vision

Building fair, democratic and inclusive societies in Africa.

mission

Shaping national approaches to transitional justice and reconciliation in Africa by drawing on community intelligence, as well as macro-trend research and comparative analysis.
I believe that the existence of the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation is to create and bring knowledge to all South Africans (and now also to our African brothers and sisters as well) about how they understand themselves and the state of their nations.

Prof. Brian O’Connell
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2015 has been a year that reminded us in no uncertain terms that reconciliation takes time. Even though at times it seems like an insurmountable challenge, the IJR has continued its excellent work in South Africa and on the continent. The IJR remains an organisation that responds effectively to the needs of building fair, inclusive and democratic societies in Africa. I have no doubt that the excellent staff and its board will be able to continue to do so in the years to come.

Following his resignation after nearly nine years at the helm of the organisation, I would like to thank Fanie du Toit for his commitment to, and leadership of, the IJR. Under his watch the IJR has become a mature and well-run organisation. We are grateful that he will remain a part of the organisation to ensure a smooth transition of leadership.

Thank you to the wonderful staff of the IJR for their ongoing commitment to justice and reconciliation in South Africa and on the continent.

God Bless You.
Archbishop Emeritus Desmond Tutu
Cape Town, South Africa

IJR
Patron

Reconciliation Award winner for 2015, Ruben Richards alongside IJR Patron Archbishop Desmond Tutu at the 2015 Reconciliation Award.
In his book *France: A Nation of Patriots*, Carlton C Hayes argued that the French were the most patriotic people on earth. Thirty years later, Eugen Weber, responding to Hayes’s claim in his book *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870–1914* asks ‘if they were indeed so, how did they become that?’

Weber’s sociological study reveals a deliberate and systematic process over time through which the state and community organisations inserted themselves into the consciousness of the people.

It was our South African dream to bring an end to the apartheid project and in many aspects we have succeeded, but we were complacent and uninformed. We believed that the vaults of diamonds and gold would be opened and the living standards of all South Africans would match that of the oppressors. This proved to be a fallacy. In short, we did not and still do not have a plan to bring the “villages” and the “towns” together to understand how devastating apartheid has been. For some reason, we did not and still do not trust South Africans with the truth – that we were handed an almost impossible task, a task we have to face together against the odds: we have to build a strong South Africa on the ruins of apartheid. But instead of capturing the revolutionary spirit that won our democracy, we made promises to the masses that all would be, well, promises we could not keep.
The closest we came to an engagement with the people of South Africa, I believe, was the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), even if its power was minimal. The TRC failed to call those “village” and “town” meetings to explain the South African dilemma: the truth that apartheid had left us almost bankrupt and that the 1994 cohort of South Africans would be called upon to limit their expectations. We were expected to work with the state in order to create the means to change the lives of all South Africans, starting with those who had suffered most. We did not engage and agree that reconciliation would have to happen on many levels: healing in the heart of the individual, bringing it into the families and communities, then making the great leap of taking healing into the provinces and the entire nation.

I believe that this is the reason for the existence of the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation: to create and bring knowledge to all South Africans (and now also to our African brothers and sisters as well) about how they understand themselves and the state of their nations. The role of the IJR is to show how, together, we must reach out to one another and heal ourselves as we create the understandings, develop the will and passion, and build the infrastructure and the institutions that will guide our countries to success.

The IJR staff, under their Executive Director Dr. Fanie du Toit, are incredible in every way. They are skilled and they are passionate, truly filled with love and caring as they bring to us the knowledge so necessary for understanding the challenges that face us but which we must and can respond to. Fanie is a wonderful leader and has served the IJR for 16 years, 8 of these as CEO. From many perspectives, including fundraising, Fanie was the rock on which IJR stood. However, I am confident that the new leadership will, in similar and new ways, lead the IJR successfully.

The IJR board has been hugely blessed by members whose hearts are filled with passion and goodwill and who serve the Institute with no remuneration. They are a model of what fellowship means, and I am proud to be their Chairperson.

Prof. Brian O’Connell
Chair of the IJR Board
From l-r: Judith O’Connell, IJR Chairperson; Prof. Brian O’Connell and Mandy Sanger at the 2015 Reconciliation Award.
The world is a considerably more volatile place at the end of 2015 than it was only a year ago. With Syria as the fulcrum of an ever-widening international conflagration, the global community is confronted with profound challenges, not least on conflict management and resolution. Beyond more immediate measures to contain and resolve specific conflicts, the reform of international institutions will remain crucial, as will the increased capacity to build sustainable peace linked to equitable development outcomes. The newly formulated Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) reflect some of this aspiration, as do ongoing efforts to develop an international justice system operating on a truly inclusive basis.

Developments on the continent and elsewhere suggest that although this ideal remains some way off, a crucial review process is beginning to take shape. If managed inclusively and wisely, this may yet have positive outcomes. In 2015, the IJR thus engaged both the SDG process (with an emphasis on youth inclusion) and efforts to address the burning issue of international justice. Hosting meetings in The Hague at the Assembly of State Parties to the International Criminal Court (ICC), at the African Union in Addis Ababa, with the SADC in Gaborone, with DIRCO in Pretoria, and with Parliamentary and other colleagues in Cape Town, the IJR has been at the forefront of convening strategic civic dialogues on the future of the ICC and its vexed relationship with the African continent.

Powerfully underscored by a growing migrant crisis across swathes of Eurasia and Africa, as well as the sharp rise in violent extremism, the world is beginning to realise that it needs to tackle political disaffection at its root, namely in regions and countries where, arguably, political transition has been mismanaged by those more aligned with factional interest than with the welfare of ordinary citizens. In this arena, too, the IJR continues to make a telling difference, whether in Iraq, South Sudan, Burundi, Kenya or the Democratic Republic of the Congo - where it is engaged in helping to develop political processes that are both accountable and inclusive, not only in terms of political representativity, but also of civic and community interests. It is doing so at national – and, tellingly, at regional – levels, where its efforts, especially in the Great Lakes region, are aimed at developing civic capacity for regional cooperation about reconciliation and transitional justice. In this regard, the IJR has consistently argued that the classic “toolbox” of transitional justice, including truth-telling, prosecutions, reparations, institutional reform and other “guarantees of non-recurrence”, needs to be re-thought within the larger, more context-specific demands of integrated political transitions that link peace agreements through institutional and political reform with inclusive development and ultimately social transformation.

