tome II: La phase de l'expérimentation (2002–2005)*. Kigali: Service National des Juridictions Gacaca, 2013.
- Schaap, Andrew. *Political Reconciliation*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Shank, Michael, and Jos Boonstra. *Community-Driven Development: Myths and Realities*. Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2014.
- Taylor, Jane. *Ubu and the Truth Commission*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press, 2007.
- Teitel, Ruti G. *Transitional Justice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa. *Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa*. Vols. 1–5. Cape Town: Juta, 1998.
- Tutu, Desmond. *No Future Without Forgiveness*. New York: Doubleday, 1999.
- Van Zyl, Paul. *Promoting Transitional Justice in Post-Conflict Societies*. In *Security Governance in Post-Conflict Peacebuilding*, edited by A. Bryden and H. Hanggi, 209–31. Geneva: Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, 2005.
- Verdoolaege, Annelies. *Reconciliation Discourse: The Case of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2008.
- Welch, Stephan. *The Concept of Political Culture*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

- Whittaker, David. *Conflict and Reconciliation in the Contemporary World*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Wilson, Richard. *The Politics of Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa: Legitimizing the Post-Apartheid State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Worthington, Everett L., Jr. *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: Theory and Application*. New York and London: Routledge, 2006.
- Yusuf, Hakeem O. *Transitional Justice, Human Rights and the Rule of Law in Africa: The Nigerian Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Journal Articles

- Auerbach, Yehudith. “The Reconciliation Pyramid – A Narrative-Based Framework for Analysing Identity Conflicts.” *Political Psychology* 30, no. 2 (2009): 291–318.
- Chinyonga, Bazel Coster, and Jeffrey Kurebwa. “Effectiveness of Transitional Justice Processes in Peacebuilding in Zimbabwe: The Case of National Peace and Reconciliation Commission.” *Journal of African Studies and Development* 15, no. 2 (2023): 23–35.
- Dimitrijević, Nenad. “Justice beyond Blame: Moral Justification of (the Idea of) a Truth Commission.” *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50, no. 3 (2006): 368–82.
- Folarin, Olu O. M., and Sheriff F. Folarin. “A Strategic and Prescriptive Approach to Nation-Building and National Development in Nigeria.” *Astra Salvensis* (2018).
- Furtado, Henrique Tavares. “The Monstrous and the Miscount: A Radical Theory of Accountability.” *Critical Military Studies* (2023): 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23337486.2023.2210407>.
- Gberevbie, Daniel E., and F. O. Oviasogie. “Women in Governance and Sustainable Democracy in Nigeria, 1999–2012.” *Economics & Sociology* 6, no. 1 (2013): 89–107.
- Gibson, James L. “Does Truth Lead to Reconciliation? Testing the Causal Assumptions of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Process.” *American Journal of Political Science* 48, no. 2 (2004): 201–17.
- Gready, Paul, and Simon Robins. “From Transitional to Transformative Justice: A New Agenda for Practice.” *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 9, no. 1 (2015): 1–22.

