

## **DISCOURSE STUDIES**

**Title:** The audience as actor. The participation status of the audience at the victim hearings of the South African TRC

**Author:** Annelies Verdoolaege

## **Abstract**

In this article Goffman's theories on *participation framework* and *change in footing* are applied to discursive material from the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The main finding is that a discursive setting such as the public hearings of a truth and reconciliation commission can be highly intricate and layered when considering the role of the various discourse participants. The testifying victims, the TRC commissioners and the audience engaged in various forms of subordinate communication - *byplay*, *crossplay* and *sideplay* – in addition to the standardised and expected interaction between victims and commissioners. This tells us that face-to-face talk should not be regarded as the prototypical participation framework, even not in a highly stage-managed discursive setting. Moreover, by paying attention to the co-presence of also a 'virtual' audience, the Goffmanian framework is taken beyond its confines of only discussing interaction between discourse participants who are physically present in a speech situation. In the end, each of the discourse participants tried to exploit the possibilities offered by this complex framework, thus adding to the impact the TRC had on South African society at large.

## **Keywords**

South Africa, Truth and Reconciliation Commission, apartheid victims, audience, public hearings, Goffman, participation framework, footing

## **Bionote**

Annelies Verdoolaege (°1975) obtained Ma degrees in Germanic Languages and in African Languages and Cultures from Ghent University and an Ma degree in Africana Studies from the State University of New York at Albany. Her PhD dissertation (June 2005) involved a discursive analysis of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission. From May 2006 onwards Dr. Verdoolaege works as a postdoctoral researcher at the department of African Languages and Cultures at Ghent University. She has published in the field of discourse analysis, political sciences and cultural studies (see <http://cas1.elis.rug.ac.be/avrug/trc/cv.htm>), she gives guest lectures on South African post-apartheid society, and she teaches Afrikaans linguistics.

# **The audience as actor**

The participation status of the audience at the victim hearings of the South African TRC

## **Introduction**

This article will look at instances where testifiers before a truth and reconciliation commission appear to depart from standard expectations of addressing their speech to the commissioners. Instead, they are addressing a wide range of discourse participants by not only playing ‘to the gallery’, but also ‘to the media’ and – rather on a historically significant level – ‘to the archive’. At the same time, in these instances, the audience appears to take on a much more active role than would normally be expected in the quasi-legal setting of a public hearing before a truth and reconciliation commission. Data taken from the victim hearings of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) will illustrate this particular perspective. On a theoretical level the question raised is how a Goffmanian framework which focuses on participant structure and footing can help us to throw light on such interactional sequences. By means of four case studies, the complexity and layeredness of the participation framework in contemporary mediatised podium events will be highlighted. In addition, we will understand in which way this interactional layeredness was crucial for the self-identification of the testifiers, and by extension for the image of the TRC. By discussing the relevance of both physically present and ‘virtual’ discourse participants, this article aims to offer an innovative contribution to Goffman’s theories on footing and participation framework. By using some unique and original data – transcripts of the hearings and camera footage – the article also significantly contributes to the empirical research on TRC discourse.

## **The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC)**

The South African TRC can be seen as one of the most significant phenomena in South African contemporary history. The Commission was called into existence by the Promotion of National

Unity and Reconciliation Act No. 34 of 1995. The Act stated that the TRC was to “promote national unity and reconciliation in a spirit of understanding which transcends the conflicts and divisions of the past” (TRC Report 1998, 1/4: 54). The Commission consisted of three subcommittees: the Human Rights Violations Committee, the Amnesty Committee and the Committee on Reparation and Rehabilitation. The Human Rights Violations Committee (HRVC) - the Committee dealt with in this article - had a number of duties; two of its most important tasks were to initiate the statement taking process and to organise public hearings where apartheid victims could come forward. The HRVC gathered close to 22,000 statements, covering 37,000 violations; this is more than any other previous truth commission had achieved (Graybill 2002: 8). In each of the South African regions the Human Rights Violations Committee then selected a number of statements for public hearing. At these hearings the victims were given a forum to talk about the human rights violations they had experienced under apartheid. They were first given a certain time span – ranging from ten minutes to one hour – to tell their stories, whereupon the TRC commissioners asked clarifying questions. This Committee has been one of the most impressive aspects of the TRC. Hundreds of apartheid victims were given a voice and they were offered a platform to talk about their experiences in the past. These testimonies revealed the extent to which apartheid has had a pernicious influence on the daily lives of many South Africans.

In the National Unity and Reconciliation Bill it was stipulated that all Human Rights Violations hearings should take place in public – the fact that victims were going to tell their experiences to the world was part of the cathartic function of the TRC (van Zyl, 1995; FXI Update, 1995).

What I will try to illustrate in this article is how some of the HRV testifiers were capable of taking advantage of this public space. Obviously, the public space was created on behalf of the testifying victims, so it was their right to make use of the audience in a manner they deemed suitable. Some of them, though, very explicitly addressed the audience - the actually present audience as well as

the non-immediate co-present audience -, and clearly considered this audience as participants to the HRV hearings. Also the members of the audience, although this was initially not intended, sometimes seized the opportunity to openly participate in the hearings. I will situate this analysis within Goffman's (1981) theories of *participation framework* and *footing*, thus revealing that within a specific speech situation – or *frame* – various forms of discursive participation can be distinguished. The analysis is based on my PhD research in which I discursively analysed 30 HRV testimonies (Verdoolaege, 2008). For this analysis I made use of the English transcripts of the victim testimonies, as available on the Official TRC Website ([http://www.doj.gov.za/trc/trc\\_frameset.htm](http://www.doj.gov.za/trc/trc_frameset.htm)). Additionally, also the videotaped images of the TRC, as recorded by the South African Broadcasting Corporation, were considered – in particular for the data cases I, II and IV.