South Africa’s experiences in 2015 matched those of the global community in terms of uncertainty and volatility. Here, the year will be remembered first and foremost for a different form of social protest, the mass student movements that swept the length and breadth of the
country. Emanating from #RhodesMustFall, students attending South Africa’s most prestigious universities succeeded in forcing President Zuma to announce a zero percent increase in fees in 2016. Significantly, the students extended their struggle to include “outsourced” workers, causing, in some cases at least, the universities to reverse “outsourcing” in favour of full employment. For the most part, these protests were restrained and disciplined and, interestingly, marked by intense debate and dialogue amongst students across all sorts of social divides that plague the post-apartheid society. Clearly, structural exclusion was a major theme, but conversations went deeper. In many cases, a new generation began to deliberate on what can be (and has been) called “cultural violence” – the abiding deep-seated prejudices, biases and assumptions that implied and enforced racial and gender hierarchies for centuries, and which, so the students claim, continue to bedevil reconciliation in South Africa.

The IJR has been intensely involved in these conversations, not only successfully mediating a stand-off between the University of Cape Town and the Rhodes Must Fall movement, but also hosting student movements in public events designed to stimulate creative exchanges further. Amongst others, the spotlight fell on the intersectional movements between gender, race, class and ethnicity, as well as on ways in which past traumas are transplanted across generations – a process often as inconspicuous as it is damaging. The IJR’s Ashley Kriel Youth Leadership Development programme provided an important additional platform for students to engage one another. In this regard, the IJR was proud to enter into a partnership with the University of the Free State to conduct more systematic research on intergenerational trauma in South Africa.

Beyond more immediate measures to contain and resolve specific conflicts, the reform of international institutions will remain crucial, as will the increased capacity to build sustainable peace linked to equitable development outcomes.

Another feature of the year has been the focus on Parliament and its relationship with the Executive, specifically President Zuma. Whilst the EFF’s chants of “Pay back the money” immobilised the most important Parliamentary moment of the year, the Presidential State of the Nation Address, and reduced it to a farce, many of the more violent protests later in the year ended at Parliament too. On several occasions, security forces had to intervene forcefully to keep protesters from entering the chambers. Against the backdrop of the Nkandla scandal and the resulting Parliamentary crisis of legitimacy as it struggled to hold the President to account, the IJR reported, through the Afrobarometer survey, on a radical drop in public trust in South Africa’s political leadership. Indeed, President Zuma’s approval
And so, whilst justice retains a fighting chance in South Africa, and whilst the political transition brought substantial and stable gains to a majority of citizens, the country has its work cut out if it is to remain stable, let alone realise the ideals with which it made peace in 1994.

I am happy to report, on a rather more positive note, that the IJR itself concludes 2015 in an exceptionally strong position. Its donors remain committed, and its finances are strong, its niche is clear, and its staff focused, hardworking and competent. We have much to be grateful for. Allow me, therefore, to extend a profound word of thanks to our donors: without you, obviously, none of this would have been possible. Thank you too to our Board of Directors, headed admirably by Prof. Brian O’Connell and supported energetically by Deputy Chairperson Prof. Don Foster, who – unlike their counterparts in the private sector – earn no financial reward whatsoever from their association with the IJR. We are delighted that our dearly beloved Patron, Archbishop Tutu, is slowly but surely recuperating from a difficult year in terms of his health – our sincere thanks to him too for his ongoing, active support and wisdom.

On a more personal note, as my tenure as Executive Director draws to an end, I would like to thank all stakeholders, colleagues and friends for the wonderful support over the past nearly nine years. It has been a singular privilege to lead this organisation and, as new challenges beckon, I am proud to hand the reins of an organisation in good health back to the Board. Thank you for your trust in me. My very best wishes accompany IJR into a bright and exciting future.

Dr Fanie du Toit
Cape Town, November 2015
The Institute positions itself as a think tank situated at the intersection between academia and civil society. With one leg in research and analysis and another in civic activism and engagement, the IJR has worked on issues related to its core values for the past 16 years. During this period, the organisation has grown steadily both in terms of its geographic footprint as well as its various outputs – and, indeed, its profile. Over time, it has built a reputation for innovative research, inclusive policy suggestions and in-depth community reconciliation work, drawing on its historical links to the South African transition as well as on quantitative and qualitative data generated through its ongoing work. This track record has ensured that the IJR remains a well-supported organisation despite a general decline in development aid to South Africa.

In what follows, we offer an impact-driven analysis of the IJR’s work during 2015. Instead of reporting in terms of institutional programmes or projects, the report will provide a succinct analysis of its work located in various geographies implemented by using a variety of methodologies. A list of outputs and publications can be found in the report.

## Strategic objectives

In 2012, the IJR commenced the implementation of its five-year strategy based on five medium-term outcomes (MTOs) which guides all its work. Naturally, these goals are not exclusively influenced by the Institute’s interventions, but are also dependent on external factors.

- **MTO 1:** Policy processes are influenced by research, analysis and diverse community perspectives.

- **MTO 2:** Stakeholders gain and use knowledge about justice and reconciliation.

- **MTO 3:** Platforms are created where personal and historical perspectives are acknowledged, prejudices challenged and inclusive narratives explored.

- **MTO 4:** Divided communities are engaged in dialogue to overcome sources of conflict.

