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Abstract

In South Africa, archival activism stretches back to the apartheid era. As state archives shunned the experiences of black communities and activists, anti-apartheid freedom fighters established their own archives to document their lives and activism. This study investigates the significance of these activist archives in communities which have been denied justice for apartheid-era crimes. It has been 26 years since apartheid ended, yet renewed campaigns have begun to demand justice for apartheid-era injustices. In particular, families whose loved ones died dubiously in police custody are applying pressure on prosecutors to reopen investigations. Within the context of these revived struggles of justice for apartheid victims, this study hones in on the role of counter-archives, archives created in response to exclusions of state archives, to produce stories which are relevant to contemporary demands for historical justice. The South African History Archive (SAHA), an archive created by anti-apartheid activists, was the location of this study. The concept of SAHA as a counter-archive is framed within Roger Silverstone’s ideal of “hospitable” media institutions. The idea of justice is approached through Nancy Fraser’s theory of social justice. Her theory includes three principles of justice based on injustices of recognition, redistribution and representation. Archival research was used to locate records from SAHA’s digital collections. An archival analysis of these media texts produced stories of recognition, distribution and representation to answer the research question: What stories of apartheid injustice do counter-archives produce that are relevant to justice for apartheid-era crimes in South Africa today? This study finds that the stories of representation-based injustice appear most prominently in the archive and remain relevant to present-day struggles for justice. It also concludes that counter-archives are important to struggles for historical justice in a country where transitional justice is unfinished.
INTRODUCTION

The power of archives in South Africa is well documented. During apartheid, the state archives cemented the dominance of the apartheid regime, ignoring histories related to the majority black population who were oppressed in a violently racist society (Harris, 2002). One of the reasons the apartheid government successfully ruled for over four decades was due to the regime’s control over “memory institutions” (Harris, 2002, p. 69). This meant that resistance movements were “forced away into informal spaces” of activist archives (p. 69). It is against this backdrop that the South African History Archive (SAHA) was forged as a counter-memory institution to the traditional and mainstream archives of the apartheid regime (Harris, 2002). Created by anti-apartheid activists in the 1980s, SAHA is a living repository of the experiences of struggle activists and their abuse by the apartheid regime (SAHA, 2020a). It is an “archive for justice”, centring the use of archival work to empower communities (SAHA, 2020a). This dissertation analyses SAHA’s archival records to determine what stories it produces that are relevant to contemporary struggles of justice for apartheid-era crimes.

The apartheid-era crimes referred to in this study centre on the unfinished work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in terms of justice for political detainees who were tortured and killed in police custody by the apartheid security police, known as the Security Branch. In the release of its report in 1998, the TRC recommended state prosecutors reopen investigations into 300 cases of gross human rights violations where perpetrators were not granted amnesty (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 1998). The TRC found that 73 detainees had been killed in detention (Mamdani, 2002). The commission possessed the power to grant amnesty to perpetrators of gross human rights violations, including torture and murder, but offenders who were denied amnesty or who failed to testify before the commission may still be prosecuted. In a united effort known as the Apartheid Era Victims’ Families Group (AVFG), families of political detainees who died in detention have demanded that unresolved TRC cases be reinvestigated (Apartheid Era Victims’ Families Group, 2020a). The families came together after a 2017 inquest into the death in detention of Ahmed Timol in 1971 overturned a 30-year-old lie: it found that
Timol had been tortured and murdered, denying the police version that Timol had committed suicide (Fihlani, 2017). The inquest spurred groups of families to unite to pursue justice for anti-apartheid freedom fighters who died in detention (Pather, 2019). The AVFG established itself as an organisation in 2020 and released its founding charter in August (Apartheid Era Victims’ Families Group, 2020a). It also petitioned President Cyril Ramaphosa to establish a commission of inquiry into the undue delays in prosecutions (Khan, 2020).

The TRC has become the foremost archive to detail apartheid-era police brutality. Through victim and perpetrator testimonies, it traced the way in which apartheid dispossessed black people of rights and dignity to consolidate white power. In its final report, the TRC recommended that $1224 be paid annually to victims of gross human rights violation over a period of six years as reparative justice (1998). Within the TRC’s framework, surviving detainees and families of those who were killed in detention would be recognised as victims of apartheid and entitled to reparations. After a five-year delay, the state agreed to pay a single grant of $1732 in 2003 to just over 20 000 victims identified on the TRC list (Gumede, 2017). The list excluded thousands of people who did not come forward to the TRC, provoking criticism (Gumede, 2017). The one-time grant was also regarded as an insult to victims (Gumede, 2017). The Human Rights Foundation and the South African Coalition for Transitional Justice, two non-government bodies which have established a website called Unfinished TRC to support victims of apartheid, have noted that reparations remain a site of tension in the country (Unfinished TRC, 2020). For two decades, Khulumani Support Group, an organisation which represents apartheid victims’ struggle to access dignified reparations, has highlighted the demands for distributive justice (Gumede, 2017).

With the country’s transition to democracy, activist archivists had hoped that the state-funded National Archive would transform into an inclusive archive that corrected its historical exclusions. Instead, the National Archive remains exclusionary (Hamilton et al., 2002). This study uses SAHA as an example of a counter-archive which deliberately includes stories of historically marginalised people to work in the interest of justice for disadvantaged communities. Its efforts
to promote equality are analysed through Roger Silverstone’s theory of hospitality (Silverstone, 2017). The idea of justice is understood within Nancy Fraser’s principles of recognition, redistribution and representation (Fraser, 2010). Using the SAHA digital archive, this research investigates the stories activist archives produce which are relevant to justice for apartheid-era crimes in South Africa today, centring on justice for freedom fighters who were tortured and killed in detention. In doing so, this research aims to demonstrate the significance of archives as institutions of justice and their importance to struggles for justice in marginalised communities who still fight for truth and accountability for apartheid-era crimes.

THEORECTICAL CHAPTER

This chapter provides an overview of the literature which grounds this research, a conceptual framework of the particular theories used to frame this study and a statement of the research question and aims.

Literature Review

Archives in Media Studies

Archival research has been explored in a variety of different fields. This research locates archives within media and communications, drawing upon the work of activist archivists who use archives to promote access to information. Archives use media — texts, images, videos, and audio records — to translate the past into the present (Hamilton et al., 2002). Derrida described physical archives as the residences of “archons”, who are the “superior magistrates”, illustrating the ways in which people with authority were the keepers of these documents that held significant power to shape societies (1996, p. 2). With the development of media technologies, there has been an increased focus on the ways in which media can be used to democratise archives.
In the United States, digital archivists use online tools to preserve records of digital activism, noting the ways in which traditional physical archives excluded these events (Jules et al., 2018). Research has demonstrated that such digital archives can help to democratise the power imbalances that have occurred within archival practices (Caswell et al., 2017). McKinney would refer to such digital archivists as “information activists” (2020, p. 2). McKinney uses the term to describe feminist lesbian archivists who established the Lesbian Herstory Archives to preserve lesbian histories in New York. Information activism involves activists producing information sought by groups who are marginalised from traditional archives. It uses media “to organise, store and provide access to information” (p. 2). Carroll and Hackett use similar ideas to inform their theory of democratic media activism, which involves the work of activists to establish media institutions which strive to uphold democratic values of inclusivity and equality (2006). Successful democratic media activism reshapes institutions and their content to create media that is fair and inclusive of all (Carroll & Hackett, 2006).

South African activist archivists have exercised democratic media activism in their work to promote justice through the establishment of inclusive archives. SAHA and university archives have been noted for their response to the exclusions of state archives (Harris, 2002). Their goal of democratising archives also constitutes information activism as it seeks to deliberately include marginalised histories neglected in traditional archives. These archives have therefore established themselves in response to traditional archives, countering the power of state archives to produce exclusionary narratives.

**Power and Counter-Archives**

The power of archives is often described in their ability to exclude certain histories that cement inequalities among communities in society. In the opening pages of *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, Derrida highlights the power that rests with archives and archivists. He states that the magistrates who controlled archives “commanded” society (1996, p. 2). These citizens who “held and signified political power” possessed the sole authority to translate records within the archive (p. 2). Foucault described the archive as “the law of what can be said, the system that governs the
appearance of statements as unique events”, emphasising the role of archives in deciding the histories that are recognised and the ones that remain left unsaid (1972, p. 129). Burton argues that archives emerge from “political, cultural, and socioeconomic pressures” which influence the histories they prioritise and exclude (2005, p. 6). In these works, the archive is constructed upon inclusions and exclusions of histories, where a select few who control the archive have the ability to shape how the past is narrated in the present and the future. Mbembe expands on their ideas, describing how archives embody symbolic power in the form of status (2002).

“The archive is, therefore, not a piece of data, but a status,” Mbembe wrote (p. 20).

The selection of documents to be preserved affords them the status of being “read and decoded” (p. 20), signifying that these are the chosen pieces of history made visible to the public while others are left behind. Caswell et al. refer to such exclusions as the “symbolic annihilation” of people who are “absent, underrepresented or misrepresented in mainstream media and archives”, demonstrating the power of archives to erase traces of communities (2017, p. 6). Within a South African context, researchers have noted the way archives remain built on decisions of inclusions and exclusions, impacting researchers’ trust in state record-keeping (Hamilton et al., 2002). Activist archives have been established in response to the power imbalances of these traditional archives.