### **Theoretical background**

The HRV testimonies can be defined as 'hidden transcripts' (Scott, 1990) – transcripts that circulate within a certain group of people, discourses about these people, the others and the relationship between both groups (for a detailed analysis of the relation between the term 'hidden transcripts' and TRC narratives, see Vandergucht, 2003 and Blommaert, Bock & McCormick, 2006). In line with Scott's discussion of hidden and public transcripts we can argue that one of the main functions of the TRC victim hearings was to bring hidden transcripts - so in-group transcripts that were completely excluded from the public realm under apartheid - to the public forum. This introduction of the previously hidden transcripts to the public sphere could only take place if these hearings resulted in an interaction between the testifier and the audience - the hidden transcripts needed a social space and an audience in order to become public (Scott, 1990: 118). At the HRV hearings the interaction between addresser and addressee could be very implicit and intangible - in a Bakhtinian sense -, or more concrete, as will be the focus of this article. Bakhtin has indeed been one of the key authors to define language as predominantly an

interactional/dialogic process. According to Bakhtin, the audience shapes the utterance as it is being made – instead of the audience only playing an active role *after* an utterance is made. Hence, for Bakhtin every utterance is “the product of the reciprocal relationship between the addresser and the addressee” (Morson, 1986a: 4). Every utterance is connected with possible replies of the addressee, resulting in significant decisions of the speaker at the time of producing discourse (Holquist, 1986: 64-66).

In his paper on footing Goffman (1981: 137) explains that the framework consisting of all persons present at a moment of speech can be called the *participation framework* for that particular moment of talk. Arguing that such a participation framework is only composed of a ‘speaker’ and a ‘hearer’ is much too simplified according to Goffman. Instead, “the whole social situation, the whole surround, must always be considered”, implying that within one and the same participation framework a network of *dominating communication* supplemented by *subordinate communication* becomes a possibility (Goffman, 1981: 133, 141). Goffman makes a distinction between ratified and non-ratified speech participants (the latter including *overhearers* and *eavesdroppers*) and he refers to adventitious participants as *bystanders*. All of these speech participants are co-present at a moment of talk, meaning that various layers of speech participants can be distinguished within a specific participation framework. Goffman continues that various speech participants can engage in various forms of subordinate communication; hence, subordinate communication between ratified participants is called *byplay*, communication between ratified participants and bystanders is called *crossplay*, and *sideplay* refers to the words exchanged entirely among bystanders (Goffman, 1981: 134).

The Human Rights Violations hearings were a very particular kind of social arrangement, and this particular setting or spatial constellation largely determined its participation structure. The HRV hearings can in the first place be classified as a *podium event*. A number of authors have stressed

the theatricality of the TRC hearings, claiming that it was mainly the media that turned the TRC into a sensational trauma spectacle (Bester, 2000 and Legassick & Minkley, 1997: 25). At this podium event the ratified participants were the HRV committee members<sup>1</sup> and the testifying victims, both of which were often situated on a stage. The communication between these speakers and hearers was the dominant communication. When commissioners changed roles questioning the victims, their *participation status* changed from ratified speaker to ratified hearer. Sometimes, the committee members exchanged a few words when one of their colleagues was leading the testifier in his/her testimony, a kind of subordinate communication between ratified participants that has been called byplay. Also the members of the audience - the 'bystanders' in this frame (see below) - sometimes talked amongst themselves; this kind of sideplay was never expressed in the transcripts of the hearings. Once in a while, though, the noise from the audience became so disturbing that a committee member had to interfere, thus resulting in crossplay. Also the testifiers sometimes addressed the audience, although this took often place on a more implicit level – such a kind of interaction too can be considered as crossplay. The interaction of the ratified participants with the *extended audience* went along with their interaction with the *immediate audience*; it can be seen as crossplay as well, though rather on a virtual level.

What I will call the *immediate audience* - so the people actually present at the hearings - usually consisted of friends and relatives of the testifiers, of members of their communities, of people from the press and also of a limited number of 'foreigners', in addition to the HRV Committee itself. This immediate audience can be classified as bystanders according to Goffman's taxonomy. These bystanders were a crucial element of the public hearings, but in reality they were to act "so as to maximally encourage the fiction that they [were] not present" (Goffman, 1981: 132). Interestingly, the audience can in fact be regarded as ratified hearers, but as non-ratified speakers. However, since their active discursive role was strictly limited, I will stick to the term 'bystanders'.

---

<sup>1</sup> I will alternately use the term 'commissioners' and 'committee members' to refer to the people presiding the hearings.

Besides this immediate audience we should take into account the *extended audience* as well, consisting of TV watchers, radio listeners and readers in South Africa and beyond. Also these people, who only got to know the TRC through media presentations, should be regarded as co-participants in the HRV participation framework. The live dissemination of the truth revealed at the TRC was to a large extent reserved for the journalists and broadcasting companies present at the hearings and these journalists and camera teams were given a prominent place within the setting of the hearings. As a result, the HRV committee members and the testifiers were very much aware of the fact that the extended audience should also be considered as ratified hearers. This can be concluded since both the commissioners and the testifying victims seemed to have the radio- and TV audience in mind when interacting. The commissioners, for instance, sometimes referred to graphic narratives in order to exploit the public effect of the hearings (see Verdoolaege, 2008: 153). The testifiers on the other hand definitely realized that they were in fact telling their story to the world at large, hence their attempt to meet the appeal for spectacle that might have existed among the TRC audience – especially the media producers.

In his essay on participation structure, Goffman (1981: 138) briefly refers to radio and TV audiences as *imagined recipients*. However, he stresses that only “live witnesses are co-participants in a social occasion”, thus insisting on the separation between ‘real’ and ‘virtual’ discourse participants. In the case of the TRC hearings this distinction is hard to maintain: the TRC proceedings were widely broadcast, so the commissioners and the testifiers definitely spoke to an audience that was not physically present as well. The extended audience can also be classified as - virtual - bystanders. Although their access to the encounter was *not directly* “perceivable by the official participants” - as, according to Goffman (1981: 132), is a prerequisite to be defined as bystanders -, it was definitely indirectly perceivable through the presence of the journalists and the video cameras.

It is now 'crossplay', so the subordinate communication between ratified participants (committee members or testifiers) and bystanders (the audience), that I will concentrate on and illustrate in the remainder of this article. Just like in a play or at a political manifestation - which are other examples of podium events - the role of the TRC audience was to appreciate remarks made, but not to reply in any direct way, except by back-channelling. However, the TRC setting was still different from theatrical or political settings, since the committee members and the victims were almost exclusively meant to address one another. Only at the beginning of a hearing, when welcoming the audience, or that the end of the hearing, when resuming until the next day, the committee members explicitly addressed the audience.