- **MTO 5:** Democratic, fair and inclusive practices guide the Institute’s processes, policies and operations.
The IJR is also regularly requested to present and provide input internationally. In 2015, the IJR participated in meetings and presented in:

- Cyprus
- Iraq – Qatar
- New York – US
- Oslo – Norway
- Paris – France
- Stockholm – Sweden
- The Hague – Netherlands

In fulfilling its mandate to promote reconciliation, transitional justice and democratic nation-building, the IJR is committed to sharing the lessons derived from research, analysis and selective interventions through the publication of books and multimedia outputs. The IJR’s
publications are targeted at political actors, civil society organisations, academics and the general public.

IJR publications are available free of charge, either for download from www.ijr.org.za or upon request. Email info@ijr.org.za for more information.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The Institute for Justice and Reconciliation operates within a sophisticated Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) system, which facilitates a progressive understanding of the interventions’ role in producing causal links from outcomes to impacts.

The system utilises both the logical frame and the results-chain approaches with a strong focus on collecting, organising and managing data to reflect outputs (What has been achieved?) and outcomes (What has changed?).

Monitoring and learning occurs in the design, implementation and project closure phases while external evaluations, internal reports, reviews and discussions are completed across projects and programmes.

Within this framework, accountability to funders, stakeholders and beneficiaries takes the standard approach of producing reports and disseminating appropriate versions through social mediums and media, as well as forums of discussions.

The questions explored for accountability are: What has been done in comparison to what was planned? Have we done our work efficiently and effectively? Which changes have our projects brought about? What are the intended and unintended, positive and negative outcomes? What are the influencing factors that have hindered and helped the project?

The IJR’s work is neither completely formulaic nor linear. Projects are complicated where high levels of expertise, knowledge and experience of the different strands of the project ensure that the project can be replicated, upscaled and/or adapted.

Projects are also complex. They have to take into account the permutation of their uniqueness in relation to variables like people (expertise, beneficiaries, stakeholders and partners), context and other parallel interventions.

The MEL system depends on a continual cycle of organisational learning that enquires, investigates and explores to develop an understanding of the interventions’ role in producing plausible contributions to the intended outcomes and impact.

M&E is currently a strategic intervention because it aims to map the causal chain of outcomes and effects for impact and explores the question: Which elements of the projects are necessary and sufficient for producing the intended changes and impacts?

Within our current South African and African context, the IJR faces deep questions about what it would take to transform society to one that is fair, democratic and inclusive. What are we learning about the paths we have to move across to change the nature and form of who we are?
In order to promote its vision and mission, the IJR must remain at the cutting edge of its ever-evolving field. This demands an appreciation for context and complexity to respond to unique and seemingly intractable challenges, but also the competency to craft broad strategies and policies that provide guidelines to deal with cross-cutting issues that manifest in different parts of the African continent and, increasingly, elsewhere in the world. It requires more than just the ability to diagnose; it also necessitates a keenness to identify shortcomings in the existing knowledge base and the intellectual astuteness to respond to it in an appropriate manner. For this reason, the IJR continues to invest heavily in its ability to research, analyse and innovate, but also to create opportunities for collaborative learning and understanding.
Given the organisation’s South African origins, but also the sustained demand for its insights at a time when the country is undergoing a period of profound self-reflection about the gains and shortcomings that have followed its political transition 21 years ago, the IJR continues to enhance its understanding of the dynamics that are at play and to use these to make interventions within strategic spheres of society.

Its newly revamped SA Reconciliation Barometer Survey, which was conducted during August and September at the height of the country’s nationwide student protests, contains new measurements that have been introduced to respond to the changing debates about reconciliation in South Africa. The results of the new survey were launched in December, which coincided with a number of widely publicised instances of racism that served to heighten racial tensions within an already polarised national context. Against this backdrop, the first briefing paper received massive national and international coverage. Some of the key insights of our findings related to the role that economic variables continue to play in obstructing the achievement of a more reconciled and inclusive society. These public-opinion findings also tied in with the economic research that was done for the 2014 Transformation Audit, which was aptly titled *Breaking the Mould: Prospects for Radical Economic Transformation*. These largely quantitative insights, produced by the Policy and Analysis Unit, were complemented by the unique in-field qualitative contributions of the Building an Inclusive Society Programme, obtained through its sustained community work in municipalities throughout South Africa. Their combined insights allowed for powerful interventions, as has been the case in the collaboration to contribute to the crafting of a new National Youth Policy, an area in which the organisation has established itself as a leader in recent years. As a result of this, several of its proposals are to be found in the new draft policy that has been published for comment.

The profile created by interventions such as these, as a result of wide media coverage, has over the years opened an increasing number of doors for the Institute to participate in forums that shape national policy in an array of areas. During 2015 the IJR was, for example, a member of the working group on the National...
In 2015, the Justice and Reconciliation in Africa Programme placed particular emphasis on the development of its international justice project, which aims to offer an authentically African perspective on the broader question of international justice as it relates to post-conflict societies.

Action Plan to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerances, instituted by the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development; engaged with the Department of Basic Education on the implementation of the Teaching Respect for All project; assisted the Department of Arts and Culture in the development of social cohesion methodologies; provided guidance to the South African Local Government Association (SALGA) on strengthening the capacity of local government by promoting multi-stakeholder dialogues; and was requested by the South African Council of Churches to assist in the formulation of a national statement on the topics of healing and reconciliation, poverty and inequality, and the strengthening of democracy.

The IJR’s impact is also felt regionally. During 2015 the IJR, as the Southern Africa Core Partner of the Afrobarometer, oversaw the completion of all ten public opinion surveys in the region. Following release events in the respective countries, the project received several requests for cooperation and information-sharing. In Lesotho, for example, the Directorate of Corruption and Economic Offences approached our national partner for collaboration on advocacy efforts, while the Lesotho Mounted Police Service requested a special briefing on the findings about the police from the survey. In Botswana, the Directorate of Corruption and Economic Crime has indicated they will in future make use of Afrobarometer (AB) data to conduct their research. In Malawi, a presentation of Afrobarometer data was used as part of an induction for new members of parliament. Swaziland, the government requested a pre-release presentation of findings to all secretaries of different government departments. During the period under review, the Afrobarometer team and Southern Africa Trust (SAT) have collaborated on various platforms, which included a presentation on key findings to the SADC secretariat.