Community archives have emerged globally to contest the exclusions of mainstream archives (Luehrmann, 2015). Mainstream archives are state-funded or controlled archives that centre the “dominant sections of society”, while excluding histories of marginalised groups (Flinn et al., 2009, p. 73). Community-driven archives are created by members of excluded groups to reflect their neglected histories and represent themselves within the archival system “on their own terms” (p. 73). Counter-archives follow the tradition of community archives to contest the inequalities of dominant archives. Kros defines a counter-archive as “an archive that makes previously silenced voices audible” (2015, p. 153), while Luehrmann links counter-archives to “identity archives” which represent collectives excluded by traditional archives (2015, p. 135). A
body of counter-archives have emerged around the world. In Britain, a counter-archive was created to document Soviet Christian histories (Luehrmann, 2015). In Australia, the Monash Country Lines Archive Program was established to include indigenous communities ostracised from traditional archives (McKemmish et al., 2019). The Favela Tem Memoria is an activist archive of favelas on the outskirts of Rio de Janeiro (Davis, 2018).

While archives democratise their records to reflect inclusivity, they also build stories of past events. Researchers have traced the way archival records can be used to produce stories of the past that cement or counter dominant versions of history in the present.

*Stories in Past and Present*

Archives have been widely used to construct narratives of the past. Studies have shown how archives produce accounts of the past which are inundated with biases (Burton, 2005; Caswell et al., 2017). Researchers have found that processes of selecting, categorising, labelling and describing records and collections have influenced the way archives tell stories and how researchers read them (Duff & Harris, 2002). Mbembe argues that archives function in the interests of the institutions which create them, selecting records to keep and, in doing so, taming histories of violence and dispossession into neatly categorised texts to be used or abandoned by researchers (2002). These “fragments” of histories, when used, are collected to tell stories of the past (p. 19). Stoler notes that archival records are “not dead matter” of histories, recounting the ways in which stories of archives are active in the present where they are repurposed to bolster state discourse and justify decisions of powerful actors (2009, p. 3). Her work complements Mbembe, evoking a sense of powerful figures taming history to produce narratives to suit their interests. She refers to the fragments of histories which impact the present as “watermarks” that trace the pieces of the past still evident in the functioning of present-day societies (p. 8). Taylor further expands on the link between archival stories and the present, emphasising how histories have been manipulated “to suit the memorialising needs of those in power” (2003, p. 17). However, archives never present a full account of history.
Harris states archives are only a “sliver” of a portal into the past (2002, p. 64). His work develops a theory of archives as fragmented pieces which can never fully encapsulate what transpired. Researchers have noted that various media forms, including art and literature, are “capable of releasing different kinds of information about the past” (Hamilton et al., 2002, p. 10). These various media allow more inclusive stories to develop, but they are unlikely to produce full narratives (Hamilton et al., 2002). Despite the incompleteness of archival stories, academics have found artefacts useful in telling stories that may otherwise remain unknown. Mongia traced the history of the passport against the backdrop of events in 1906 and 1915 when Canadians sought to force Indian immigrants to carry passports (1999). Toth used archival documents to tell the “untold stories” of Mexican author, María Cristina Mena (2013, p. 331), and Pathé and Théofilakis recounted stories of 20th century prisoners of wars (2016). They begin their compilation with the words: “Good stories often start in old boxes, with the lid more or less firmly stuck down, full of papers turning yellow with age” (2016, p. 1), recognising the nature of archives as places where stories can be told from the remains of old records.

Against this backdrop, South African archives have sought to tell their own stories. SAHA presents itself as “recapturing lost and neglected histories” to promote struggles for justice in the present, thus indicating that the stories it tells are of marginalised communities and events (SAHA, 2020a). Justice has been a core tenet that has been richly researched in archival work, particularly in South Africa.

*Archives and Justice*

The story of archives in South Africa is intrinsically tied to the work of justice and liberation. The TRC marked a turning point in the country, where oral history was recorded to reflect the crimes of apartheid and the hope forged by the struggle against it (Andrews, 2004). The TRC operated within the framework of transitional justice (Backer, 2010). Transitional justice has been defined as the processes by which societies confront regimes of gross human rights violations to build peace in the present and future (Bentrovato & Wassermann, 2018). It often includes truth commissions, reparations and trials to complete the political and social transition from oppressive
rule to democracy (Elster, 2004; Humphrey & Valverde, 2008). In South Africa, renewed interest in historical crimes has illustrated that transitional justice remains incomplete as activists still demand justice for historical human rights violations.

Researchers have documented the impact of apartheid-era economic crimes on existing poverty and corruption in South Africa (Van Vuuren, 2017), while others have studied the trauma meted out by the apartheid security apparatus (Dlamini, 2015). Further academic works on archives have researched the possibility of archival work as a tool to respond to historical injustice. Hughes-Watkins argues for the notion of a “reparative archive” which would collect, store and make public histories that have traditionally been neglected to aid processes of reconciliation (2018, p. 3). Hughes-Watkins’ call for a reparative archive links to Silverstone’s notion of hospitality.

Silverstone envisioned media justice through the idea of hospitality (2007). Traditionally, he applied the theory to the “mediated space of appearance in which the world appears… and through which we learn about those who are and who are not like us” (p. 31). Silverstone suggested that media institutions which translate the world through media technologies have an obligation to welcome all people, particularly “the stranger” (p. 14). Hospitality is a prerequisite of justice in these institutions and its absence is “a sign of injustice” (p. 140). In this conceptualisation, hospitality is not only welcoming of the stranger, but also an “obligation to listen and to hear” them (p. 136). For media institutions, hospitality is then a responsibility to hear all people, regardless of their status in societies. Within the archival profession, hospitality links to counter-archives in the way it seeks to respond to systemic inclusions through welcoming marginalised histories and communities. Harris echoes this sentiment as he states that hospitality within the archive means that archives are spaces for community engagement where all people can be represented and participate in the archive (2002). He argues that the work of archivists is to bring the archives into communities to spread knowledge of the past in order to forge a “new dream” for the future (p. 119). Silverstone’s work differs theoretically from Harris’s in that it
focuses on a specific theory of justice institutions should follow. The justice he emphasises is incorporated through the work of Rawls.

Silverstone uses Rawls’ “veil of ignorance” in his concept of hospitality (p. 146). The veil of ignorance is a process where members of society become equal through a lack of awareness of their political, economic and cultural status and therefore the unequal power relations among them. In media institutions, the veil would develop conditions where no one would expect to be excluded, resulting in equal inclusion and participation of all people in processes for justice (Silverstone, 2007). Rawls adopted the veil of ignorance to guarantee fairness in his theory of justice (1999). The Rawlsian account of justice argues for societies to be arranged in a way that accommodates justice through embodying democratic values of equality. He refers to this as the “basic structure” of societies (p. 6). All participants in processes of justice would agree on “primary goods” that are basic needs desired by all humans, including liberal rights such as freedom of movement and speech (p. 54). To establish a fair procedure of justice, all members must be able to participate without making decisions based on their own interests. They would therefore require the veil of ignorance, as they should not know their social status. Within Silverstone’s model, access to and participation in media constitutes a primary good as he concludes that it is a “precondition for full membership of society” (p. 147). While Rawls’ theory has become widely celebrated it has also faced challenges.

Fraser has argued that not all basic structures are of equal benefit to everyone in society, challenging the universal approach of Rawlsian justice (2010). The impact of race and gender on inequality is also not considered in the Rawlsian account of justice. Allen notes that race and gender “may specify relevant points of view” in societies which do not meet the basic structure of the Rawlsian ideal, highlighting the limitations of justice as fairness in societies where inequality exists (2014, p.1695). Kittay has also argued that Rawlsian justice excludes groups who are dependent on others, including elderly people and women who rely on men when the arrangements of society deny them opportunities (2018). In later works, Rawls concludes his
theory is a normative ideal of how societies should function rather than an account of societies as they are now (2001).

A range of other theorists have argued different versions of justice. Freire details how oppressed groups require access to the production of communication to challenge the messages produced by oppressors (1990). Sen argues that justice should create conditions where people, as equals, possess the capabilities to make choices to live a life which they value (1999). Fraser has argued for a model of justice based on three principles: recognition, redistribution and representation. Her theory aims to develop a “difference-friendly world” where people can be equals in society, regardless of their differences (2003, p. 7). Social justice, in the Fraserian philosophy, centres on the need for “parity of participation” (2010, p. 16), which would mean that all members have equal participation in their society. Recognition is justice sought for “misrecognition”, which is the mistreatment of people based on race, gender, sexuality or other personal identities (p. 16). Redistribution is justice sought for the exclusion or dispossession of certain groups from access to economic wealth, known as “maldistribution” (p. 16). Fraser argues that representation is based on the injustice of “misrepresentation” where people are denied full participation in social and political institutions, including processes of justice, on the basis of the communities or political grouping to which they belong (p. 18). Fraser states that representation is “the political”, as it is the sphere of society where certain groups may be included, allowing them to make claims for justice, or be excluded, denying them membership “from the circle” where claims for justice are discussed (p. 17).

Groups can also experience exclusions from these political arenas as a result of misrecognition, where they are denied access because of their identities, or maldistribution, where they are denied access on the basis of their class membership. In this way, Fraser illustrates that the three principles of justice are not mutually exclusive. Fraser details two forms of misrepresentation. The first is “ordinary-political injustice”, where a collective is denied full participation in their community, yet has some degree of participation (p. 6). The second is “misframing”, which occurs when communities are denied any membership in a given society (p. 19). The core difference
between the two misrepresentations is therefore the extent to which groups are ostracised from society. In this way, the Fraserian ideal of justice considers societies where different oppressions require different forms of justice, centring historical exclusions that continue to perpetuate injustice in the present. Given the legacy of apartheid injustice in South Africa, theories of justice help to conceptually frame and further contribute toward understanding struggles for justice in the country’s past and present.