This participation frame can be seen as the dominant or standard frame – so the expected interpretative frame of reference. Regularly, though, speech participants changed their alignment, establishing a *change in footing*. According to Goffman (1981: 128) a change in footing “implies a change in alignment we take up ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance. A change in our footing is another way of talking about a change in our frame for events”. Through such a change in footing speakers indicate their engagement in subordinate communication. Changes in footing may be a matter of gross changes or subtle shifts. In verbal behaviour changes in footing can be signalled through devices such as pitch, volume, rhythm, stress, tonal quality or code switching (Slembrouck, 2008: 40). Also very significant, however, can be the management of turn-taking, gesticulation, gaze shifts or facial expressions, as we will see in the examples taken from the HRV hearings.

Importantly, the HRV committee members, the testifiers and the audience were not the only people present at the hearings. A crucial role was reserved for the interpreters, who interpreted the language of both the testifiers and the commissioners, speaking in the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular all the time. The team of interpreters covered practically all possible combinations of the eleven

official South African languages, so each hearing displayed a unique language situation (see du Plessis & Wiegand, 1997 and Verdoolaege, 2008 for more information). Usually, the interpreters were never referred to in the course of a hearing. Once in a while, though, the interpreter revealed its participation status by directly interfering. Sometimes this was also taken over in the transcripts, as is the case in this example:

MR DLAMINI: Is Thandeka at school?

MR MWELASE: Yes.

INTERPRETER: *The interpreter could not get that.*

MR DLAMINI: May you please repeat your question. *The interpreter could not get what you just said*, and I also wasn't ... (incomplete)

MR MWELASE: Nthuthuko is residing with his mother in Gabini. Who comes after Nthuthuko is Thandeka, who is 14 years old, a girl.

INTERPRETER: *The interpreter still could not get that.*

MR DLAMINI: Please let us be quiet. We have to listen to the speaker, and the speaker won't be audible enough if there's noise.

Referring to the interpreters usually happened in either one of two cases: the testifier spoke inaudible or too fast, or there was too much background noise. At the hearings the interpreters were usually located in a specifically designed interpreter's booth, or in a closed off corner of the hall. They were barely visible, so when adhering to Goffman's terminology, we could classify the interpreters as *eavesdroppers* – they followed the talk closely, in a purposely engineered fashion, but they were no official participants (Goffman, 1981: 132). Crossplay with the interpreters took mostly place between the interpreters and the commissioners – the latter indicating this change in

footing by means of a gaze shift or a change in tone. Sometimes, the testifiers also addressed the interpreters, but this was very rare; I know of one case only in which an elderly lady asked the interpreter not to talk too loudly into her headset, as ‘this voice’ was disturbing her.

The victims who testified before the Human Rights Violations Committee not only related their stories to the members of the Commission and the audience; they were also going to be included in South Africa’s apartheid archive. According to the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act (TRC Act, 1995: chapter 2, 3) one of the objectives of the TRC was to compile a report providing an account of the gross human rights violations that had taken place under apartheid. The establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, its proceedings and its final results, were seen as an attempt to reconstitute South Africa’s apartheid past. The apartheid experience was to be reconstructed and then recorded and treasured to serve as a reminder of the past for future generations. In this way, the TRC could be considered as a place of archive; more particularly, it was a public archive (Derrida, 2002: 49). In South Africa, the concern for archiving the past developed alongside the political transformations. According to Verne Harris (2001) it was in the period 1990-1994 that a so-called “transformation discourse in archives” emerged. This was a discourse informed by the assumption that archives required redefinition and reinvention in order to establish a democratic South Africa.

In order to compile an archival record of the TRC proceedings, additional discourse participants were present at the victim hearings, such as stenographers. These stenographers produced textual artefacts out of the interactions-on-stage and so prepared them for the archive, i.e. the TRC Report. In the same way as the interpreters, also these discourse participants followed the talk closely, but they were no official participants (Goffman, 1981: 132). Therefore, they can also be classified as *eavesdroppers*. Although these ‘data-collectors’ were crucial in order to achieve one of

the TRC's main objectives, they were largely invisible at the TRC proceedings – and they were never referred to in the transcripts of the hearings.

In the analysis of my four case studies I will deal with the above-mentioned discourse participants, the ratified participants as well as the real and virtual bystanders. Consequently, an extra interpretative layer will be added to Goffman's participation framework. Since my illustrative data consist of the official transcripts – as a reflection of the TRC archive – and SABC footage – reflecting the impact of the media in disseminating an image of the TRC -, it is clear that only focussing on the actually present discourse participants would be too limited an interpretation of the intricate TRC participation network.

### **Listening to the testifiers**

During the first part of the testimony, victims were asked to talk about the gross human rights violations they had encountered and they were given an – almost – unlimited amount of time to tell their story. During that time, the participation frame mostly consisted of face-to-face interaction between the victim and the leading commissioner, the victim narrating his/her story and the commissioner nodding in agreement or uttering back-channel cues. It was usually in the second part of the testimony, when the testifiers were being asked clarifying questions, that the participation framework became more complicated.

In this part the HRV testifiers - and to a lesser extent also the commissioners - sometimes oriented their discourse towards the audience and they did so by means of all kinds of linguistic devices, some of them verbal (vocabulary, grammar or morphology), some of them paralinguistic (facial expressions, gestures, eye contact). In this section I will discuss how the testifiers (and to a lesser extent also the HRV commissioners) tried to catch the attention of the audience, how they

referred to the audience or how they manifestly directed their discourse to the audience, thus engaging in a subtle kind of dialogue with the members of the TRC public.

### *Data case I*

One of the most assertive, proud and also angry testifiers I came across in my selection was Mr. John Buthelezi, who related a story about detention, torture and betrayal. This testimony highlights how crossplay can have a self-legitimizing function and how, in particular cases, the interaction between testifier and the audience was restricted by the commissioners. In the beginning of this testimony the audience seems to be noisy, which was often the case when the next testifier came to the stage. Possibly, the audience was aware of Mr. Buthelezi's short-tempered character and they were noisy in anticipation of a lively testimony. This is how chair Manthata tries to calm down the public:

MR MANTHATA: (...) Sorry, sorry, Mr Buthelezi, come, I am sorry. *Please, please, let there be order, please.* Mr Buthelezi, who is, who is accompanying you?<sup>2</sup>

Note that Mr. Manthata apologises for the inconvenience caused by the noisy audience. This could be seen as an indication of the respect attributed to the testifiers, a feature that was very prominent throughout the Human Rights Violations hearings (for a discussion, see Verdoolaege, 2008: 136-145). The “Please, please” and also a gaze shift towards the audience (only visible on the video recordings) signal a change in footing on the part of the commissioner: the noise produced by the audience is so disturbing that in an attempt to calm them down Mr. Manthata has to engage in crossplay.

