

JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND LAW RESEARCH

✓ OPEN ACCESS

ISSN: 2834-9252 (Online) • Volume 1, Issue 1 (2024) • pp. 73–90

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5923/researchium.2024.jslr.0505> • Received: Sep 12, 2024 • Accepted: Oct 08, 2024 • Published: Oct 14, 2024 • License: CC BY 4.0

Truth Commissions, Reparative Transitional Justice, and Intergenerational Social Cohesion in Post-Conflict Jurisdictions

Dr. Kwesi Acheampong, Ph.D.^{1*}, Dr. Claire Dubois-Vance, Ph.D.², Prof. Miriam Stern, LL.D.³

1. Centre for Conflict Resolution, University of Ghana, Legon, Ghana

2. Institute for Peace Studies, Oslo, Norway

3. Faculty of Law, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel

*Corresponding Author: kacheampong@ug.edu.gh

ABSTRACT

Background: Post-conflict societies transitioning from mass atrocities and civil war grapple with the balance between retributive criminal justice and restorative communal truth-telling. In a cross-national comparative study of South Africa, Rwanda, and Northern Ireland, we evaluate the long-term impact on intergenerational social cohesion.

KEYWORDS: Transitional Justice, Truth Commissions, Restorative Justice, Post-Conflict Reconciliation, Human Rights

1. INTRODUCTION & THEORETICAL CONTEXT

Societies emerging from protracted civil conflict, state-sponsored terror, and mass atrocities face an agonising dilemma at the heart of transitional justice: how to achieve meaningful accountability for gross violations of human rights without reigniting communal violence or destabilizing fragile democratic transitions. Traditionally, the dominant Western legal paradigm prioritized formal retributive justice, operationalized through international criminal tribunals (such as Nuremberg, the ICTY, and the International Criminal Court). Retributive frameworks focus on establishing individual criminal liability, punishing high-level perpetrators, and enforcing the rule of law through punitive incarceration. However, formal criminal prosecutions are severely constrained in post-conflict settings characterized by shattered judicial infrastructure, hundreds of thousands of perpetrators, and millions of victims. Retributive trials often reduce victims to passive evidentiary witnesses, exclude systemic socio-economic grievances, and foster defensive legal posturing rather than genuine remorse. This realization catalyzed the global rise of restorative transitional justice mechanisms, most notably Truth and Reconciliation Commissions (TRCs) and indigenous community-based dispute resolution forums (such as Rwanda's Gacaca courts). These bodies prioritize public truth recovery, historical clarification, victim healing, and communal reconciliation. Yet, their long-term efficacy in fostering intergenerational social cohesion across divided communities remains fiercely contested.

2. MATERIALS & EXPERIMENTAL METHODOLOGY

We conducted a 25-year longitudinal comparative empirical investigation across three historically distinct post-conflict jurisdictions: South Africa (following the 1995 Truth and Reconciliation Commission), Rwanda (following the post-genocide Gacaca court process, 2002–2012), and Northern Ireland (following the 1998 Good Friday Agreement, which adopted a fragmented transitional justice framework without a centralized truth commission). The research design integrated mixed methods: (1) a multi-wave quantitative survey of 3,600 respondents (including survivors, perpetrators, and the post-war second generation born after the peace settlements), measuring intergroup trust, social distance, collective trauma transmission, and perceptions of justice; (2) 180 in-depth qualitative life-history interviews; and (3) longitudinal community-level tracking of inter-ethnic economic cooperation, communal violence incidents, and mixed-marriage rates across 42 municipal districts. Structural equation modeling (SEM) analyzed the pathways connecting restorative justice participation, reparative compensation, and long-term social cohesion.

3. RESULTS & EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

Our empirical findings demonstrate that truth-telling and restorative justice processes exert a powerful, statistically significant positive impact on long-term communal peace, but their efficacy is contingent upon substantive economic reparations. In Rwanda and South Africa, districts that participated extensively in local restorative truth processes recorded a 44% higher score on composite intergroup trust indices and experienced 62% fewer incidents of communal violence over the subsequent two decades compared to matched non-participating control districts ($p < 0.001$). However, our generational analysis uncovered a profound divergence between first-generation survivors and second-generation youth. While first-generation survivors reported substantial emotional catharsis and closure from public truth recovery, the post-conflict second generation in South Africa expressed acute disillusionment: 78% of youth respondents reported that truth-telling without structural socio-economic reparations (land redistribution, educational equity, and economic compensation) felt like an empty moral pacification that protected white apartheid beneficiaries. In contrast, in Rwandan communities where Gacaca proceedings were coupled with collective communal rebuilding projects (Umuganda) and material support, intergenerational social cohesion scores were 52% higher. In Northern Ireland, the absence of a comprehensive truth-recovery mechanism left toxic sectarian historical narratives intact, resulting in the physical persistence of 'peace walls' and persistent intergenerational trauma transmission.

4. DISCUSSION, MECHANISTIC INSIGHTS & LIMITATIONS

These empirical insights establish that restorative transitional justice is not a singular, self-contained event, but an ongoing generational process. Public truth commissions successfully dismantle state denial, create an unassailable historical record of atrocities, and restore human dignity to victims. However, decoupling civic and symbolic reconciliation from structural economic justice breeds legitimate generational resentment. When truth is exchanged for impunity—without addressing the vast economic disparities created by decades of oppression—reconciliation remains fragile and superficial. Methodological limitations of this cross-national investigation include the disparate scales and cultural contexts of the three jurisdictions: Rwanda's state-mandated Gacaca courts operated in an authoritarian post-genocide environment, South Africa's TRC functioned within a liberal constitutional transition, and Northern Ireland represents an asymmetric sub-state conflict within an advanced Western democracy, limiting direct institutional translatability.

5. CONCLUSION & FUTURE TRAJECTORIES

Restorative justice and truth recovery are essential foundations for post-conflict peacebuilding, but they cannot succeed as substitutes for economic reparations and structural justice. Sustainable intergenerational reconciliation requires a holistic transitional justice framework that bridges individual moral truth-telling with systemic socio-economic redistribution and educational reform. International human rights donors must abandon short-term legalistic milestones and commit to long-term multi-decade funding for community reparations and intergenerational healing initiatives.

Funding: This research was supported by the Researchium Global Scholarship Consortium and Institutional Strategic Grants.

Data Availability: Analytical datasets and computational models are archived under open repositories under DOI: 10.5923/researchium.2024.jslr.0505-data.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no competing financial or non-financial interests.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hayner PB. *Unspeakable Truths: Transitional Justice and the Challenge of Truth Commissions*. Routledge; 2010. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203867822>
- [2] Braithwaite J. *Restorative Justice & Responsive Regulation*. Oxford University Press; 2002.
- [3] Cilliers G, Dube O, Siddiqi B. Reconciling after civil conflict increases social capital but decreases individual well-being. *Science*. 2016;352(6287):787-794. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad9682>