In addition to its impact related to research outputs, the IJR has continued its practical support in the region...
for the strengthening of local processes that deepen an understanding of transitional justice in both policy and practice. One such example of this is the provision of technical expertise in the formulation of the guiding principles for Transitional Justice Policy and Practice in Zimbabwe at a stakeholders’ conference that was held in July 2015 in Nyanga, Zimbabwe. The National Transitional Justice Working Group of Zimbabwe (NTJWGZ) is a platform established by 46 human rights NGOs in Zimbabwe and provides an interface between civil society stakeholders and the official transitional justice processes. The platform is a direct outcome of an international transitional justice conference that was co-hosted by the IJR, The Hague Institute for Global Justice (THIGJ), and the Zimbabwe Human Rights NGO Forum in Johannesburg in October 2013. The adopted policy guidelines were published and presented to national stakeholders in September 2015 to influence how Zimbabwe should frame its policy on transitional justice, once the National Peace and Reconciliation Commission becomes functional as mandated by the country’s new constitution.

Its sustained presence in Southern Africa, the Great Lakes region, the Greater Horn and East Africa, as well as its collaborative work with partners in other regions, has allowed the IJR to develop a sophisticated comparative perspective on matters of transitional justice on the continent, which has seen it becoming increasingly involved in continental policy forums and, in some instances, actively shaping such policy.

In 2015, the Justice and Reconciliation in Africa Programme placed particular emphasis on the development of its international justice project, which aims to offer an authentically African perspective on the broader question of international justice as it relates to post-conflict societies. This involved a strategic review of its current activities and the decision to focus on four strategic themes that are explored through research, stakeholder engagement, seminars and high-level dialogues. Ultimately, the Institute will seek to interrogate the debates and critical issues about justice in a way that will promote an international justice order premised on global equality, an end to impunity, and a victim-centric approach to international justice, with particular cognisance of those most gravely affected by war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide.

The much publicised al-Bashir saga provided the IJR with a very good opportunity to insert some of its positions on international justice into the policy arena, but it was by no means the only focus in a year substantially shaped by critical developments in international justice. The Institute actively participated in the debates about these developments, which saw it attend events such as the 14th Annual Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute in The Hague as a civil society observer and hosting a side event on the prosecution of sexual and gender-based violence, as well as the UN Special Rapporteur’s high-level policy dialogue on ‘Guarantees of non-recurrence: from aspiration to policy’ in Stockholm, Sweden, in October 2015.

As far as the deepening of its research offering on international justice is concerned, it is currently involved in a research project pertaining to the Palestine preliminary examination at the ICC, as part of a broader...
project surrounding Africa, the ICC and the politics of international justice. In October 2015, the IJR also launched a new project, funded by the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Pretoria, which focuses on the prosecution of sexual and gender-based violence in conflict. This project recognises the remarkable developments in the field of international criminal justice in prosecuting gender-based violence in war. At the same time, the project seeks to address both the disjuncture between academic and policy conversations surrounding the issue and the need for effective means in domestic jurisdictions to implement the developments in prosecuting sexual and gender-based violence. In pursuit of this, the project will see a series of roundtables and seminars in The Hague, Pretoria and Addis Ababa on the various facets of the issue.

While it is critical to reach and influence specific centres of policy-making directly, it is equally important to conscientise, influence and, where possible, help to frame the parameters of public opinion on the broader questions of transitional justice, because any chosen policy course will require public consent to be ultimately successful. To this end, the IJR has endeavoured to establish a substantive print, broadcast and online media presence over the past four years through the placement of opinion articles by staff members, offering its expertise for broadcast interviews, blogs and the issuing of press releases. It has also worked particularly hard at leveraging the multiplication effect of social media, and during the past 12 months has managed significantly to improve its presence on the most frequented platforms. During the period under review, the IJR gained almost 1 000 additional followers on Facebook (3 034 in total) and about 650 on Twitter (1 868 in total).

Resulting from the organisation’s extensive track record in terms of the quantitative measurement of reconciliation and broader social cohesion processes, through survey projects such as the SA Reconciliation Barometer, Afrobarometer, as well as the advisory role it has played in other similar projects, the IJR was contracted by the UNDP’s Regional Service Centre for Africa to develop a framework for the measurement of social cohesion across Africa. A first draft report was completed by the end of 2015, which will be followed by an international expert workshop towards the middle of 2016. This new project has the potential to make a meaningful contribution with regard to continental efforts to obtain a multifaceted picture of the interaction of the different variables that determine social cohesion patterns across the continent.

Despite its focus on social media outlets, the IJR has sustained and expanded its presence as far as traditional outlets are concerned. During the year, the IJR featured and/or contributed to more than 250 print and online articles in the form of opinion pieces or citations. A substantial proportion of our coverage has come from findings related to our survey results and other research, with outputs, such as the Reconciliation Barometer and Afrobarometer increasingly being regarded as the most authoritative sources in their field. This can in no small way be attributed to the targeted strategy that our communications team has followed to create a greater awareness of their utility across borders.

This section speaks to the IJR’s MTO 1: Policy processes are influenced by research, analysis and diverse community perspectives.
BUILDING CAPACITY AND SHARING KNOWLEDGE ON JUSTICE AND RECONCILIATION

A key challenge for governments and intergovernmental organisations is the lack of understanding and misconceptions of the nature and multiple dimensions of justice and reconciliation.