**Conceptual Framework**

It is clear that the exclusions of mainstream archives reflect widespread power inequalities in societies. Academics and activists have traced the influence of archives on society and vice versa to track how archives impact justice and injustice. This research contributes to their body of work on archives and justice. It positions archives and justice within Silverstone and Fraser’s ideals. Counter-archives are analysed through Silverstone’s model of hospitality, which evokes the obligation of institutions to promote equality and actively welcome marginalised communities. While Silverstone’s account of media justice follows Rawlsian justice, this dissertation draws on the Fraserian account of justice.

Within the context of this study, Fraser’s idea of justice reflects the current inequalities faced by South Africans on the basis of racism, classism and unequal levels of access to political and social institutions. While Silverstone’s hospitality uses a Rawlsian account of justice, the current socio-economic and political landscape within South Africa is not ordered to fit the basic structures required by Rawls. Instead, this landscape echoes the Fraserian account of injustice where activists have demanded justice for race and gendered discrimination in the form of misrecognition, unfulfilled reparations in the form of maldistribution and unequal access to systems of justice in the form of misrepresentation. Academics have successfully applied the Fraserian account of justice to cases of historical injustice in South Africa, highlighting its usefulness in analysing historical gender-based discrimination and land dispossession (Gouws, 2014; Beyers, 2014). In this way, previous research has demonstrated that a Fraserian account of justice is an appropriate tool to analyse struggles for historical justice in South Africa.
Research Question and Aims

Through conducting this research, this dissertation aims to understand how archival records remain relevant in understanding contemporary struggles of justice for apartheid-era crimes and the ways in which counter-archives are significant for marginalised communities who demand this justice. It ultimately seeks to examine the importance of archives in societies where transitional justice is incomplete. The following research question will help this study make findings in terms of the aims expressed:

What stories of apartheid injustice do counter-archives produce that are relevant to justice for apartheid-era crimes in South Africa today?

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides a justification for the method used to conduct this study. It includes a description of the method, insight into the research design and mode of analysis, as well as the ethical considerations of this research.

Methodological Rationale

This study is located in archives. The research question requires an examination of archival artefacts to produce stories of apartheid injustice. I therefore selected archival research as the method to conduct this study. The method involves collecting data from archives and analysing it within the parameters of a research topic (Mills & Mills, 2018). Archival research is therefore the most effective method to answer the research question as it provides the tools for researchers to explore archival databases and analyse records to construct narratives of past events and people.
This method is also a justifiable approach to conducting this study as it analyses how political and social power relations influence the establishment of archives and their collections (Burton, 2005). Researchers have noted that archives are biased institutions where contestations of power take place and where inequalities are cemented (Burton, 2005, Caswell et al., 2017). This research examines similar themes as it studies how counter-archives have emerged as a response to the historical exclusions of traditional archives. However, there are notable disadvantages in using archival research, as discussed below.

Identifying a universal step-by-step approach for archival research is challenging. Academics have agreed that archival research lacks a distinct protocol of how it should be conducted. Lewis Gaillet notes that there is “little codified information” on the method and a lack of scholarship on the “how-to of archival research” (2010, p. 29). This means that a universal guide on how to do archival research is difficult to find. A further challenge is imposed by the lack of clarity of what an archive contains. Steedman documents the excitement of finding significant artefacts in archives, whilst also acknowledging that researchers may not find artefacts of value for their studies (2001). This research experienced these challenges, but also found ways in which to successfully respond to them.

Academics have recommended piloting research within an archive to establish whether it contains relevant material (Lewis Gaillet, 2010). This study therefore conducted prior research within archives to determine if archival material existed to answer the research question. A codified method of artefact analysis, which will be discussed later, was also piloted to determine if it would be appropriate to answer the research question. Resultantly, this study successfully implemented tools to strengthen the method based on previous research.
Research Design

The research design for this study was impacted by the outbreak of Covid-19 in the United Kingdom. In March 2020, the UK government announced a lockdown, and public institutions, including archives, were indefinitely closed. As a result, this research located digital archives as the field of study. This is a notable limitation as physical archives make a vast number of artefacts more accessible than their digital counterparts, significantly limiting the sample.

Data Collection

I conducted early research on a number of digital archives in South Africa before determining the final selection. The research question positions counter-archives as the sites of analysis. Within the framework of this study, counter-archives incorporate features of Silverstone’s hospitality through an obligation to welcome marginalised communities into the institutions and promote inclusivity of their histories. The archive selected as the site of research would thus need to adopt these traits in its institutional values and practices.

Earlier studies indicated that anti-apartheid activists turned to SAHA and university archives to store records in response to state exclusions of their histories (Harris, 2002). Other researchers highlighted the impact of SAHA and the University of Witwatersrand’s Historical Papers archive as documenters of anti-apartheid activism (Graham, 2010). Following the emphasis on the work of SAHA in prior research, I searched its website to learn more about its establishment. Its mandate as an “archive for justice” (SAHA, 2020a) and its efforts to participate in information activism embody features of Silverstone’s ideal of a hospitable institution through its focus on marginalised communities and its encouragement of community participation in the archive. A search of its collections for records related to detainee death and torture produced many results. These factors made it an appropriate location for the purposes of this research.

Additionally, SAHA collaborated with Historical Papers in 2003 to launch an archive called Traces of Truth. Its purpose is to make previously inaccessible TRC records available to the public (Traces of Truth, n.d.). SAHA’s collaboration with Historical Papers was included in this research.
as it offers insight into how university archives contribute to hospitable archival practices. It also contained information on reparative justice relevant to this research, which could not be found in SAHA’s database. Once the selection of archives was confirmed, purposive sampling was used to determine which archival collections would be included in the study.

Purposive sampling is most appropriate in studies where archival researchers are “interested in a specific type of activity”, as Balcells and Sullivan note (2018, p. 141). This study used purposive sampling to acquire archival records related to death and torture in detention during apartheid in the interests of the research question.

Initially, search words for “detainee”, “torture”, and “detention” yielded results in various collections in the SAHA archive. The SAHA Poster Collection was widely popular in all search results, but this collection was excluded from the research as the posters were less useful than artefacts found in other collections. In the Sunday Times Heritage Project Collection (STHP), records were found focusing specifically on detainees who had died and who had survived torture in detention. This collection included a variety of different media, such as drawings, newspaper clippings, and interview transcripts (Collins, 2009a). The collection was included in this research as it provided ample opportunity for the construction of stories relevant to the research question. The Freedom of Information Programme Collection was also included in the research. Records contained in this collection forged links to artefacts in the STHP collection, helping to corroborate those records and further develop stories (Marima, 2010).

Two other collections were used from the Traces of Truth archive: the Independent Bureau of Inquiry (IBI) collection and the NGO Working Group on Reparations collection. The IBI collection was selected as it contained information on detainee torture and death that contributed to the stories this study produces. The NGO Working Group on Reparations collection is significant as it is the only collection in either archive to focus on struggles for reparative justice. It was included to adequately reflect this struggle for justice in answering the research question. Once the archival
collections had been selected, methods of analyses were studied to determine an appropriate mode of data analysis for this research.

**Analysis of Data**

As previously discussed, various researchers have used archival artefacts to produce narrative accounts of events or people that may otherwise have been left untold. While a variety of tools can be used to analyse artefacts — including discourse analysis, content analysis, and semiotic analysis (Given, 2008) — this research followed the traditions of archival researchers who traced fragments of historical events and people to construct narratives about them. Within the framework of the research question, these narratives were centred on stories of justice using Nancy Fraser’s theory of social justice.

Quantitative analysis tools, such as content analysis, were rejected for the purposes of this study due to the lack of attention these methods place on examining the meaning of data (Franzosi, 2008). Qualitative analytical tools have been understood to place stronger emphasis on the ways in which data can communicate different interpretations (Franzosi, 2008). The object of this research is to determine the stories of counter-archives and what they mean in terms of contemporary struggles of justice for apartheid-era crimes. Discourse, semiotic and narrative analysis were also rejected as this research uses diverse media formats. No single form of analysis would be appropriate for the various media analysed. Incorporating too many methods of analysis to examine each form of artefact would lead to confusion and may be difficult to replicate in future studies. Lewis Gaillet’s approach to archival analysis was therefore adopted as an appropriate form of qualitative analysis, as discussed below (2010).

This research followed the advice of Krüger et al., as quoted in Balcells and Sullivan, who state that researchers should “stay close to the data” when analysing purposive samples to avoid making flawed generalisations (2018, p. 141). Using Lewis Gaillet’s method of analysis, the records were examined at a denotative level to maintain as much factual accuracy as possible in storytelling (2010). Lewis Gaillet’s method was established to develop a mode of analysis that
could be applied to a variety of texts and contexts. Her method is a system of rules archival researchers should follow when conducting analysis. It includes the following instructions (pp. 35-36):

1. Finalise the research questions
2. Provide a denotative description of the artefact
3. Locate the artefact within a genre or category
4. Place the artefact in political, social and other systemic contexts of its time
5. Corroborate the claims made from the artefact
6. Situate the artefact within current discourses and events
7. Determine the motives behind the creation of the artefact
8. Study the original audience of the artefact
9. Examine how the artefact was received
10. Study the contemporary reception of the artefact
11. Choose how the story will be told

A pilot of this method was initiated to analyse a drawing created by Kantilal Naik, who survived torture in police detention in Johannesburg in 1971 (see Appendix A). The method was found to be effective in locating the artefact in historical and present-day contexts. The nature of the research question is temporal in that it seeks to locate the relevance of past atrocities in present-day struggles for justice. Recent media reports and campaigns by contemporary activists were used to couch artefacts within current events. Activist campaign documents included recent court papers, statements and petitions. Archival newspaper clippings, documents and TRC records were used to locate artefacts within historical discourses and events. The analysis proved successful as it allowed me to locate the artefacts within historical circumstances (see point 4) and within current events (see point 6). It thus offers an opportunity to answer a significant
component of the research question. The story of Naik’s detention was told through using artefact information and corroborating it with sources inside and outside the archive, which will be discussed later. There were, however, challenges in applying all facets of Lewis Gaillet’s method.