- Ifaloye, Oluwatosin R., Sheriff F. Folarin, and Moses M. Duruji. "Investigating the Challenges That Inhibited the Success of Nigeria's Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission." *Proceedings of ADVED 2019: 5th International Conference on Advances in Education and Social Sciences* 21, no. 23 (2019): 931–36.
- Kabwete, Charles Mulinda. "Towards Justice and Reconciliation in Post-Conflict Countries: Meaningful Concepts and Possible Realities." *African Journal on Conflict Resolution* (2021): 65–91.
- Keightley, Raylene. "Political Offences and Indemnity in South Africa." *South African Journal on Human Rights* 9, no. 3 (1993): 334–57.
- Labelle, Timothée, and Jean-Nicholas Trudel. "Au cœur de la reconstruction ivoirienne: la réconciliation." *Revue québécoise de droit international* 25, no. 1 (2012): 91–118.
- Odoemene, A. "The Nigerian Armed Forces and Sexual Violence in Ogoniland of the Niger Delta Nigeria, 1990–1999." *Armed Forces and Society* 38, no. 2 (2012): 225–51.
- Parker, Peter. "The Politics of Indemnities, Truth Telling and Reconciliation in South Africa/Ending Apartheid Without Forgetting." *Human Rights Law Journal* 17 (1996): 1–13.
- Quinn, Joanna R. "Constraints: The Un-Doing of the Ugandan Truth Commission." *Human Rights Quarterly* 26 (2004): 401–27.
- Rivera, H. C. "Transitional Justice, Human Rights and the Restoration of Credibility: Reconstructing Mexico's Social Fabric." *Mexican Law Review* 7, no. 1 (2014): 57–81.
- Rogers, John, and Marie C. Nelson. "'Lapps, Finns, Gypsies, Jews, and Idiots'? Modernity and the Use of Statistical Categories in Sweden." *Annales de démographie historique* 1, no. 105 (2003): 61–79.
- Solanke, Iyiola. "Accountable Judges and Their Role in Prosecuting Serious Violations of Human Rights." *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 6, no. 2 (2012): 366–73.
- Steinø, Nicolai, Marwa Dabaieh, and Karima Ben Bih. "Post-Conflict Reconstruction in the Middle East and North Africa Region: A Bidirectional Parametric Urban Design Approach." *International Journal of Architectural Computing* (2020): 1–18.
- Vora, Jay A., and Erika Vora. "The Effectiveness of South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission: Perceptions of Xhosa, Afrikaner, and English South Africans." *Journal of Black Studies* 34, no. 3 (2004): 30.

Yusuf, Hakeem O. “The Judiciary and Constitutionalism in Transitions: A Critique.” *Global Jurist* 7, no. 3 (2007).

Zwanbin, Ezekiel. “The Challenges of Transitional Justice in Nigeria: Echoes from the Oputa Panel, 1999.” *Journal of Language, Technology & Entrepreneurship in Africa* 8, no. 2 (2017): 73–91.

Edited Books

Benyera, Everisto. “South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission and Nigeria’s Oputa Panel: Comparison, Lessons and the Future of Truth Commissions in Africa.” In *Nigeria–South Africa Relations and Regional Hegemonic Competence*, edited by Oluwaseun Tella, 183–202. Advances in African Economic, Social and Political Development. Cham: Springer, 2019.

Ifaloye, Oluwatosin R., Sheriff F. Folarin, and Moses M. Duruji. “Investigating the Challenges That Inhibited the Success of Nigeria’s Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission.” In *Proceedings of ADVED 2019 – 5th International Conference on Advances in Education and Social Sciences*, 931–36. 2019.

Thomas, Kylie. “Refusing Transitional Time: Re-opening the Unresolved Truth and Reconciliation Commission Cases and the Future of Memory in Postapartheid South Africa.” In *Remembering Transitions: Local Revisions and Global Crossings in Culture and Media*, edited by Ksenia Robbe, 137–58. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110707793-006>.

Van Zyl, Paul. “Promoting Transitional Justice in Post-Conflict Societies.” In *Security Governance in Post-Conflict Peacebuilding*, edited by A. Bryden and H. Hanggi, 209–31. Geneva: Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, 2005.

Cochrane, James, John W. de Gruchy, and Stephen Martin, eds. *Facing the Truth: South African Faith Communities and the Truth & Reconciliation Commission*. Cape Town: David Philip, 1999.

Kentridge, William. “Director’s Note.” In Jane Taylor, ed., *Ubu and the Truth Commission*, viii–xv. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press, 2007.

González, Eduardo, and Howard Varney. “What Are Truth Commissions?” In *Truth Seeking: Elements of Creating an Effective Truth Commission*, 9–12. Brasilia: Amnesty Commission of the Ministry of Justice of Brazil, 2013.