The IJR’s capacity-building and education programmes operate in an environment where theory is regularly challenged by the immense complexity of political transition. The search for justice and reconciliation may also differ considerably from one context to another. The IJR is therefore committed to producing current analyses and research findings that are shared with a diverse range of stakeholders, with the aim of informing crucial decision-making processes in transitional societies – stimulating further investigation and research. The organisation’s historic link to the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), and its privileged access to South African and other African experts who enjoy an established association with the IJR, enables the organisation to field highly experienced teams to conduct capacity-building workshops and seminars across the continent.
In the Great Lakes region, where the eastern DRC has created a vortex of instability that has drawn countries like Rwanda, Burundi and Uganda into its sphere of violence, the IJR has positioned itself as a catalyst for change, actively working with local partner governments and organisations to raise awareness of the need for “regional reconciliation”. The constitutional crisis in Burundi, which has led to the death of several hundred people, has acquired regional dimensions with claims of alleged complicity in the instigation of violence by the Rwandan regime, led by Paul Kagame. In addition, there are indications that armed groups from the eastern DRC have infiltrated Burundi and conducted attacks in this country. These serious allegations are fuelling instability in the entire region. In response, the IJR has proposed the adoption of “regional reconciliation” as a more comprehensive cross-border strategy that takes cognisance of the reality of porous borders and thus the fluidity of conflict in the region. A key challenge for governments and intergovernmental organisations is the lack of understanding and misconceptions of the nature and multiple dimensions of justice and reconciliation. The idea of undertaking cross-border regional interventions is, however, not yet established in mainstream approaches to addressing such conflicts and, in line with the IJR’s MTO 2, to ensure that stakeholders gain and use knowledge about justice and reconciliation, it seeks to popularise approaches such as these.

In terms of this deteriorating context in the Great Lakes region as well as in northern Uganda, the recurrence of violence stems from the failure to deal effectively with the past. The strategies adopted and deployed by governments and intergovernmental organisations have been largely cosmetic and only addressed the superficial issues, due in part to a lack of understanding and knowledge of the complexity of justice and reconciliation processes. In all of these countries, the failure to deal with atrocities (many of which were committed several decades ago) means that they are now experiencing “compound” violations, which have contributed to a deepened sense of woundedness. This lack of closure inevitably means that they resurface and become manifest in the form of the political tension that continues to afflict Burundi, South Sudan, eastern DRC and northern Uganda. This phenomenon is also evident in Rwanda, Kenya and Zimbabwe, where poor governance takes the form of constitutional manipulation, the undermining of the rule of law and shutting down of civil society engagement. Similar trends are also being witnessed in north and west Africa.

The IJR’s continental interventions are based on a recognition that the knowledge and skills required to confront these failures of societal transformation and regressive tendencies in governance processes, within societies across the continent, need to be enhanced and further developed. In addition, national stakeholders need to be empowered through skills transfer so that they can mobilise their own communities to drive the justice and reconciliation processes in their own countries as well as regionally.

The IJR is working with partners across Africa to enhance the knowledge and skills transfer, including the Burundi Truth and Reconciliation Commission (BTRC), the South Sudan Committee on National Healing, Peace and Reconciliation (CNHPR), Peacebuilding Network of Zimbabwe (PBNZ), the Kenya National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC), the Rwanda National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC) and the DRC Centre for Conflict Prevention (CACOPA). The Transitional Justice Fellowship Programme is the Institute’s in-house residency-training initiative designed to transfer knowledge and skills to key governmental and civic actors from the Great Lakes, Horn of Africa and southern African regions, with the objective of empowering them to drive their own in-country capacity development processes. Similarly, the Afrobarometer training and capacity development for its network partners actively contributes towards enhancing the skills of local actors to conduct perceptions survey methodologies and analytically engage with the recommendations that are generated.

In South Africa, 2015 was a turbulent year in which
student protests dominated the socio-economic and political landscape. Central to the students’ demands was the failure of their universities to transform and become more representative of South African society, not only regarding demographics but also in terms of the academic staff complement and orientation of their curriculum. The University of Cape Town’s #RhodesMustFall movement agitated for the “decolonisation” of the university. The need for continued knowledge exchange about the term “decolonisation”, and indeed a range of other aspirational terms associated with the student discourse, is now more evident than ever in South Africa. The student protests gradually morphed into the #FeesMustFall movement, which has brought the forefront the failure to achieve widespread socio-economic redress in South Africa. In the absence of concerted programmes to ensure that stakeholders gain and use knowledge about justice and reconciliation, the country is likely to continue witnessing the deterioration of its hard-won societal cohesion.

In South Africa, the IJR’s various flagship training programmes include the Ambassador’s Programme, the Education for Reconciliation training initiative entitled “Respect for All”, which was initiated by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and that the IJR is operationalising in partnership with the South African Department of Basic Education. In addition, the IJR’s Community Healing initiative continues to build a core group of community-based reconciliation facilitators. Similarly, the Schools’ Oral History Programme (SOHP) is empowering learners and educators with the ability to generate and produce their own knowledge. The Ashley Kriel Youth Leadership Development Project specifically works with enabling youth actors to empower themselves with knowledge about conditions as young citizens of South Africa. It also empowers them with the ability to engage actively in the mobilisation of their fellow youth to advance efforts to promote a deeper understanding of the country’s past with a view mapping out its future. ■

*This section speaks to IJR’s MTO 2: Stakeholders gain and use knowledge about justice and reconciliation.*
OFFERING SPACES TO ENGAGE WITH COMPLEX ISSUES
The IJR uses a number of tools to encourage people from varied backgrounds, world views and orientations to engage with one another to forge ways to build cohesion within the spaces they share. In the context of South Africa, these spaces are rare. The rise of a broad student movement in 2015, that has questioned the way in which public spaces remain dominated by colonial memorials and artefacts, should be seen as symptomatic of this lack of opportunity to confront obstacles to greater cohesion. Instead of opting for proactive measures that would allow for opposing perspectives to be aired in a constructiver manner, many of the engagements between students and authorities during this period were confrontational in nature. The IJR continues to work towards the creation of a society in which societal tensions can be dealt with by means of inclusive dialogue platforms that pre-empt conflict. In complex, multicultural societies that have been divided for centuries, there is unfortunately not a single methodology that can achieve this. The organisation therefore follows a multipronged approach.