Naik’s drawing could not easily be located within a particular genre (point 3). It was also unclear as to who the original audience for this artefact was (point 8). The drawing was not published and thus the original reception of it could not be ascertained (point 9). It was also difficult to state how contemporary audiences received the work, as no information was available to make this clear (point 10). In these instances, information was not included in the analysis. This did not harm the nature of the research as the ability to locate the artefact within past and current events proved most useful. As such, the method was tweaked to suit the purposes of this study and thus excluded points 3, 8, 9 and 10 from the analysis. It was determined that stories could adequately be told through collating relevant fragments of information from records to produce narratives. This required particular attention on the corroboration of sources.

Numerous researchers encourage the corroboration of archival information to substantiate stories derived from artefacts (Lewis Gaillet, 2010; Balcells and Sullivan, 2018). Archival researchers do not specify how many records should be used to corroborate claims, but this research used at least two sources of corroboration as a benchmark to ensure at least two accounts of the same claim exist. Archival records, newspaper clippings and TRC documents were used to verify claims made in the artefacts selected for this research. These sources were also used to couch artefacts within past events as required by Gaillet. Balcells and Sullivan state that researchers should rationalise their reasons for selecting sources of corroboration (2018). This research selected sources of corroboration that closely linked to the events described by the artefact, namely through referencing the same people, location and abuses that were said to have taken place.
Lewis Gaillet’s analysis method was used to analyse each artefact selected for this research. The information was collated in a table for ease of reference. An excerpt of the table is included in Appendix B.

**Ethics and Reflexivity**

Archival research is often a personal endeavour. Some academics have described the romanticism of discovery that attracts them to archival research (Steedman, 2001), while others have reflected on how their own beliefs intertwine with their research interests in the archives (McKinney, 2020). As a researcher, I have experienced sympathetic feelings towards victims of apartheid injustice, centring their continued struggle for justice in this study. To avoid any false inferences or overlooked narratives, I have included data that reflects the stance of security police as well as records created by independent bodies — such as Amnesty International and academic researchers — to ensure many different perspectives were considered in the construction of the stories produced.

**RESULTS AND ANALYSIS**

This section presents the results for data collected in the following way: an analysis of the selected four archival collections from the SAHA and Traces of Truth archives within Silverstone’s ideal of hospitable institutions and the findings of what stories they produce driven by Fraser’s concept of social justice.
**Analysis of Four Collections**

The four collections chosen for this research are analysed within Silverstone’s ideal of hospitable institutions.

**SAHA: The Sunday Times Heritage Project**

The Sunday Times Heritage Project (STHP) was a joint collaboration between SAHA and the Sunday Times, the most widely circulated national newspaper in South Africa (Breitenbach, 2019). The newspaper funded the project as a celebration of its centenary anniversary in 2006. Its aim was to mark the most important news events of the past 100 years, focusing on notable “newsmakers who stood at the heart of these actions” (Bauer, n.d.). The newspaper worked with artists and historians to design memorials to freedom fighters and establish a digital archive. It also developed a website of learning materials for teachers and students. SAHA describes the STHP digital collection as a transformation of the archival discipline to include communities “beyond a traditional user base of researchers and academics” (Sunday Times Heritage Project, n.d.). It also sought to correct historical absences within traditional archives. In this way, the collection follows Silverstone’s ideal of a hospitable institution as it promotes inclusivity of marginalised groups both in terms of the histories it preserves and its encouragement of community participation in the archive.

The digital collection contains a wide range of material on South African anti-apartheid struggles, including interview transcripts, newspaper clippings, and drawings. The detainee records from this collection were perused for this research as a result of the unique intimacy they evoke of two detainees in particular — Joyce Dipale and Stanza Bopape. Bopape’s records include newspaper clippings which document media reports of his death in detention. Three of these newspaper clippings were selected for this research (see Appendix D, E, and F). Dipale’s records include a drawing of her torture (see Appendix C) and an interview transcript (Smith & Dipale, 2007). She and fellow activists who were targeted by police were interviewed by organisers of the STHP for the collection.
The Freedom of Information Programme Collection at SAHA is an example of one of the ways the archive seeks to challenge hegemonic power in South Africa through empowering access to information. The collection contains records obtained under South Africa’s Promotion of Access to Information legislation (PAIA), which allows institutions and individuals to request government, corporations and public interest bodies to disclose public interest information that is kept secret (SAHA, 2020b). The collection mainly comprises of apartheid security documents which SAHA compelled the democratic government to release via PAIA applications. Its aims are to create awareness about the public’s right to access information and to empower people to use PAIA legislation “as a strategic advocacy tool” (SAHA, 2020b). As a commitment to this goal, SAHA offers to submit PAIA requests on behalf of individuals and community organisations (SAHA, 2020b). The collection embodies Silverstone’s idea of hospitality as it demonstrates the way the archive has reached out to communities to identify what information they seek and how it can be obtained. In this way, SAHA shows its active role in marginalised communities and its commitment to telling their stories.

The records obtained for this study include TRC testimony transcripts of former Security Branch officer Charles Zeelie (Department of Justice and Constitutional Development, 2007a) and former police commissioner General Petrus Johann Coetzee (Department of Justice and Constitutional Development, n.d.). The TRC Section 29 hearing transcripts illustrate police attitudes and beliefs during the apartheid era. The Section 29 hearings, conducted by the TRC’s Human Rights Violations Committee, were closed inquiries involving Security Branch policemen believed to have knowledge of acts of gross human rights violations (SAHA, 2015). SAHA successfully secured the release of these transcripts from the state Justice Department through PAIA requests (SAHA, 2015).
The name of this collection refers to the Independent Board of Inquiry into Informal Repression (IBIIR). The South African Council of Churches, an anti-apartheid religious body, established the IBIIR in 1989 to investigate claims of police violence and abuse (Independent Board of Inquiry into Informal Repression, n.d.). The organisation collected a wide range of material in its investigations of police human rights violations. It continued its work until 1996, when the TRC was established. Its collection in the Traces of Truth archive preserves apartheid-era academic reports, police investigations as well as findings of the apartheid government’s inquiries into allegations of police violations (Independent Board of Inquiry, n.d.). Within the context of apartheid-era violations, this collection seeks to preserve the records obtained through the IBI which do not appear available in any other digital collection. The collection carries features of Silverstone’s hospitality in that it makes visible investigations into police brutality during the apartheid era, providing detailed information on the oppression of historically marginalised groups who had been traditionally excluded in state archives. It also includes both police narratives and investigations by NGOs which produce counter-narratives, demonstrating its willingness to highlight all narratives in an inclusive approach.

This study includes a police report in response to allegations of abuse in detention by independent pathologist Dr Jonathan Gluckman (The Chief: Crime Investigation Service, n.d.). The document was included as it reflects the police’s attitudes at the time and the conflict of narratives between police accounts and independent human rights observers. The report is lengthy, but this study focuses specifically on cases in the report where police discuss detainees who died in detention. An Amnesty International statement was also included as it produced findings on human rights violations against police, starkly contrasting the police report (Amnesty International, 1991).
The NGO Working Committee on Reparations Collection was included in this research as it is the only collection within the two archives that focuses on distributive justice in the form of reparations (The NGO Working Committee on Reparations Collection, n.d.). The inclusion of this collection in the Traces of Truth archive is indicative of the way in which the archive is hospitable as it is the only digital collection in the two archives which centres the experience of activists campaigning for reparations, therefore demonstrating an inclusiveness of a significantly marginalised population. The NGO Working Committee on Reparations was an amalgamation of individuals and ten activist organisations, including Khulumani Support Group which was established in 1999 and which continues to represent victims of apartheid in present-day South Africa. The group demanded that the democratic government implement recommendations for reparations made by the TRC. This study includes three letters sent between Khulumani and the state justice department on the issue of reparations to develop a story of the struggle for distributive justice in post-apartheid South Africa (see Appendix G, H, and I).

**Stories of Justice**

This section presents and critically analyses the stories produced from the records contained in the selected archival collections. Using Lewis Gaillet’s method of analysis, the data was gathered into a table and each category of analysis was used to examine the records (see Appendix B). This provided the analytical tools to produce stories through the lens of Fraser’s principles of recognition, distribution and representation.

**Stories of recognition**

Although apartheid was built on racist discrimination, stories within the archive seldom reflect recognition-based injustice. As a result, stories of misrecognition were not commonly found within the archives, but an account of the experiences of detainees is included in this research to
illustrate the forms of misrecognition that were found and the omissions that occurred. A story of activist Joyce Dipale will first be analysed and an account of freedom fighter Stanza Bopape will then follow.

a. Joyce Dipale

The Sunday Times Heritage Project collection contained numerous records which tell the story of Joyce Dipale, a freedom fighter in resistance movements. Her story emerges primarily through a visceral drawing she commissioned in 2007 during a workshop on memory and detention in Johannesburg (see Appendix C).