- Longman, Timothy. "Justice at the Grassroots? Gacaca Trials in Rwanda." In Naomi Roht-Arriaza and Javier Mariezcurrena, eds., *Transitional Justice in the Twenty-First Century*, 206–28. 2006.
- Malan, Jannie. "Understanding Transitional Justice in Africa." In *Peace and Conflict in Africa*, edited by David J. Francis, 133–47. London and New York: Zed Books, 2008.
- Ndahinda, Felix Mukwiza, and Alphonse Muleefu. "Revisiting the Legal and Socio-Political Foundations and (Western) Criticisms of Gacaca Courts." In *African Perspectives on Tradition and Justice*, edited by Tom Bennett, Eva Brems, Giselle Corradi, Lia Nijzink, and Martien Schotsmans, 149–73. Cambridge: Intersentia, 2012.
- Roht-Arriaza, Naomi. "The New Landscape of Transitional Justice." In Naomi Roht-Arriaza and Javier Mariezcurrena, eds., *Transitional Justice in the Twenty-First Century*, 1–16. 2006.
- Schabas, William A. "The Sierra Leone Truth and Reconciliation Commission." In Naomi Roht-Arriaza and Javier Mariezcurrena, eds., *Transitional Justice in the Twenty-First Century*, 21–42. 2006.
- Sunga, Lyal. "Ten Principles for Reconciling Truth Commissions and Criminal Prosecutions." In José Doria, Hans-Peter Gasser, and M. Cherif Bassiouni, eds., *The Legal Regime of the International Criminal Court*, 1071–1104. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Unpublished Works

- Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation. "Survivors' Perceptions of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and Suggestions for the Final Report." 2006. Accessed September 17, 2025. <https://web.archive.org/web/20060925181412/http://www.csvr.org.za/papers/papkhul.htm>.
- Fullard, Madeleine. "Dis-Placing Race: The South African Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and Interpretations of Violence." Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, 2004. Accessed September 17, 2025. <https://www.csvr.org.za/docs/racism/displacingrace.pdf>.
- Pillay, Suren, and Helen Scanlon. "Peace Versus Justice? Truth and Reconciliation Commissions and War Crime Tribunals in Africa." *Policy Advisory Group Seminar Report*. Cape Town: Centre for Conflict Resolution, May 17–18, 2007.
- Scanlon, Helen, and Suren Pillay. "Peace versus Justice? Truth and Reconciliation Commissions and War Crime Tribunals in Africa." *Policy Advisory Group Seminar*, Centre for Conflict Resolution (Cape Town, 2007).

Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation. *Report of the Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation*. Vols. I–III. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press and the Centre for Civil and Human Rights, 1993.

Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC). *Final Report: Joint Select Committee on Constitutional Recognition Relating to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, November 2018. Retrieved August 20, 2025, from https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Former_Committees/Constitutional_Recognition_2018/ConstRecognition/Final_Report.

Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia. *Final Report: Joint Select Committee on Constitutional Recognition Relating to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, November 2018.

Regeringskansliet. “‘Som om vi aldrig funnits’ (As If We Never Existed).” Regeringskansliet, November 15, 2023. Retrieved August 20, 2025, from <https://www.regeringen.se/rattsliga-dokument/statens-offentliga-utredningar/2023/11/sou-202368/>

Theses and Dissertations

Adeyemo, David D. “Transitional Justice after the Military Regimes in Nigeria: A Failed Attempt?” Master’s diss., University of the Western Cape, 2013.

Guåker, Espen. *A Qualitative Analysis of the Oputa Panel and the Factors Which Explain the Failure of the Commission*. Master’s thesis, University of Bergen, 2007.

Guåker, Espen. *A Study of the Nigerian Truth Commission and Why It Failed*. Master’s thesis, University of Bergen, 2009.

Archival Sources

Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC). *Final Report*. Vol. 1. 2002a. Accessed September 17, 2025. <http://atjhub.csvr.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Oputa-Panel-Report-ume-1.pdf>.

Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC).. *Final Report*. Vol. 3: *Research Reports*. 2002b. Accessed September 17, 2025. <http://atjhub.csvr.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Oputa-Panel-Report-ume-3.pdf>.

Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission (HRVIC).. *Final Report*. Vol. 7: *Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations*. 2002d. Accessed September 17, 2025. <http://atjhub.cs.vr.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Oputa-Panel-Report-ume-7.pdf>.

World Wide Web (Online) Sources

“The Truth and Reconciliation Commission.” *Stortinget*, June 1, 2023. Retrieved August 20, 2025, from <https://www.stortinget.no/en/In-English/About-the-Storting/News-archive/Front-page-news/2022-2023/the-truth-and-reconciliation-commission/>.

“Truth-Telling Central to Reconciliation Process.” *Reconciliation Australia*, May 10, 2018. Retrieved August 20, 2025, from <https://www.reconciliation.org.au/truth-telling-central-to-reconciliation-process/>.

“What Is ‘Truth-Telling’ and Why Does It Matter to Indigenous Australians?” *ANTaR*, February 4, 2019. Retrieved August 20, 2025, from https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Former_Committees/Constitutional_Recognition_2018/ConstRecognition/Final_Report/section?id=committees%2Freportjnt%2F024213%2F26675#footnote10target.

Akinterinwa, Bola A. “Nigeria: Oputa Panel: Sacred Cows and Immunity.” *ThisDay*, August 13, 2001. <http://allafrica.com/stories/200108130346.html>.

Barrow, Greg. “South Africans Reconciled? Special Report.” *BBC*, October 1998. Accessed September 17, 2025. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/special_report/1998/10/98/truth_and_reconciliation/142673.stm.

Boddy-Evans, Alistair. “Quotes from P. W. Botha, Prime Minister of South Africa.” *ThoughtCo*, 2021. Accessed September 17, 2025. <https://www.thoughtco.com/quotes-pw-botha-43577>.

Gómez, Luisa Fernanda. “¿Qué es la Comisión de la Verdad?” *Colombia Check*, December 4, 2018. Retrieved August 20, 2025, from <https://colombiacheck.com>.

Ibhawoh, Bonny. “From Rights Commissions to Truth Commissions: Human Rights and the Politics of Regime Legitimation in Africa.” In *Expanding Perspectives on Human Rights in Africa*, edited by R. Izarali, O. Masakure, and B. Ibhawoh. New York: Taylor and Francis, 2019.

Moran, Ry. "Truth and Reconciliation Commission." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, October 5, 2020. Retrieved August 20, 2025, from <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/truth-and-reconciliation-commission>.

Newspaper and Magazine Articles

Ager, Maila. "Davide Named Truth Commission Chief." *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, June 29, 2010. Archived August 20, 2025, from <http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/breakingnews/nation/view/20100629-278225/Davide-named-Truth-Commission-chief>.

Akinterinwa, Bola A. "Nigeria: Oputa Panel: Sacred Cows and Immunity." *ThisDay*, August 13, 2001. <http://allafrica.com/stories/200108130346.html>.

Barrow, Greg. "South Africans Reconciled? Special Report." *BBC*, October 1998. Accessed September 17, 2025. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/special_report/1998/10/98/truth_and_reconciliation/142673.stm.

Boddy-Evans, Alistair. "Quotes from P. W. Botha, Prime Minister of South Africa." *ThoughtCo*, 2021. Accessed September 17, 2025. <https://www.thoughtco.com/quotes-pw-botha-43577>.

Storey, Peter. "A Different Kind of Justice: Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa." *The Christian Century*, 1997.

Tasker, John Paul. "Residential Schools Findings Point to 'Cultural Genocide,' Commission Chair Says." *CBC News*, May 29, 2015. Archived August 20, 2025, from <https://web.archive.org/web/20160518220713/http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/residential-schools-findings-point-to-cultural-genocide-commission-chair-says-1.3093580>.

Thompson, Ginger. "South African Commission Ends Its Work." *The New York Times*, March 22, 2003. Accessed November 7, 2022.

Wahlquist, Calla. "Victoria Launches Truth Commission into Ongoing Effect of Violent Colonisation on Aboriginal People." *The Guardian*, March 10, 2021. Retrieved August 20, 2025, from <https://www.theguardian.com>