---

<sup>2</sup> All of these illustrations have literally been taken from the transcriptions on the Official TRC Website; the italics are always mine.

Mr. Buthelezi immediately starts to talk about the torture and the harassment he suffered at the hands of the police. Right from the start it looks as if he wants to show off and to make an impression on the immediate and extended audience. In fact, Mr. Buthelezi proposes to demonstrate how he was tortured, this probably with an eye to the audience and the TV cameras. He might feel that words are not adequate enough to express his harrowing experiences - acting out these experiences will have more of an effect on the audience. Such acting out was extremely rare at the TRC hearings; to my knowledge, the only other instance where a testifier has been acting out an experience in front of the TRC was the much televised amnesty hearing where Jeffrey Benzien demonstrated his wet-bag torture method (see Bester, 2002; Payne, 1999). In the case of Mr. Buthelezi, the “Yes, I was standing like this” in the following fragment indicates a change in footing, by trying to catch the attention of the addressed participants (the commissioners) as well as the not directly addressed participants (the immediate and the extended audience).

MR BUTHELEZI: I was handcuffed to the pole, the flagpole, at the police station. I was handcuffed, *maybe I should demonstrate how I was handcuffed to the pole.*

MR LEWIN: Please do.

MR BUTHELEZI: *Yes, I was standing like this* and they tied my, the rope around my legs to the pole and my hands were handcuffed to the pole and I was tortured until I started to bleed. I was bleeding profusely through my mouth and my nose and they continued to torture me.

A little later on we see that Mr. Buthelezi is angry and that he explicitly mentions that he is unwilling to reconcile. According to the reaction of commissioner Lewin, the public reacts fiercely to these words. We thus notice something similar as in the beginning of this testimony,

the commissioner changes footing by addressing the audience – in an attempt to re-establish the standard participation framework:

MR BUTHELEZI: I will explicitly emphasise the fact that I will never reconcile until I mention those who wanted to attack me and kill me.

MR LEWIN: *Could we have quiet please.*

MR BUTHELEZI: I will only reconcile if I will be given opportunity to see those people who called me informers, (...)



**Figure 1: “I will only reconcile if...”**

Exactly the same happens a couple of minutes later. Every time Mr. Buthelezi raises the topic of reconciliation, either by stressing that he will only reconcile after he has met the traitors and informers, or by maintaining that he refuses to reconcile, the audience reacts fiercely:

MR BUTHELEZI: (...) I want to tell you that I will only reconcile when only I could be given opportunity to see those people who were painting others black and yet they were the evil ones, the traitors and the informers. That is when I will reconcile.

MR MANTHATA: *Order please. Order, order please. We are asking you could you please be quiet. Go on.*

(...)

MR BUTHELEZI: (...) I know all of those people and I am prepared to make mention of their names *right here*. People are here to reconcile.

MR LEWIN: *Could we please have quiet. Do you want to read the Riot Act and I will ...*

MRS SEROKE: Sorry.

MR LEWIN: *Read the Riot Act. Just ask them, explain that we have to have quiet.*

MR MANTHATA: *Please we are expected to be quiet. If you want to hear the truth and let everybody here hear the truth, please, let us be quiet.*

MR BUTHELEZI: What I will say is that I was so much assaulted, harassed and I was going through sufferings and people would point fingers at me saying I am a traitor, an informer, calling me a sell-out.

(...)

MR BUTHELEZI: So, I am not going to, I am not going to reconcile, I am not about to.

MRS SEROKE: *Order please, order.*

MR MANTHATA: Buthelezi, could you, I think you have come to the end, could you please take questions. Thank you.

MR LEWIN: Thank you, Mr Buthelezi, *and could we please give the witness a chance to have his say.*



**Figure 2: “...I’m not going to reconcile, I’m not about to.”**

Mr. Lewin, Mr. Manthata and Mrs. Seroke take turns trying to calm down the audience. The public could be noisy because Mr. Buthelezi does not fulfil the role of a docile, reconciliation-oriented testifier. In addition, Mr. Buthelezi talks about traitors and informers. He implies that these informers belong to the community and that they are even present in the hall – note the “right here” in his second phrase. It looks as if he wants to mention these traitors in front of the Commission. Therefore, people in the audience might feel threatened, or they might disagree with his accusations, both of which could lead to commotion. In addition, we may not forget that these hearings were most probably going to be broadcast on national television, which makes Mr. Buthelezi’s reference to the community even more relevant. It is thus clear that Mr. Buthelezi is

not only talking about his experiences to the HRV committee, but that he constantly tries to address the audience and to engage in crossplay. Not only does he explicitly evoke the message that he is unwilling to reconcile, a message that was bound to attract the attention of the audience in a reconciliation-oriented setting as the TRC, he also wants to directly draw certain members of the audience into his story by mentioning their names.

The public then seems to be silent for a couple of minutes; towards the end of the testimony, though, uproar starts again:

MRS SEROKE: Nhlanhla, you have said in your statement you were tortured because you were manufacturing petrol bombs at home, you opened your own factory of petrol bombs. Is that true?

MR BUTHELEZI: Yes, that is true. *Not alone.*

CHAIRPERSON: *Order please.*

MR BUTHELEZI: *With other Comrades.*

MRS SEROKE: Were you alone or you had some company in this manufacturing?

MR BUTHELEZI: As I have said, we were many, except that the venue was my home.

MR MANTHATA: *Please, people, we are here to listen to each and every word that comes from the witness.*



**Figure 3: Both the audience and the testifier are laughing:**

**“...except that the venue was my home.”**

It looks as if the people in the audience are enjoying themselves. The victim refuses to comply with the typical HRV victim profile: he is showing off and he seems to be proud about himself as a victim. At the end of his testimony, it looks as if Mr. Buthelezi even ridicules the Commission. The utterance “As I have said, we were many, except that the venue was my home” must be phrased in an ironic fashion, since the audience bursts into laughter (only audible on the video). The chair then intervenes to calm down the audience. Also note the “Not alone” and “With other Comrades” in this extract, indicating again that Mr. Buthelezi refuses to take sole responsibility for some of his actions. He accuses fellow Comrades, maybe community members present at the hearing, which results in noise from the audience. Especially in this fragment there seems to be constant crossplay between the audience (the actually present and the virtual) and either one of the two ratified speakers.