The drawing illustrates a woman sitting in a chair with a hood over her head and wires attached to her breasts. The woman is naked. Her arms are behind her back and her face is faintly visible under the hood. The drawing is accompanied by notes at the bottom of the page. The notes name three venues: John Vorster, Bloemfontein, and Women’s Jail (No. 4). It is clear they are references to police institutions as John Vorster and the Women’s Jail are two well-known apartheid police facilities in Johannesburg. The note includes details on whether there was torture or solitary confinement in each location. It also states that the wires attached to her breasts are “electric shocks” and that the hood covering her was “probably wet”. It adds that the depiction is of “torture at John Vorster Square”. The drawing is signed by Clive VDB “as requested by Joyce”, confirming Dipale commissioned the illustration. The torture is further narrated by Dipale in her interview transcript (Smith & Dipale, 2007). Although Dipale’s transcript is often incoherent, it is useful in providing fragments of a possible narrative of what may have occurred.

In her interview transcript, Dipale describes her experience in John Vorster, saying there were men “then hood and then electric shock” (p. 3). She refers to “torture”, but does not expand on what happened to her (pp. 3-4). She also makes mention of “racism”, but does not state how she experienced racism (p. 4). At one point, the interviewer asks Dipale what John Vorster represents to her. Her response is: “Rape. Torture. Same story. And women” (p. 5).
The drawing and the transcript tell a story of Dipale’s time at John Vorster Square. It is a story of a black woman who was stripped naked and severely assaulted through electric shock torture. Fraser defines misrecognition as a process where groups are “denied the status of full partners in social interaction” as a result of social standards which devalue their “distinctive characteristics” (2003, p. 29). Within this model, Dipale’s story is one of misrecognition in that she mentions both racist and gendered patterns of abuse in her torture, illustrating how she was mistreated on the basis of her race and gender. Further research helps develop a fuller account of the suffering Dipale survived and corroborates claims made in the text and drawing.

In her interview transcript, Dipale mentions “aphasia” (p. 3). Further reading indicates that a few years after her release from John Vorster, security police shot Dipale three times in an attempt on her life (SAPA, 1997). As a result of the attack, she suffered a stroke which impaired her language and limited her ability to express herself. This may account for her stilted language in the transcript. Curators of the workshop where Dipale commissioned the drawing confirmed that through the process of the illustration, she was able to better articulate herself and describe exactly the setting in which she was tortured (Madikida et al., 2008). A sworn affidavit by Elizabeth Rosalia Abrahams also further corroborates Dipale’s account of abuse and torture (2020).

Abrahams was detained in John Vorster in the same period Dipale was detained. She also survived electric shock torture, helping to establish that it was a form of abuse in detention. The affidavit also highlights injustices of recognition as Abrahams gives a detailed account of the way police humiliated her while she was menstruating. Abrahams’ affidavit is part of evidence in the 2020 reopened inquest into the death in detention of trade unionist Neil Aggett in 1982 at John Vorster Square (Evans, 2020). Dipale’s case is therefore relevant to present-day struggles for justice in that it corroborates accounts of torture and abuse at John Vorster Square. Cases of abuse at John Vorster Square form part of the failed investigations the AVFG is attempting to reopen (Apartheid Victims’ Family Group, 2020a). However, feminist recognition-based activism is limited in contemporary activism. This is demonstrated as the list of cases pursued by present-
day activists exclude women detainees (Ahmed Timol, 2020). In this way, within the Fraserian ideal of justice, Dipale’s story of gendered misrecognition has limited relevance to recognition-based justice, as contemporary activists are not pursuing these cases. Similarly, racial misrecognition in current struggles for detainee justice is not strongly expressed. The AVFG mentions race through linking its struggle for transitional justice to the global #BlackLivesMatter movement (AVFG, 2020b), but this form of justice is not strongly emphasised in its work demonstrating a limited link between past and present injustice within the Fraserian ideal. While the narrative of Dipale within SAHA illustrates some omissions of recognition-based justice, these gaps are further emphasised in the archival account of Stanza Bobape’s experiences.

b. Stanza Bopape

The story of Stanza Bopape is told through newspaper clippings published at the time of his detention (see Appendix D, E, and F) and the testimony of Zeelie at the TRC (1997). Zeelie was one of the police officers who arrested Bopape.

Newspaper reports indicate that Bopape was detained in 1988 by security police and taken to John Vorster Square (see Appendix D, E and F). He was the general secretary of the Mamelodi Civic Association and a known “activist” in his community (see Appendix D and E). Bopape never emerged from police custody alive. Police claimed Bopape had “escaped” whilst showing officers an alleged site of resistance activity in a nearby town (see Appendix D). The family rejected the police claims, believing Bopape had been killed (see Appendix D, E and F). A New York Times article helps corroborate accounts of the family’s pain, signifying the way news media focussed on the victims of apartheid (Wren, 1988).

Later, at the TRC, the police narrative unravelled. Zeelie confessed that Bopape had died in police custody (1997). He revealed that electric shocks had been used against Bopape at the time of his death. Zeelie’s testimony is corroborated by former police commissioner Johan Van Der Merwe and other officers who admitted that Zeelie had died in detention and that there had been no
Zeelie does not refer to race in his accounts of Bopape’s killing. The Bopape family statements in archived newspaper clippings also omit his race as a factor in his detention. The newspapers themselves make no mention of his race in their description of him. In this way, stories of recognition are not told in the killing of Bopape.

Instead, a story emerges of a man arrested, tortured and killed, yet his family waited 9 years to hear this confirmation. In the interim, they desperately applied pressure for the truth to be told while police maintained the cover-up of his death. Yet, they did not focus on his race. In this way, stories of misrecognition are hardly expressed. This relates to present-day struggles for justice as references to race or other forms of misrecognition are not emphasised in the AVFG campaign.

As mentioned above, the AVFG only refers to race in terms of global transitional justice. A petition for justice by the AVFG mentions detainees and their killings, but not the impact of racism on their experiences (Khan, 2020). Similarly, the Unfinished TRC website makes no mention of race on the front page of its website (Unfinished TRC, n.d.). The Bopape killing is therefore relevant to struggles for contemporary justice as it links to current detainee justice movements where misrecognition is not emphasised, whilst still providing useful narratives of torture and police cover-ups in detention. However, despite the overt omission of race, it is known that liberation struggles against apartheid were fought for the freedom and equality of black South Africans (Salo, 2010). Researchers have noted that the archives are “riddled with holes” (Ramsey, 2010, pp. 84), and the significant exclusion of race in apartheid-era records is an indicator that while records may be relevant to struggles of justice in South Africa today, they do not present a complete narrative of what took place.

**Stories of Representation**

The stories of representation are illustrated in the accounts of activists who died in detention, police testimonies and investigative reports. Through these accounts, stories of representation appear prominently in the archive. These narratives mainly show how victims’ families were
excluded from processed of justice through the police use of cover-ups and through political contestations which were used by the police to justify violence against activists.

a. Cover-ups to exclude victims from justice

In the case of Stanza Bopape, police illustrate how they covered up his death in Section 29 transcripts (Department of Justice, 1997). The newspaper clippings describe his family’s desperate attempts to find his body and show police had maintained until 1997 that Bopape had disappeared whilst attempting to escape detention.

Bopape’s family were denied information on his disappearance (see Appendix D and E). They were also denied access to him while he was in detention (see Appendix D and E). Police investigated the so-called escape at the time, but archived news reports suggest the family were not included in the investigation (see Appendix D and E). Fraser articulates that misrepresentation occurs when marginalised groups are excluded from processes of justice. The cover up conducted by the police and the efforts to lie to the Bopape family and exclude them from the truth of his whereabouts therefore impart a misrepresentation as they were denied access to processes required for justice.

The Bopape account illustrates both the relevance of archival newspaper clippings and the Section 29 transcripts to struggles for justice in South Africa today. In particular, it is relevant to stories of death in detention as it reflects that cover-ups did occur. In this way, it aids struggles for justice as it shows evidence, through detailed tracking of police accounts and testimony, that cover-ups took place to deny Bopape’s family access to justice. Zeelie’s account of the cover-up is confirmed by other police officers who admitted to dumping Bopape’s body in a river. These testimonies are contained in TRC Section 29 transcripts available on SAHA (Department of Justice, 2007b, 2007c), as well as in archival media clippings of TRC coverage (SAPA, 1998).

In a similar vein, as the police denied culpability for its actions, interest groups, activists and researchers began investigating claims of brutality in detention. One report contained in the
Independent Board of Inquiry collection relates how independent pathologist Jonathan Gluckman had kept records of police abuse (South African Police, n.d.). The Minister of Law and Order established a police investigation into the claims, which subsequently concluded that there was no foul play in most cases. The investigation also found that inquests rarely found police guilty. In this way, the report portrays police operations as mostly lawful. In one example, the police investigation recounts how detainee Nixon Phiri “started shaking, fell from his chair and died” whilst under interrogation (p. 80). The report reflects that an inquest made no finding on the cause of Phiri’s death and Gluckman did not participate in the proceedings. No document could be found to corroborate the police’s claims, but an Amnesty International statement in the Traces of Truth archive contradicts the report (1991).