One of these is the use of oral history as a tool to find and record the voices of ordinary citizens, which contribute to new and emerging narratives within the public sphere. Oral history through a variety of carefully developed storytelling methodologies is designed to build confidence and self-respect, as well as a sense of inclusion. Participants in this type of work are also exposed to stories of fellow citizens that provide insight into the identities of others. Out of this process, relationships develop and spaces for difficult conversations emerge. This rarely happens with sporadic and once-off dialogues, but rather through sustained, well-crafted interventions.

Given South Africa’s history of exclusion, many older people have lived their entire adulthood on the margins and with a sense that they do not matter. Under the title, “My storie voordat dit onder die sand verdwyn” (My story before it disappears under the sand), participants from the small Western Cape towns of Doringbaai, Clanwilliam and Villiersdorp had their personal life stories published. This experience proved to be powerfully humanising to the participants of this project and helped them to deal with deep trauma that many have carried for decades. This became evident at the launches where a number of participants spoke with deep emotion, sometimes tears, about the sense of liberation in knowing that they matter. This shows that the “re-humanisation” of a deeply traumatised and wounded society like South Africa can still happen, through storytelling, if only citizens are afforded the opportunity to do so.
The creation of safe spaces for dialogue also occurred on the level of gender discourse. The 2015 year saw the introduction of the IJR’s Gender Justice and Reconciliation Project, which opened up opportunities for participants to engage with gender assumptions and how they play out in social relationships. The team used a number of tools to create a safe space for engagement. One of these has been the production of Season 5 of the IJR’s African Identities Film Series, which focused on the LGBTIQ community in the Northern Cape to tell stories about, and share insights into, the lives of these individuals.

Showcasing the films in various communities, followed by dialogues, has contributed to attitudinal shifts. A male participant at one of these screenings noted, for example, that:

“This was interesting. I don’t like what they are doing, I don’t accept it but I have learnt today that I must accept them as they are – it’s not their choice. I will accept them but I don’t want them as my friends. They must stay far away from me.”

While a comment like this may not be extraordinary in an urban context, it is profound in conservative rural settings where many of the people in the LGBTIQ communities experience intense prejudice and often physical violence. Initiatives like these, although small, play an important part in changing the narrative with regard to these people in more isolated communities.

**Challenging personal prejudices** and perspectives can be difficult, but we have found that it is possible when accessible platforms for robust dialogue are created. The graphs opposite, generated from the Ashley Kriel Youth Leadership Development Project, the IJR’s flagship project dealing with young people, shows how a cohort of 30 young people have rated their participation in such dialogues and the effect these have had on their attitudes.

Oral history, through a variety of carefully developed storytelling methodologies, is designed to build confidence and self-respect, as well as a sense of inclusion.
This 2nd graph illustrates that young people, after having had the opportunity to engage, were more inclined to effect change in the geographical community where they live, their places of work, or, in the case of students, in institutions of higher learning. This was evident in the involvement of some participants in the #RhodesMustFall and #FeesMustFall movements that defined student activism of 2015.

A community bottom-up research project to determine indicators for healing offered participants in Vryheid, Grahamstown and Warrenton an opportunity to engage with people from different backgrounds. The quote below from one of the researchers in Grahamstown shows this, after she interviewed a Pakistani shopkeeper for the research project.

“The man couldn’t stop venting about the xenophobic violence from locals and the need to make them understand their sacrifices as foreign nationals. It was like he got an outlet for much bottled-up frustration. He even gave us refreshments free of charge from his shop, while other customers were waiting to be served, we definitely must make sure to invite him to the next dialogue.”

This simple interaction indicates how enemy images can be broken down when people are included, acknowledged and given a safe space to talk. When people feel included, they are open to sharing something as personal as food with others. This positive gesture is then reciprocated with a commitment to include the “other” in further conversations.

The eagerness of participants to engage in platforms offered by the IJR to appreciate, acknowledge, challenge and explore options for inclusive narratives is an indication that these spaces are rare and important for sustainable shifts in society. The platforms require a deep insight into the complexities and intersectional nature of human relations. The intersections are between race, class, gender orientation, the rural, the urban, economic realities, education levels and employment possibilities.

The IJR’s own insights show that breakthroughs and shifts are possible when engagements are able to:

• Acknowledge people’s pain, fears and hopes;
• Interrogate degrees of privilege and look for ways to interrupt rampant growth in privilege for a few;
• Develop agency for participants to shift from dependence and independence to interdependence;
• Seek opportunities for solidarity on the basis of seeing and loving self before engaging with others;
• The fact that we need one another;
• Enhanced security by ensuring security and well-being of all; and
• Crafting a joint future.

These initial insights and other learnings will be thoroughly explored in the 2016 Social Change Model of the Building an Inclusive Society (BIS) Programme.

This section speaks to the IJR’s MTO 3: Platforms are created where personal and historical perspectives are acknowledged, prejudices challenged and inclusive narratives explored.
Peace agreements often rely on pragmatic consensus among the elite, which discounts the entrenched roots of conflict. The IJR seeks to provide appropriate platforms for dialogue, where necessary, in order to overcome the legacy of divided histories.
In many ways the year 2015 marked a significant breakdown of dialogue in the public sphere in South Africa. Commencing with the SONA debacle in Parliament and ending off with the student protests, it seemed that South Africans were saying, “We are tired of talking. We want to see change now.”

Yet, it is specifically in times like these that well-crafted and facilitated dialogues are even more crucial than usual. To this end, the IJR focuses on the mediation of face-to-face encounters and dialogue processes in a sustained manner between former enemies and political opponents, and has seen a marked increase in demand for its services in 2015.