Both the testifier and the audience seem to enjoy each other’s discourse and we notice, indeed, that their interaction intensifies in the course of the testimony. The public is noisy in reaction to

Mr. Buthelezi's words: they might feel threatened by his accusations, they might enjoy his boasting manner of challenging the commissioners or they might like his showing off and his manifest self-confidence. In addition, it also seems as if Mr. Buthelezi enjoys the attention paid to him by members of the audience. His proud way of talking about his experiences and about his personality, his threats aimed at the audience and his explicit refusal to reconcile seem to be consciously directed towards the public. Hence, it looks as if Mr Buthelezi's crossplay with the public has to do a lot with his self-legitimation.

The interaction between Mr. Buthelezi and the audience is built up throughout the testimony, but it is constrained all the time by the commissioners. The commissioners wanted to stay in control - hence the reference to the Riot Act. However, they phrased their efforts to contain the noise in such a way as to suit the values of the TRC. Namely, the audience had to be quiet out of respect for the testifier.

### *Data case II*

Sometimes, testifiers explicitly mentioned gruesome details of the incident they came to talk about, with the specific intention, it seems, of impressing or shocking the audience. This was the case with Phebel Robinson, whose husband was tortured and killed in prison. In contrast with case I, the crossplay of this testifier is not constrained by the committee members and Ms. Robinson is allowed to openly take advantage of the public forum and the presence of the audience. It is true that each testimony of these HRV victims was aimed at the audience. All of them wanted to tell the world about what they had endured. Sometimes, however, a certain change of intonation, a certain gaze, or a certain gesture could indicate that a specific phrase or description was directly aimed at the audience. By doing so, the testifier effectuated a change in footing and by no longer directly addressing the HRV committee members he/she engaged in subordinate communication. In fact, it could be more reasonable to argue that in this particular

instance the testifier decided that the interaction with the audience temporarily became the ‘dominating communication’. For a number of testifying victims, the fact to testify *in public* was indeed more important than the mere fact of telling about the gross human rights violations they had endured. This also means that for these testifiers addressing the broadcast audience was at least as important as talking to the immediate audience. They wanted to be heard, by as many people as possible, sometimes reverting to theatrical presentations, as is also the case with Ms. Robinson.

Indeed, after having related her story, Ms. Robinson comes back to the fact that her husband was “gruesomely murdered”. In great detail she describes how his body was mutilated – she even brought pictures to show, which indicates that the idea of impressing the audience might have been prepared beforehand. These shocking utterances are pronounced with a different intonation and with a louder and more explicit voice. Such an expressive intonation was likely to attract the attention of the audience. While pronouncing these words Ms. Robinson also gesticulates to demonstrate where her husband was stabbed and how his arms were slit open. Possibly, this effort to make the trauma more visible was also aimed at the audience. Through various verbal and non-verbal elements Ms. Robinson thus brings about a change in footing:

MS ROBINSON: I would like the truth. Who is behind this whole thing or who was in on the murder *because my husband gruesomely murdered. It wasn't just one stab wound, his arms was slit open, he had several stab wounds on his body and marks from where they had tortured him.* That is not one persons work, the report is laying there. I brought it with me who ever wants to read it can read it so that they can see what happened to him.



**Figure 4: “...his arms were slit open...”**

Later on, Ms. Robinson explicitly presents her husband as an activist who stood for his community. This projected identification is clearly oriented towards the immediate audience, where many people from the community were present, as well as towards the TV watchers/radio listeners at home:

MS ROBINSON: My husband wasn't scared, he was not afraid of anyone and he fought for human rights. *He was a man for his community.* He supported the poor, and the people that were battling.

(...)

MS ROBINSON: So once again I say that he was not afraid of anybody and he stood for what he believed in and for his community. *There are many people here that can bear testimony to that - to the fact that he stood for his community.*



**Figure 5: Facing the audience: “There are many people here that can bear testimony to that...”**

During these utterances there is manifest interaction with the audience. After the phrase “He was a man for his community” the public applauds, indicating that they endorse Ms. Robinson’s assertion. The testifier also emphasises the word “community”, meaning that she does not only talk *about* the community, but also *to* the community. Also in the next sentence Ms. Robinson incorporates the audience into her testimony. She addresses the audience by claiming that many people in the audience can bear testimony to her husband’s community spirit. At this point, the testifier looks at the audience as well. Up till now she only looked at the commissioners, but now she clearly changes perspective by directing her attention to the public directly. The appreciation shown by the audience also seems to stimulate her to talk louder and faster. She knows that the people understand and support her and realising that the audience values her testimony is an incentive to talk even more expressively.

Finally, at the end of her testimony, Ms. Robinson comes back to her husband’s community spirit. Before pronouncing “As somebody said to me” she looks at the public explicitly, as if to

attract their attention before pronouncing the next sentence, full of pride and affection for her husband:

MS ROBINSON: (...) But I do not have any children of my own. As somebody said to me in other words *I am raising the community's children* and I said yes, that is what my husband left me to do.

Throughout this testimony, Ms. Robinson is openly valued and acknowledged by the audience. The testifier is taking advantage of this situation by manifestly adding to the interaction with members of the public - mainly through gestures, facial expressions and intonation. Strikingly, this interaction with the audience - the noisy and cheering reactions by the audience - is not constrained in any case, this in contrast with Mr. Buthelezi for instance. Apparently, certain testifiers were more allowed to take advantage of the public space than others. Especially towards the end of her testimony, Ms. Robinson explicitly chooses to consider the audience as ratified participants. The interaction with the audience has almost become the dominant communication and the members of the public also take on this role and they react as addressed participants.

### ***Data case III***

The third case, the testimony of Bernice Whitfield, takes this interaction with the audience further by not only explicitly trying to arouse compassion, but also by attempting to persuade the public to endorse certain beliefs; Mrs. Whitfield's husband was killed in an APLA<sup>3</sup> bomb attack. Her testimony is full of self-pity, for which she tries to arouse sympathy from the audience. This self-pity is evident from Mrs. Whitfield's detailed and repeated explanation of her financial problems and from the dramatic ways in which she relates many different kinds of misfortunes that befell her family - some of which having nothing to do with the APLA bomb attack. She

---

<sup>3</sup> APLA: Azanian People's Liberation Army, the military wing of the Pan-Africanist Congress

also gives a gruesome description of the way her husband died – a description that might have raised the attention and sympathy of the audience:

MRS WHITFIELD: I think it was either three or four bullet wounds in the chest. *He was alive for a while but he drowned in his own blood.* That's when he died.