Amnesty International wrote that Phiri’s inquest had occurred in near secrecy with the family having no access to the proceedings. Gluckman was prevented from testifying, according to Amnesty International. The organisation also states that fellow detainees who heard Phiri “screaming” under interrogation were unable to present evidence at the inquest (p. 3). The Amnesty International report thus demonstrates how processes of justice — the police investigations and inquests — deliberately sought to exclude people who represented the interests of the victims. A media clipping further corroborates Gluckman and Amnesty International’s concerns about police violence, centring the pathologist’s allegations that the police committed “barbarous treatment” against detainees (Carlin, 1993). A Human Rights Watch report also corroborates Amnesty International and Gluckman’s claims, describing reports of violence in detention (1994). They thus starkly contrast the police claims, and in doing so, illustrate how the police orchestrated cover-ups to deny detainees access to justice through presenting their operations as innocent of wrongdoing.

The stories of Bopape’s cover-up and the police attempts to cover-up the Gluckman allegation, signify the way in which apartheid victims were denied participation in systems of justice and were thus misrepresented. This relates to present-day struggles for justice as the AVFG has accused the current government of political interference to halt apartheid-era prosecutions,
thereby signifying a similar denial of access to justice and misrepresentation (AVFG, 2020a). The families have waited nearly three decades for prosecutions, but they have been largely ignored in systems of justice. Accounts of past injustice are therefore relevant to present-day accounts of injustice, as they develop a narrative of historical misrepresentations that continue to be experienced in South Africa today. While the police used cover-ups as a means to deny the Bopape family access to processes of justice, a contest over political belief also resulted in the police justifying their mistreatment of Bopape.

b. Political contestations in exclusions from justice

Within the records retrieved, recognition is not widely discussed as a marker for exclusion. However, the records suggest that contestations of political affiliation and belief prevented victims from accessing justice during apartheid.

Zeelie and former police commissioner Coetzee state that the police were waging a “war” against “terrorists” (Department of Justice, 1997, p. 75; Department of Justice, n.d., pp. 12 & 64). They state that interrogation techniques were aimed at extracting information from terrorists to save lives that were threatened by the terrorist activities. Newspaper clippings on Bopape identify him in terms of his political membership to the Mamelodi Civic Association. He is therefore only seen through the lens of his political activities, which are rooted in anti-apartheid activism. The story that emerges suggests that activists were abused because they were considered to be terrorists by the state as a result of their resistance to apartheid. For police, this is a story about saving lives from a terrorist threat, which thus justifies the mistreatment of activists. These statements demonstrate that activists were denied justice because their political affiliations were considered terrorist in nature by the apartheid authorities. This is further corroborated by Johan Van Der Merwe’s testimony at the TRC where he described a “battle” being waged and police attempting to save lives through interrogation (SAPA, 1998).
In this way, SAHA’s archival stories of apartheid-era injustice do not largely reflect recognition-based injustice. Instead, what emerges is a story of a political battle waged against “terrorists”, in the police version of events, and a story of a violent and inhumane security force which targeted freedom fighters, in the version of apartheid-era victims. The misrepresentation occurred because of contestation over political beliefs. Further research would reveal that apartheid-era freedom fighters centred their activism primarily on race and class-based struggles as the fight against apartheid aimed to secure the liberation of black people (Salo, 2010). Yet, a reading of the SAHA archive without this context would not produce this complete image to include aspects of recognition politics.

The struggle to access justice has continued. The AVFG has petitioned the South African president to explain delays and has alleged that political interference has prevented victims’ access to justice. The Unfinished TRC group has accused the present-day justice system of having TRC cases “swept under the carpet” to avoid reopening them (Unfinished TRC, n.d.). Representation thus remains key as activists echo past experiences of exclusions from systems of justice. These activists experience ordinary-political injustice as they have a degree of access to processes of justice, but they have been denied full participation. At least two other inquests have been reopened since the Timol case, indicating that some AVFG families have been heard, yet the majority remain waiting. There is scant mention of misrecognition or dispossession of wealth in these claims. Instead there are demands for meetings with prosecutors and ministers in order to facilitate processes of justice and to set the stage for victims to be heard. Stories of misrepresentation in the archive therefore are relevant to stories of misrepresentation today as activists are still fighting to be able to participate fairly and equally in systems of justice where they have faced exclusions.
Stories of redistribution are rare within the two counter-archives. A search of SAHA’s online digital collection for the word “reparations” yielded a limited number of resources. In the Traces of Truth archive, the NGO Working Committee on Reparations made three records available online (Traces of Truth, 2020). Each record deals with attempts made by NGOs, namely the Khulumani Support Group, to apply pressure on the state to implement reparation payments.

A letter from Justice Minister Maduna to the Khulumani Support Group in November 1999 reveals that the group had petitioned the justice department to finalise reparations (see Appendix G). The Minister informs Khulumani that while reparations had not been formalised, efforts had been made to pay victims in the interim. He warns that a lack of financial resources may deter full reparative payments. In a second letter, dated 29 March 2000, Khulumani notifies the state of its plan to march to the president’s office to deliver a memorandum of demands regarding reparations (see Appendix H). Khulumani states that the government had ignored its correspondence after the 1999 elections and that its members were “feeling grossly neglected, disgruntled, disillusioned and very angry” about the government’s delays (see Appendix H). Khulumani Support Group and an organisation known as the Ex-Political Prisoners and Torture Survivors Support Group wrote a third letter addressed to President Thabo Mbeki, dated 27 April 2000 (see Appendix I). It details a list of six demands, which include: the payment of reparations and further opportunity for victims to be added to the list of TRC beneficiaries.

The letters tell a story of the delays and frustration victims experienced while waiting for the state reparation plan to materialise. Khulumani represents the voices of victims. Its efforts to petition the government and march on Union Buildings are a marker of the tension between victims and government. There are no records in the collection prior to the 1999 letter or after the letter in 2000. As a result, the story largely has no clear ending or beginning from a reading of the archival records. Nevertheless, it illustrates the unhappiness of victim support groups in efforts to secure reparations in the early years of South African democracy.
An Amnesty International report confirms that during this period concerns had been raised publicly regarding the delay in reparative justice from the government (Amnesty International, 2003). It documents the work of Khulumani in applying pressure for reparation payments, thus corroborating a version of this story that tensions did exist. A study by the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, an independent South African research institute, also covers the protest Khulumani undertook on in April 2000, further confirming struggles were waged to secure reparations (Makhalemele, 2004). It is thus clear that in the early years of South Africa’s democracy victims fought for distributive justice. This demand fits Fraser’s notion of distributive justice as reparative justice in South Africa involves activists demanding fair access to economic resources to restore victims’ dignity. Fraser states that maldistribution is when people are denied “full participation” in society “by economic structures that deny them the resources they need in order to interact with others as peers” (2020, pp. 16). Using this definition, activism for reparative justice follows Fraser’s framework as it demands a redistribution of wealth to restore dignity and acknowledge the suffering of those historically oppressed by gross human right violations during apartheid.

In contemporary South Africa, distributive justice has not been completed. On its website, the Unfinished TRC body describes its role as “a repository of information on the victims of apartheid-era atrocities and their families’ struggle for justice, truth, and reparations”, centring the way in which reparations remain a site of tension in the country (n.d.). However, the demands for reparations have not been as prominent as they were after the TRC. The AVFG has made no demands for reparations and distributive economic justice is seldom mentioned. The archival records are relevant to the work of bodies like Unfinished TRC and the continued activism of Khulumani Support Group, as these organisations are still striving for reparative justice. However, this form of justice, within the context of outstanding TRC promises, is no longer as prominent in contemporary South Africa as activism around these issues has dwindled. This is indicated by the lack of current activism for TRC reparations in the country (Gumede, 2017).
The story the archive tells illustrates that there is no significant amount of data in the digital archive related to reparations. This follows a pattern in current South Africa where calls for reparations in the form of TRC recommendations for gross human right violations have also dimmed in comparison to demands for justice as encountered on a representative level. The records unearthed in the archive are still relevant to tensions around such injustice, as it articulates struggles activists waged for the payment of reparations and the undue delays of the state to deliver. The story is incomplete, however, as the Traces for Truth archive does not include in its digital collections the one-off payment the state made to victims in 2003, as discussed earlier. In this way, it fails to reflect the entire story of distributive justice and the tensions around it. Ultimately, stories of representative justice feature prominently in the archives and are most relevant to current struggles for justice.

**CONCLUSION**

This study has made meaningful findings on how archival records remain relevant to contemporary struggles of justice for apartheid-era crimes. In addition, it also made findings on the limitations of archival narratives. The study identified SAHA and the Traces of Truth archive as counter-archives which embody features of Silverstone’s hospitality. Records were analysed to produce stories of apartheid-era injustices within Fraser’s principles of recognition, redistribution and representation.

Human rights violations against apartheid-era political detainees were centred in the empirical research. The analysis led to findings that stories of representation remained most commonly produced within the archives, while the data showed lesser accounts of recognition and redistribution-based struggles for justice. This finding is significant as apartheid is internationally condemned for its dehumanising abuse of black South Africans. The findings highlight an important feature of the limitations of archival work. They indicate that before research is conducted in an archive, historical context must be clearly understood. Within the context of this
research, it is known that apartheid was racist, patriarchal, and classist and that these inequalities would impact on injustices people experienced. However, a reading of the archives without this context misleads researchers to believe that identity and class hardly affected the way in which political detainees were treated by the security police. In this way, this study continues to make the same finding that archival researchers before it have made: that archives seldom produce complete stories.