The student protests of 2015 highlighted not only the pertinent issues about transformation in tertiary institutions, but also showed the deeply rooted lack of sustained social transformation in South Africa overall. Dialogue is a tool that can often not only provide some form of resolve for participants but can also insert new insights into our public discourse. It was in this context that the IJR organised its annual Ashley Kriel Lecture in a format that gave ordinary South Africans the opportunity to engage with the students on the objectives of the protest movement. At the event, student leaders who represent the three influential movements, namely #RhodesMustFall, Open Stellenbosch and the Black Students Association, engaged in a dialogue with a student activist of the 1980s, which allowed for an intergenerational exchange of perspectives and the contextualisation of the current student struggles within those of the past.

The protests starkly highlighted a growing intergenerational gap on key societal issues in post-apartheid society, which again underscored the need for more sustained dialogue between South Africans of different generations. The IJR’s collaboration with the University of the Free State titled Trauma, Memory and Representations of the Past began to engage this gap critically through a series of public intergenerational dialogues. These engagements placed the issues of trauma and memory, and the strategies that individuals of different generations use to heal, in the public sphere. Interesting perspectives emerged when former constitutional judge Albie Sachs (70 years old), and Candice Mama (23 years old), whose father Masilo Mama was one of the Nelspruit Five killed by the notorious apartheid-killer Eugene de Kock, entered into a dialogue about the past.

Well-facilitated dialogue opens up perspectives and broadens the horizons of those who participate in good faith. The IJR was able to observe this phenomenon through its youth programme. Over a period of 10 months, 30 young people from diverse backgrounds held dialogues about difficult issues they face in their day-to-day lives on topics such as race, privilege and inequality. The dialogues challenged their comfort zones and caused them to find possible solutions.

Conflict breaks down communication. It requires concerted efforts from all parties involved and, in many instances, a third party is necessary to mediate and enable dialogue. The IJR was able to play this significant convening role in facilitating a groundbreaking process between the student movement #RhodesMustFall (RMF) and the management of University of Cape Town (UCT).

Our dialogue initiatives also continued elsewhere on the continent. As explained above, the implementation of dialogues is often done in conjunction with partners across the continent where the IJR often plays the role of building capacity and sharing knowledge from its in-depth experiences in South Africa. In Rwanda, for example, the Institute, in conjunction the country’s National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC), facilitated the creation of Reconciliation Forums that aim to offer spaces for dialogues in a workshop setting. NURC focuses on sensitising the leadership of the forums in how to use community dialogue as a vehicle for addressing societal issues and forging reconciliation. For the most part, leaders of this forum were neither trained nor equipped for effective community dialogue. This is the gap that the workshop aimed to address. As an outcome, participants were introduced to the basics of reconciliation methodologies and the role of dialogue in preventing conflicts within the community.

This section speaks to the IJR’s MTO 4: Divided communities are engaged in dialogue to overcome sources of conflict.
Over the past decade, the Institute’s work in and engagement with conflict-affected countries across Africa has highlighted some of the negative effects that conflict has on societies: high levels of social fragmentation, lack of social cohesion, broken families and warring communities, high levels of violence and aggression, high levels of gender-based violence, negative economic productivity trends, alcohol and drug abuse and, in more isolated cases, high levels of depression and suicide.

Research shows that the duration and nature of the exposure to trauma impacts on how survivors themselves perceive peace and reconciliation processes and how willing (or not) they are to engage with these processes. Acknowledging the serious and long-lasting impact of traumatic events on people’s mental health, their ability to restore their lives and to rebuild the social fabric of the societies that they are part of in conflict-affected countries, the IJR has, in recent years, begun to integrate mental health into its community healing and dialogue for reconciliation training work.

In Kenya, South Sudan and South Africa, IJR training participants have shown high levels of interest in this domain. Not only were these participants keen (if not in need of) a space in which to open up about their personal or communal trauma - they also started pushing the IJR’s conceptual understanding of how best to address...
high levels of trauma within conflict-affected countries and within the realm of peacebuilding work to a higher level.

Post-conflict reconstruction and social transformation measures, especially those aimed at restoring relations between human beings, need to include mental healthcare provisions. Mental health is defined as a state of well-being in which every individual realises his or her own potential, can work productively and fruitfully, and is able to contribute to her or his community. Given that conflict tends to affect people’s mental health adversely, and that high levels of poor mental health affect the ability of individuals, communities and societies to function peacefully and effectively during and after conflict, post-conflict justice and reconciliation mechanisms must necessarily integrate mental health and psycho-social support structures into their toolkits.

The field of mental health and psycho-social support (MHPSS) in post-conflict settings has developed rapidly from a widely diverse set of fragmented approaches towards a comprehensive approach that includes directing attention towards the effects of collective violence on the psychological well-being of individuals and at the societal level, such as the breakdown of social support structures that sustain local communities and society. A clear consensus has developed that MHPSS activities in (post) conflict settings should not only focus on assisting individuals and families with ‘problems’, but should include interventions to strengthen the resilience and coping mechanisms of the communities and society at large and to promote the overall well-being of individuals and communities. Consensus-building exercises between stakeholders of organisational, academic and geographical backgrounds have resulted in landmark publications such as the Inter-agency Standing Committee Guidelines for MHPSS in Emergency Settings. However, in practice most MHPSS programmes pay limited attention to the effects of interventions on larger social transformation processes within societies recovering from armed conflict. Moreover, there is a significant gap between the discourses of “peacebuilding and reconciliation” and of “MHPSS”.

It was against this broad background that the IJR partnered with the Netherlands-based War Trauma Foundation to host a three-day international conference which brought together 52 academics, researchers, practitioners and policy-makers from 16 countries to explore ways in which the field of peacebuilding can interface more with the field of MHPSS and vice versa.