Mrs. Whitfield uses interjections as well to establish a change in footing and to directly address the audience. These interjections could be a marker of nervousness - hedging phrases such as 'you see' and 'you know' can be markers of affect indeed, as highlighted by Blommaert (2005: 88), but it could also be a way of addressing the audience, meaning 'do you understand what I am saying', 'do I make myself clear'. As indicated by Schiffrin (1987: 290) "you know" leads a hearer to focus attention on a piece of information being presented by the speaker. "You know" "creates an interactive focus on speaker-provided information". The speaker is marked as information provider, but the successful fulfilment of that role is dependent upon hearer attention. Schiffrin suggests that "you know" functions this way, because it is an expression which is reduced from a "do you know" question:

MRS WHITFIELD: Yes, fourteen years suspended for thirteen years. They had a picture of the gentleman in the paper and they said that they managed to catch this guy and it was a Black gentleman and they said that he got fourteen years suspended for thirteen years. I just tore the paper up and I said *you know* this is justice and I'm not even interested.

(...)

MRS WHITFIELD: Yes, I do have a lot of hope and because I don't put my hope in people I put my hope in the Lord I see a lot of hope in the world. As I said if we focus on God because it's only God that can give you inner peace ... *you know* I help and encourage so many people who

come to me with broken heart and I say to them the world might reject you but Jesus will always love you and *you know* that gives us so much hope.

Mrs. Whitfield seems to possess a lot of communicative competence: her narrative is highly structured, very coherent and also well-considered, so the impression is given that the “you know” is consciously employed to appeal to the audience. Through “you know” the audience is not only drawn into the narrative, the people in the public are also invited to put themselves in the event, to empathise with the experiences of the testifier and to show pity and support. In the first fragment, “you know” focuses the attention of the audience on the injustice in present-day South Africa. In the final fragment, when Mrs. Whitfield touches upon her faith, it looks as if she does not only ask for empathy, but also as if she tries to persuade the audience to accept her conviction. It almost sounds as if she tries to convert the listeners by convincing them of the overall blessing of Christianity. By doing so, she certainly not only has the immediate audience in mind, but also the extended audience. In the case of Mrs. Whitfield the change in footing is less explicit, since the interjections do not go along with a gaze shift or facial expressions.

Importantly, the HRV testimonies of white victims had a more explicit national relevance, since it was crucial to demonstrate that also white South Africans had suffered under apartheid. In these cases, appealing to the extended audience got an extra dimension, and was thus clearly a factor to take into account.

#### ***Data case IV***

In addition to the first three cases, also the testimony of Muhammed Ferhelst should be mentioned. Mr. Ferhelst was detained and severely tortured by the apartheid police. Interestingly, Mr. Ferhelst sometimes quotes his torturers in Afrikaans, thus underlining that also code switching can be used to indicate a change in footing. This code switching could be a result of the very nature of the traumatic experience – maybe quoting the police officers in Afrikaans was the

only way to relive the incident. Mr. Ferhelst might also quote the policemen in this harsh and vulgar Afrikaans to negatively identify them, and to present them as personifications of the brutal apartheid regime:

MR FERHELST: There was approximately 20 to 30 'cops' in the dining room and this Captain burst into the room where I was laying, I was still in a shorts. He pulled me up, he said can I use the exact words because like it's hard for me to forget what that man said today and like I tried to forget, but it's always there, this Captain his name is Van Brakel. He came into that room, he and about 4 or 5 other SB's, he said to me, **jou slym etter gemors, ons het jou, ons gaan jou nou vrek maak** you piece of trash, we have you now, now we going to kill you.

(...)

MR FERHELST: Ja, they took me to a doctor once, I can still remember the doctor was somewhere in Bellville, my whole body was bruised. I had marks on my face and I came to the doctor, the doctor just took out a stethoscope, put it against my heart and he reckons to the SB, **die donner makeer fok all, vat hom hier weg**<sup>4</sup>.



**Figure 6: Slightly smiling and facing the audience before pronouncing “jou slym etter gemors”.**

---

<sup>4</sup> Translation: “Everything is fucking wrong with the bastard, get him out of here.”

However, Mr. Ferhelst could also have used this uncivilised Afrikaans discourse purposely to shock the audience. The words he employs in Afrikaans are taboo words; they are extremely harsh and impolite and usually not to be used in public spheres. Maybe, Mr. Ferhelst wants to describe this policeman as a rude and uncivilised person, a barbarian who uses very insulting words. Quoting him in English would not have made the same impression on the audience. These Afrikaans quotes definitely attracted the attention of the audience, it made them aware of the brutality of these officers and it could also have enhanced their sympathy for Mr. Ferhelst's experiences.

The kind of code switching Mr. Ferhest employs is a *metaphorical code switching* (Gumperz, 1982), as it concerns communicative effects and as it is not related to any kind of situational change. The people who transcribed and edited these TRC transcripts also noticed that these words had a special - pragmatic - connotation: they either emphasised the highly traumatic nature of the experience, or they specifically identified the apartheid police in a negative way in order to make an impression on the audience. That is why the transcribers highlighted them in the transcription (in bold letter type). Usually, no other language than English was used in the transcriptions, so the mere fact that the Afrikaans is transcribed already indicates that the transcribers noticed something peculiar about these words. When watching the video recording of this testimony you can see that the victim smiles before pronouncing the Afrikaans words from the first fragment above. Mr. Ferhelst probably knows that the words will have a big impact on the audience, so this facial expression could be seen as a subtle indication of the change in footing that is to follow.

## **Discussion**

Although the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission was the sixteenth commission of its kind, starting with the Ugandan Commission of Inquiry in 1974 (Hayner 2001: 291), at the

time of being established it did have a number of particular characteristics. The South African Commission, for instance, was unique in its transparency, such as in the selection of the commissioners, the openness to the media and the holding of public hearings. This contrasted with similar initiatives, like the National Commission on the Disappeared in Argentina, which did not hold public hearings at all (Hayner 2001: 34). As a result, the nationwide (and worldwide) impact of the Argentine Commission was considerably smaller and also the role played by the victims was more limited.