This research has, however, contributed to a body of work on archival justice in South Africa. It illustrated the way in which counter-archives, which embody features of Silverstone’s hospitality, remain relevant to struggles for justice in marginalised communities through the stories they construct. The stories produced by counter-archives demonstrate that demands for representative justice remain at the centre of activism for detainee justice both in the past and in the present. This is significant as justice in South Africa is often discussed through demands of race-based recognition or class-based redistribution. Yet a denotative reading of stories in the archive through the lens of Fraser’s principles reveals a third element of justice which is prominent: the demand of communities to attain equal access to systems of justice where they have historically been denied participation. Activists of the past were denied access to justice on the basis of their resistance to apartheid, whereas activists in the present are struggling for representation as they believe the democratic government is unwilling to revisit apartheid-era crimes. In this way, this research has demonstrated the vital work of archives in demonstrating the historical extent to which representative justice has been fought in South Africa.

While this research has made valuable findings, there is room for future research to determine to what extent counter-archives are useful for activist activities. The limitations of this project meant that it could not measure the uses of artefacts for present-day activists. Research of this nature would further help to understand the role of counter-archives in struggles for justice. This research was able to find that counter-archives forge links between past and present-day struggles for justice. It illustrated that 26 years after apartheid, misrepresentation continues to be a form of injustice in South Africa which is loudly demanded and continuously denied.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Kantilal Naik’s drawing of a police officer
Appendix B: Excerpt of tabulated analysis

Full spreadsheet: https://www.dropbox.com/s/afbscmv7ow391mi/Dissertation%20Raw%20Analysis.xlsx?dl=0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Artefact Type and Name</th>
<th>Physical Description</th>
<th>Political, Social, and Institutional Historical Context</th>
<th>Corroboration</th>
<th>Current Events and Discourses</th>
<th>Motive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Sunday Times Heritage Project</td>
<td>Drawing: Drawing</td>
<td>A drawing of a naked woman sitting on a chair or rectangle bunk. Her head is covered by a triangle-shaped hood, with her face faintly visible. There are electrodes attached to her nipples. The notes at the bottom of the page indicate it was drawn by &quot;CVDB&quot; on the request of Joyce Dipale. The notes also state that it is a depiction of &quot;electric shocks&quot; and &quot;torture at John Vorster&quot;. The triangle hood is described as &quot;probably wet&quot;. It is possible to deduce that this is a depiction of Dipale being tortured.</td>
<td>This artefact was created in 2007 at an event to commemorate the Women's Jail in Constitutional Hill, Johannesburg. Dipale was a participant at the workshop and requested the drawing of her torture in John Vorster Square as a visual representation of her suffering. At the time this artefact was created, women freedom fighters were still marginalised in apartheid history. South Africa was considered among the worst countries in the world in terms of gender-based violence, highlighting the continued gender discrimination, albeit in a different context. Records also indicate that in the 1970s, women's freedom fighters were still marginalised in apartheid history. South Africa was considered among the worst countries in the world in terms of gender-based violence, highlighting the continued gender discrimination, albeit in a different context. Records also indicate that in the 1970s</td>
<td>The Dipale interview transcript, the affidavit of Elizabeth Rosalia Abrahams, a SAPA article on Dipale's torture titled &quot;Coetzee Tells Amnesty Committee Of Bungled Cross-border Raids&quot;, and the journal article titled &quot;The Reconstruction of Memory at Constitution Hill&quot;</td>
<td>The AVFG's work illustrates the continued fight to deliver freedom and equality in South Africa through confronting past crimes, particularly against detainees. The AVFG makes no mention of particular instances of violence against women, and it does not represent any women detainees. Similar is found on the Unfinished TRC website.</td>
<td>Women's Jail workshop curators said facilitators helped create this work as a representation of the suffering of apartheid-era detainees who were tortured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Board of Inquiry (IBI) Report: Dr Gluckman: Persons Who Died in Police Detention</td>
<td>Police investigation into allegations by pathologist Dr Gluckman of abuse in detention. The report hones in on various categories of detention and violence, but pages 38 and onwards deal with deaths in detention, police accountability, and incidents where there is no mention of race or reparations in the report. It does not give details on exclusions of activists from processes of justice.</td>
<td>The report is undated however, it is assumed to have been compiled between 1990 and 1993 when police investigated Gluckman’s allegations. At the time, media reports indicate that there was continued condemnation and suspicion that police were involved in killing detainees. Media articles highlight sympathy for detainees.</td>
<td>No information could be found to corroborate the claims in the report, but a news article by Independent titled &quot;Doctor's crusade against S African police &quot;licence to ill-treat&quot; confirms the police launched an investigation into Gluckman’s claims. A 1994 Human Rights Watch report titled &quot;Prison Conditions in South Africa&quot; also confirms the report was made.</td>
<td>The motive of the report is to indicate to the minister of law and order the results of the police investigation into Gluckman’s claims. No other motive can be stated with certainty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Drawing of Joyce Dipale

John Vorster: Torture and Alone
BLOOMFIELD - NO TORTURE, ALONE
WOMEN'S JAIL (NO. 4) NO TORTURE, BUT IN SOLITARY. BATHING WAS COMMUNAL.

DRAWN BY CLIVE URB as REQUESTED
BY JOYCE

ELECTRICAL SHOCKS
BLACK HOOD PROBABLY WET.
TORTURE AT JOHN VORSTER'S SQUARE.
Appendix D: Newspaper report on Stanza Bopape, July 1988

**Mystery shrouds missing detainee**

*By KERRY CULINAN*

There is fear for the life of general secretary of the Mamelodi Civic Association, Johannesburg, Stanza Bopape. He went missing after being detained under Section 29 of the Internal Security Act early last month.

Police allege that he escaped from custody on June 12. However, five days after his alleged escape, the SAP confirmed in a telephone conversation with Bopape's lawyers that he was in detention.

The lawyers were only informed on July 4 by a tel ex from the security police that Bopape had escaped.

Meanwhile, no one has heard a word from Bopape. Family and friends fear he may be dead.

Said Bopape's colleague from the Community Resource and Information Centre, Keith Coleman, "In the progressive movement, we live in constant fear for each other's safety."

"There is also a constant need to allay each others' fears. Has Stanza escaped, he would have gone out of his way to contact us," added Coleman.

Cric, which employs Bopape as a youth worker, said this week that a number of questions needed to be answered.

"Is Stanza still alive? How did he escape? Why was there a three week break before we were informed of his escape?" asked Dr. Beyers Naude, who is a member of Cric's board.

"An aura of very serious suspicion surrounds Stanza's position," added Naude.

"We are also not aware of any police investigation into his escape. The police have not been to his home or to his father's home, both of which are known to them," a Cric statement said.

The Mamelodi Civic Association and Mamelodi Youth Congress have also expressed their concern at Bopape's disappearance.

And Stanza Bopape is not the first activist to have disappeared.

Bopape is not the first alleged escapee to cause concern in activist circles. Vincent Mahlalela, also a Section 29 detainee, allegedly escaped from jail in Pretoria on December 21, 1986. He has not been seen since, and his family has not received any word from him.

In another case, Sonny Boy Mokoena's mother was first told her son had escaped from police custody. Later, they said he had been found hanging from the bars of his Pilgrims Rest cell. This was in September, 1985. Sipho Hashe, champion of Galesa and Qaqawuli Godolotse, leader of the UDF-affiliated Pori Elizabeth Black Civic Association, were last seen alive in May 1985 at Hendrick Verwoerd Airport.

When lawyers applied to the Supreme Court for their release from detention, police denied holding them.

Congress of SA Students leader Siphelele Mthimukuthi and his friend, Tokkie Madaka, disappeared in 1982 while on their way to a Pori Elizabeth hospital.

Mthimukuthi was in the process of seeing the Minister of Police for allegedly poisoning him while he was in detention. Neither has been heard of since.

In addition to the disappearances, a number of activists have been gunned down by faceless assassins in mysterious circumstances.

As recently as last week, Sidney Masi, a former bodyguard of ANC leader Oliver Tambo, was murdered.

Lawyers defending ANC member Ebrahim Ismail Ebrahim, kidnapped last year from Swaziland and currently on trial in Bethal, were apparently going to call Masi as a defence witness.

And earlier this year, young Section Dinao, a volunteer worker for the Detainees Parents Support Committee, was found shot dead in a field near his home.

Four UDF leaders in Cradock – Matthew Goniwe, Fort Calata, Siphiwo Mkhonto and Siphiwo Mdumo – disappeared on June 27, 1985, on the road between Port Elizabeth and Cradock. Their charred and mutilated bodies were found a day later.

According to Derrick Swartz, the last man to see the four alive, Goniwe had said that they would not stop on the road, except at a road-block.}

*Durban couple Griffiths and Victoria Masenge were also assassinated. Lawyer Gerald Mothi was killed in November 1981. His wife – also a lawyer and treasurer of the UDF- Natal – was shot dead outside their Mamelodi home in December, 1981.*

Another couple – community leader Dr. Fabia Riberio and his wife Florence – were shot dead outside their Mamelodi home in December, 1981.

The murderers’ cue was traced to Noel Robey, an ex-Selous Scout and a member of the SADF.

At a preparatory hearing, Robey was cleared of any connection with the killings.

The SAP’s public relations division says that “Mr. Bopape willingly escaped from police custody during the night of June 12, 1988, whilst being escorted by the same vehicle to Vereeniging where certain police investigators were in progress…”

Although the escape was public knowledge at the time, it would have passed a current investigation regarding the movements and subversive activities of these ANC terrorists in the area.