We can argue that the public character of the Human Rights Violations hearings has been crucial to the success of the HRV Committee. Not only were these public testimonies cathartic to some of the victims of human rights violations, being able to testify in public also strengthened the self-esteem and dignity of the victims. It has been claimed many times that for most of the victims who came forward to the HRV Committee testifying was a healing experience. Public testimonies restored the dignity of apartheid's victims, giving them an opportunity for catharsis and mourning before a sympathetic audience (see for instance Boroughs 1997; Minow 1998: 66; Fourie 2000; Meiring 1999: 371; Rakate, 1999). By telling their stories, victims realised that their suffering had not been a private matter, but that it had been part of a social experience in which millions of people played a role. In this way it became easier for them to deal with the past trauma and with the powerlessness and humiliations they had been confronted with for so many decades (Minow, 1998: 67). For the first time in their lives, their suffering got acknowledged and they felt respected and valued by society. Many of them had wanted the world to know about the past and therefore they greatly appreciated the opportunity given to them to tell their stories in public (see Chapman, 2003a, 2003b; Kgalema & van der Merwe, 2003; Phakathi & van der Merwe, 2003).

As a result of the public character of the hearings, and also due to the fact that many testifiers paid great importance to ‘going public’, the participation framework of the HRV hearings was highly intricate. The HRV hearings were set up as an interaction between a testifying victim and the members of the HRV committee, accompanied by a clearly visible audience. Therefore, I have characterised the participation status of the audience as bystanders: they were ratified hearers, but non-ratified speakers. The interaction between committee members and the audience can definitely be seen as crossplay, as the commissioners were never meant to address the members of the public. I have also defined the interaction between the testifiers and the audience as crossplay, although here we should be more nuanced. Also for the testifiers the communication with the HRV committee members was definitely the dominant communication. Nevertheless, for a number of testifiers, and usually also towards the end of the testimony – when the victim had gained confidence, we notice that they gradually seemed to “upgrade” the interaction with the audience, moving it from a subordinate communication to – another – dominant form of communication. These testifiers (Mr. Buthelezi and Ms. Robinson for instance) seemed to consider the audience as a *primary recipient or addressee* (Van Dijk, 2009: 132) and not the TRC commissioners. Sometimes, these testifiers valued the audience to such an extent that they tried to benefit from its presence, for instance to boost their own identity.

When going over the illustrations we notice that it was mainly a specific kind of testifiers that addressed the audience. Testifiers who consciously oriented their discourse towards the audience were usually self-assured victims, victims who presented a well-defined identity at the hearing. Often, self-esteem, self-pity, pride or anger seemed to be incentives to address the audience explicitly. All of these people tried to attract the attention of the audience, they all tried to raise understanding for their projected identity. They all wanted to be explicitly acknowledged and they incorporated the audience in their efforts to create a distinct profile for themselves. These testifiers deliberately decided to engage in a change in footing; they consciously opted for a kind

of crossplay whereby the audience was openly acknowledged as ratified and addressed hearers – sometimes, under the impulse of the testifier’s change in footing, the audience even seemed to be urged to react, to act as a participating speaker.

This is in contrast with the communication between the commissioners and the audience, where we see a different kind of crossplay. The commissioners did not *opt* for crossplay, they were rather compelled, so we can talk about an *inevitable* or *necessary* type of crossplay. Indeed, it seemed as if the committee members wanted to stay in control, thus constraining the participatory power of the audience. In the course of this article we have noticed that quite a number of times the commissioners tried to calm down the audience. In this way, the commissioners wanted to stress that the HRV hearings consisted of two main participants: the testifiers and the HRV Committee. The audience was considered as a third-rate participant: it was necessary for the public character of the TRC, and sometimes - as in the case of Mr. Buthelezi demonstrating how he was tortured - the interaction with the audience was encouraged to enhance the dramatic effect of the hearings. However, the audience was not supposed to actually partake in the conversation. It was never allowed to actively interact with the main participants – for instance by posing questions or by openly reacting to the expressions of the victims or the commissioners. The interaction with the audience was usually strictly contained. Especially tense and aggressive reactions from the audience were perceived as disturbing, while more space was allowed for encouraging and supportive reactions. We thus see that the HRV commissioners tried to hold on to their participation status of primary addressee; they wanted to maintain the afore established frame. The testifiers - or some of the testifiers - on the other hand tried their best to break the standard participation framework by consciously addressing members of the audience.

We have also seen that the extended audience (TV watchers and radio-listeners) should be considered as ratified discourse participants – and not just as *imagined* recipients, as claimed by

Goffman. The TRC testifiers clearly considered the broadcast audience as ratified listeners, thus addressing their discourse and directing their change in footing also to people not physically present at the hearings. It is true that the media played a crucial role in bringing the TRC to the world (for more information see, amongst many others, the Rhodes Journalism Review, Online Edition 14, 1997 or Wilson, 2001) – a role that was conscientiously prepared in the running-up to the hearings and that is still eagerly followed by truth commissions all over the world (see the e-mail conversation on the Transitional Justice Network, April 2008). In addition, through the mediatisation of these hearings, the self-confidence of the testifiers, which was largely manifested in their interaction with the audience, was made relevant to apartheid victims countrywide. As a result, we can claim that the testifier-audience exchanges could have had a consciousness-raising function extending far beyond the actual hearings.

Finally, let me briefly come back to the macro-level relevance of the TRC hearings. The testimonies of these HRV victims were transcribed, analysed, put on the TRC website and reflected upon in the TRC Report. The discourse of these testifiers thus became part of South Africa's historical archive. On this macro-level we could argue that the historical record, South Africa's national consciousness and the apartheid archive also belonged to the participation framework of the TRC hearings. These – institutionalised – entities 'received' the discourse of the apartheid victims and stored it away for future generations. This is a level of discourse participation the testifiers were probably least aware of, so it is these entities I would classify as *imagined recipients* – in contrast with Goffman who uses the term 'imagined recipients' for the broadcast audience. Nevertheless, it is quite likely that in the long run these highly abstract discourse participants might have had the biggest impact on South African society.

## Conclusion

When taking the victim hearings of the TRC as an example, it becomes clear that face-to-face talk should not be regarded as the prototypical participation framework, even not in a highly stage-managed discursive setting. Social situations are becoming more and more complex with regard to production and reception formats – think only about video conferences, virtual meetings via e-mail, or indeed, public hearings involving highly personal - even intimate - narratives, where we can distinguish many layers of ratified participants/bystanders (the commissioners, the testifiers, the interpreters, the immediate audience, the extended audience and the archive). They all have a different participation status, but they are all, consciously or unconsciously, mutually taken into account. What I have tried to illustrate in this article is that addressing each of these layers carried with it a change in footing. By paying attention to non-immediate co-present discourse participants I have also attempted to extend Goffman's framework beyond the physical here-and-now. In a mediatised world and in particular in the case of truth commissions, which always have a national relevance, it is necessary to distinguish additional layers in Goffman's participation structure. Especially the relation with the extended audience determined the set-up and also the participation structure of the TRC hearings, although the TRC archive as an imagined recipient should be taken into account as well.

To conclude, we can argue that the interaction between the testifiers and the audience was a big issue for each of the three main participants in the HRV discursive situation. Although the TRC commissioners wanted to stay in control at the hearings, they accepted the interaction with the audience to a limited extent – the public nature of the TRC was important for the image of the Commission. With regard to the testifiers, some of them made use of the – immediate, wider and imagined - audience to boast their own identity, to raise empathy or to get acknowledgment. In this way, testifying in public was crucial for these apartheid victims, in order to try to cope with their traumatic experiences. The immediate audience, finally, either appreciated or rejected the

presented identities. They were usually present to support a relative or a friend, but in addition they often tried to turn the hearing into a memorable personal experience by actively engaging in the process. All of these discourse participants wanted to fully participate in a process that, also thanks to its public nature, has changed South African history once and for all.

## Reference list

Bester, R. (2000) 'At the edges of apartheid memory', Paper to 'Encounters With Photography: photographing people in southern Africa, 1860 to 1999'. Conference, Cape Town, 14 to 17 July 1999.

Bester, R. (2002) 'Trauma and Truth'. In *Experiments with Truth*. Documenta 11\_Platform2, Okwui Enwezor et al (eds.), 155-174. Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz Publishers.

Blommaert, J. (2005) *Discourse. A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J., Bock M. and McCormick, K. (2006) 'Narrative inequality and the problem of hearability in the 'TRC hearings'', *Journal of Language and Politics* 5 (1), 37-70.

Boroughs, D. (1997) 'Will the 'Truth set them free?', *US News and World Report* 122 (16): 42-45.

Chapman, A.R. (2003a) 'The 'TRC's Approach to Promoting Reconciliation in the Human Rights Violations Hearings', Research Report, Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.

(2003b) 'Perspectives on Forgiveness in the Human Rights Violations Hearings', Research Report, Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.

Derrida, J. (2002) 'Archive Fever in South Africa', In *Refiguring the Archive*, C. Hamilton et al (eds.), 38-80. Cape Town: David Philip Publishers.

Dijk van, T. (2009) *Society and Discourse. How Context Controls Text and Talk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Fourie, G. (2000) 'The psychology of perpetrators of "political" violence in South Africa – a personal experience', *Ethnicity and Health* 5(3-4): 283-289.
- Freedom of Expression Institute of South Africa. (1995) 'The Truth Commission Bill. Transparency in Government: another Urban Legend?', *FXI Update* January 1995: 1-12.
- Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher.
- Graybill, L.S. (2002) *Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa. Miracle or Model?* Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982) *Discourse strategies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, V. (2001) 'Seeing (in) Blindness: South Africa, Archives and Passion for Justice', Keynote speech at the August 2001 Silver Jubilee annual conference of the Archives and Records Association of New Zealand. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Hayner, P.B. (2001) *Unspeakable Truths. Confronting State Terror and Atrocity*. London: Routledge.
- Holquist, M. (1986) 'Answering as Authoring: Mikhail Bakhtin's Trans-Linguistics', In *Bakhtin. Essays and Dialogues on His Work*, G.S. Morson (ed.), 59-72. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kgalema, L. and Van der Merwe, H. (2003) 'What is Truth? Victim and Commission Perspectives', Research Report, Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.
- Legassick, M. and Minkley, G. (1997) *Current Trends in the Production of South African History*. Bellville: University of the Western Cape
- Meiring, P. (1999) *Chronicle of the Truth Commission*. Vanderbijlpark: Carpe Diem Books.
- Minow, M. (1998) *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness. Facing History after Genocide and Mass Violence*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Morson, G.S. (1986) 'Who Speaks for Bakhtin?' In Bakhtin. Essays and Dialogues on His Work, G.S. Morson (ed.), 1-20. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Official TRC Website. (2003) [http://www.doj.gov.za/trc/trc\\_frameset.htm](http://www.doj.gov.za/trc/trc_frameset.htm).

Payne, L.A. (1999) 'Confessions of Torturers. Reflections from Argentina'. Paper to 'The TRC: Commissioning the Past Conference'. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand, 11-14 June 1999.

Phakathi, T.S. and Van der Merwe, H. (2003) 'The Impact of the TRC's Amnesty Process on Survivors of Human Rights Violations', Research Report, Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.

Plessis du, T. and Wiegand, Ch. (1997) 'Report on interpreting at the hearings of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission: April 1996 to February 1997', Acta Varia. Onderweg na vertaal- en tolkopleiding in Suid-Afrika 3: 10-29.

Rakate, P.T.K. (1999) Domestic truth commissions and international criminal tribunals as mechanisms for conflict resolution in transitional societies, with specific reference to South Africa and the former Yugoslavia. Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the Degree of Masters of Laws, University of Stellenbosch.

Rhodes Journalism Review (1997) Online Edition Number 14.  
(<http://www.rjr.ru.ac.za/no14.html>).

Schiffrin, D. (1987) Discourse markers. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 5. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scott, C.J. (1990) Domination and the Arts of Resistance. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Slembrouck, S. (2008) Analysis of Spoken Interaction. Leuven: Acco.

Transitional Justice Network mailing list. (2008)  
<http://listserv.aaas.org/mailman/listinfo/tjnetwork>.

TRC Act Online. (1995) [http://www.doj.gov.za/trc/trc\\_frameset.htm](http://www.doj.gov.za/trc/trc_frameset.htm).

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa Report. (1998) Volumes 1-5. Cape Town: Juta & Co Ltd.

(2002) Volume 7. Cape Town: Juta & Co Ltd.

(2003) Volume 6. Cape Town: Juta & Co Ltd.

Vandergucht, L. (2003) De Notie Brotherhood binnen Umkhonto we Sizwe. Master thesis. Department of African Languages and Cultures, Ghent University.

Verdoolaege, A. (2008) Reconciliation Discourse. The case of the South African TRC. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Wilson, R.A. (2001) The politics of Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa. Legitimising the Post-Apartheid State. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zyl van, P. (1995) 'Hiding behind the truth', Mail & Guardian, January 27th to February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1995.