The SAP’s Public Relations Division also said that “The SAP’s public relations division says that “Mr. Bopape willingly escaped from police custody during the night of June 12, 1988, whilst being escorted by the same vehicle to Vereeniging where certain police investigators were in progress…”

The escape was public knowledge at the time, it would have passed a current investigation regarding the movements and subversive activities of these ANC terrorists in the area.

The SAP’s Public Relations Division also said that “The SAP’s public relations division says that “Mr. Bopape willingly escaped from police custody during the night of June 12, 1988, whilst being escorted by the same vehicle to Vereeniging where certain police investigators were in progress…”

The escape was public knowledge at the time, it would have passed a current investigation regarding the movements and subversive activities of these ANC terrorists in the area.
Father rejects Vlok’s tale of son’s “escape”

By MUSA ZONDI

THE POLICE account of the alleged escape of security detainee Stanza Bopape “is implausible”, says Nicholas Haysom, a lawyer representing the Bopape family.

Haysom was speaking at a press conference on Wednesday, a day after Bopape’s father met the Minister of Law and Order, Adriani Vlok.

Bopape, a Community Research and Information Centre employee and general secretary of the Mamelodi Civic Association, was detained on July 10. Police allege he escaped while being transported from John Vorster Square police station to Vereeniging two days later.

Police said they had a puncture during the trip. While the three policemen were changing the tyre, Bopape, who was handcuffed and in leg-irons, is said to have taken keys from a jacket on the front seat of the car and freed himself.

According to police, Bopape opened the car door and fled into the nearby bush. They fired two shots but said they could not see clearly.

Haysom believes the investigation “lacked vigour”, as police had never been to Bopape’s home to ask his whereabouts.

Colleagues and friends have not heard from the activist, and are adamant that he would have contacted them after an escape.

Matome Bopape

The police contacted Bopape’s lawyers about his disappearance three weeks after it happened. Although they had contacted the lawyers on three previous occasions about him, they did not say that he had escaped.

In his meeting with Vlok, Matome Bopape, Stanza’s father, begged the minister to tell him if his son was dead. He was assured that the police would find him.

Vlok revealed that the activist had been transported in leg-irons and handcuffs — the first mention of this.

According to Haysom, police had not replied to questions by the lawyers about whether Bopape had been bound.

The meeting with Vlok was arranged by the independent member of parliament for Claremont, Jan van Eck. The minister refused to meet anyone but Bopape’s father.

Van Eck has appealed to the police to grant him an opportunity to speak to Bheki Nkosi, a colleague of Bopape’s who was detained with him, but has received no reply. Nkosi was released but detained later.

“The onus is on the police to say what happened to Bopape,” Haysom said.

Matome Bopape said he and his wife were heartsore and could not sleep.

Two other Mamelodi men recently disappeared in mysterious circumstances.

Funeral undertaker Andrew Maluleke and businessman Harold Sefolo disappeared in July last year after two men had driven them to an unknown destination.

Another man, Peter Maluleke, drove off with two men, who asked him to show them how to fit ceilings.

His family raised the alarm when he failed to return.

According to Van Eck, the police had initially denied that Maluleke was in detention. He claimed that the police had later conceded that the men were being held under section 29 of the Internal Security Act.

SA Police asked for comment, but had not responded by press time.
Appendix F: Newspaper report on Stanza Bopape, July 1996

‘Give me Stanza’s bones’

By Khathu Mamela

The mother of Stanza Bopape, the activist who disappeared under mysterious circumstances while in police custody, yesterday broke down and wept when she asked the Truth Commission to help her find her son’s bones.

Testifying in Pretoria, Mrs. Francina Bopape said: “I want the commission to help me find the bones of my son. I want the policemen who were with my son to give me his bones so that I can bury him.

“I do not believe the police story that he escaped. Stanza’s cellmate, Bhekinkosi, told me that they took Stanza to another cell and a few moments later there was a gunshot from that cell.”

Bopape said she was suffering from a heart ailment and that her husband had died a sick and unhappy man after he had splashed in vain for his son who disappeared in 1988.

The commission was told that the then police minister Mr. Adrian Vilak said that Bopape had escaped while being transported in a police car. The police claimed Stanza had joined the African National Congress in exile.

Mrs. Annah Katumela, whose son Lucky died in detention, also wept as she related how her son was killed.

Lucky, an Azanian People’s Organisation activist, was a journalist for a local newspaper at the time.

Mrs. Katumela said police said they had killed her son because he had written bad things about them. Police had claimed Lucky had reported that they killed a student.

The brother of ANC MP Mr. Peter Mokaba, Mr. Ernest Mokaba, told the commission how police had harassed his family for years while looking for Peter.

“For the harassment of my family, I got arrested in 1982. I was detained for a week. They would not let me see my family. They would not let me talk to them. I was kept in the Pretoria Prison for a year. They would not let me see my family.”
The General Secretary
Khulumani Support Group
Fax: 011 - 3396785

Dear Sir/Madam,

URGENT INTERIM REPARATION AND LONG TERM REPARATION

I hereby acknowledge receipt of your petition, which was handed to Mr Paul Setsetse, my media spokesperson, on Friday, 29 October 1999.

I wish to assure the Khulumani Support Group of Government’s absolute commitment to processing all matters relating to reparations, as required by the TRC report, as effectively and as speedily as possible.

At the same time I must remind you that the TRC reparations process is an extremely complex and delicate one, requiring the involvement of various role players including Government, Parliament and the TRC itself. While we are anxious that the matter be expedited efficiently, we must guard against rash decisions being made now that could have negative implications later.

Although progress in the beginning was slow, a concerted effort has been made by all the relevant departments to bring this matter to conclusion as soon as possible, and to table a report for consideration by Parliament in the near future.

A Cluster Committee consisting of the Directors-General from the Departments of Justice and Constitutional Development, Foreign Affairs, Housing and Health met in Cape Town to discuss this matter recently. The Committee has since made specific proposals in respect of long term reparations. These proposals will now be placed before the relevant Inter-Ministerial Committee for consideration and submission to Cabinet for approval.

The ideal would, of course, be to provide Parliament with a report, which relates to all the work of the Commission. We are, however, confident that even within the context of final reparations, there may be areas, which could be implemented sooner.
Appendix H: First page of letter from Khulumani Support Group to President Thabo Mbeki dated 29 March 2000

The Honourable State President of South Africa
Mr Thabo Mbeki
Office of the President
Union Buildings
PRETORIA


The Honourable President,

Re: FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO ADOPT FINAL REPARATIONS PROGRAMME

The Khulumani Support Group wishes to inform our State President about the upcoming Reparations Now March which we will stage on April 27 at 1:00 p.m. at the Union Buildings in Pretoria.

Khulumani Support Group is a national, non-partisan organization whose constituency includes survivors and families of apartheid-era violence in South Africa.

Khulumani mobilized thousands of victims of apartheid atrocities in order to contribute to the success of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Since the publication of the TRC Report in October 1998, Khulumani, in conjunction with an NGO Working Group on Reparations, has been attempting to lobby Government to adopt a national policy on final reparations. From October 1998 to February 1999 we met three times with the former Minister of Justice in order to outline our concerns and hear the Government’s perspective about the reparations process. This dialogue was extremely fruitful.

However, since the June 1999 elections, this dialogue has dissipated. We also wrote another letter on the 21st December 1998 to the office of the Deputy President asking for an appointment to meet in March 1999 and there was no response. Khulumani, along with the NGO Working Group on Reparations, wrote two letters to the current Minister of Justice, Mr. Penwell Maduna, asking for information about Government policy on reparations. These letters did not receive any response.

As a result, we were forced to confront the Government on this issue and staged a march on October 29th, the anniversary of the publication of the TRC Report, at the Library Gardens in Johannesburg. There, a representative from the Ministry of Justice received a
Appendix I: The first page of letter from Khulumani Support Group to President Thabo Mbeki, dated 27 April 2000

The Honourable State President,
Mr Thabo Mvuyelwa Mbeki
Union Building
PRETORIA

27 April 2000.

The Honourable State President,

Today we are submitting the memorandum that carries a list of our demands based on the promises made during TRC preparations and hearings, whom up to now the government has unable to honour.

The full set of demands are:

1. The Final Reparations promised to us by the TRC and the government must be paid out.
2. Not all of us were afforded the opportunity to give a statement to the TRC. This opportunity needs to be extended and the additional people deserving reparations be included.
3. Many of us have applied for special pensions, but have not yet received anything after waiting for up to four years. We demand that special pensions be implemented as a priority.
4. Dedicated services were also promised to us. These promises must be met. One such service, the Trauma Centre faces closure due to lack of funds. Such services, such as the Trauma Centre in Cape Town and the Khulumani Support Group must remain open and provide services to the victims as means of honouring the promises made during the TRC process.
5. Khulumani Support Group wishes to reiterate its position of being considered an important stakeholder in addressing the final reparations by the government.

We would like a written answer to these demands on the 7th May, 2000. This campaign will continue until these demands are met.

Khulumani Organising Committee Members: Sylvia Diomo-Jops, Maggie Friedman, Mavis Khumalo-Mbali, Mokgosi, Catherine Mangeni, Rudy Mhleka, Allegria Nyeke and Nonini Mosikaire (Office Co-ordinator). The Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (Tel: 403-5650) provides some social assistants to the independent group, representatives are Tshoki Motsekg (Ousreach Co-ordinator), Tshaong Musepa (Education and Training), Dino Motseko (Social Support Services) and Brandon Hamber.
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