In order to lay a foundation for the path ahead, the event report defines some of the main concepts that were used at the conference and that have widely diverging definitions, with the purpose of finding some level of consensus. Despite the varied profile of participants and presentations, a number of dominant themes emerged from the conference that are central to articulating the interconnectedness between psycho-social needs, practice and peacebuilding. These themes include recognising the centrality and complexity of context, being sensitive to the cultural construction of “mental health”, understanding and building on local resources, clarifying the role of narrative in memory formation and identity, the trickle-down effect from wounded leaders to local communities, using dialogue as a foundation for healing, the impact of (sexual) gender-based violence on health and peacebuilding and, finally, understanding the intergenerational transmission of violence and trauma on peacebuilding efforts. Finally, in order to begin building a conceptual framework that bridges MHPSS and peacebuilding, the socio-ecological model is introduced. The socio-ecological model likely offers the most promising holistic framework within which to arrange the increased confluence of peacebuilding and MHPSS activities. This comprehensive approach recognises the importance of the individual while placing significant emphasis on both the social context and the broader environment in which individuals operate. The report ends with a set of recommendations that include online tools to bring the two fields closer together as well as conducting further research, analysis, advocacy and capacity-building to deepen the nexus between MHPSS and peacebuilding further. One of the IJR’s priorities during 2016 will be to implement the many recommendations that emerged from the conference.
CELEBRATING RECONCILIATION

Gantane Kusch (left) and Daniel Richards (right) in their roles as ‘Glas’ and ‘Draad’ in the play Die Glas Ennie Draad, based on a true story of two gangsters who worked with the RRF. Photo by Ashraf Hendricks
Each year, the IJR confers the Reconciliation Award upon an individual or organisation that has made an outstanding contribution to nation-building and reconciliation in South Africa, whether these efforts originate in the spheres of politics, business, culture, or community service.

The 2015 theme of Confronting Exclusion focused on highlighting the connection between reconciliation, inequality and economic exclusion.

The award was conferred to the Ruben Richards Foundation for enabling communities to overcome gangsterism and organised crime.

The Ruben Richards Foundation works to reduce both the causes and effects of gangsterism on the Cape Flats. This non-profit organisation was founded in 2012 and became involved in mediation in Lavender Hill. Community leaders and religious leaders came together with senior gang leaders and negotiated the longest ceasefire in Lavender Hill’s history. The Foundation has helped many reforming gang members to abandon a life of crime, including Rashid Staggie, former leader of the infamous Hard Livings. Out of this experience, the Ruben Richards Foundation has sponsored a play, Die Glas Ennie Draad, which aims to bring the stories of this marginalised world to mainstream consciousness. The character Marlin reveals his life story to “die kopdoctor”, a psychologist. Marlin is based on two real characters who worked with the Ruben Richards Foundation. One of them is a reformed gangster.

The Ruben Richards Foundation aims to address the underlying causes of gangsterism by integrating reforming gang members into the mainstream economy, an initiative the Foundation calls “industrial consciousness”. This outlook of dialogue and “economic reconciliation” gives South Africa a much-needed alternative to negotiation models based on policing.

The foundation also works to address other forms of social exclusion, such as teenage pregnancy in schools. The aim is to destigmatise pregnancy and motivate the girls to complete high school.
BREAKING BARRIERS OF SEPARATION: FOUR YEARS OF BUILDING INCLUSIVE COMMUNITIES IN SOUTH AFRICA

“My political perspectives have been given depth as I have been exposed to other political views from different races. Also my perspective on other people’s stories has gained weight. It is now more important to me to gain knowledge to understand people’s views.” – Wynand Breytenbach, postgraduate Theology student, Stellenbosch University

South Africa’s history of apartheid and colonialism has, over centuries, created a deeply fractured and divided society. The deliberate engineering of the apartheid state has ensured that these divisions remain structurally and systemically entrenched. This legacy is also reflected in our urban and town planning. Since the commencement of the IJR’s five-year strategy, the Building an Inclusive Society Programme of the IJR has engaged various geographical and interest communities to develop a potential model for how to build cohesive communities and test methodologies that could begin to break down these divides.

The geographical areas that the IJR chose through a rigorous selection process are Vryheid (KZN), Warrenton (Northern Cape), Grahamstown (Eastern Cape) and Worcester (Western Cape), and as interest communities, youth and community leaders (Western Cape).

In 2016, its fifth and final year, the findings and results will be compiled into a model and various policy recommendations, but at the end of 2015 one could already observe some fascinating shifts. Building cohesive communities is a contested and difficult concept to measure. The IJR focused its work in communities on the strengthening of relationships and interactions among divided groups and, at the same time, on highlighting issues of exclusion and inequality, and assisting communities to address these. The team has tried to capture the slow growth of formal and informal networks and connections through socio-grams and the monitoring of the discourses with and between participants. The graphs describe scenarios prior to the IJR’s interventions, and the current status in 2015 showcasing the increase in beneficial relationships towards more cohesive communities.

The Vryheid story, as illustrated in the socio-gram (see left), is one that reflects the realities of many South African communities. It was, and still is, a town that typifies apartheid town planning along racial lines. The physical separation was socially mirrored. The socio-gram illustrates how difficult it was to attract a diverse demography to our interventions in 2012. The 2015 picture is one of the interaction across traditional divides of race, gender, class and politics. The five drivers of dialogue processes represent Black, Coloured, Indian and White constituencies. Through their efforts, the IJR was able to bring diverse people, who otherwise would never have connected with one another, into safe dialogue spaces. One notable exception is the unwillingness and inability of the local municipality to move beyond paying lip service to active support for the transformative and groundbreaking processes taking place in their jurisdictions.
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SELECTED EVENTS AND INTERVENTIONS

FEBRUARY
Confronting the Triple Challenge: Findings on poverty, unemployment and inequality from the Afrobarometer surveys in South Africa.
Cape Town, South Africa

Study visit for newly appointed Kenya National Cohesion and Integration Commission members in Cape Town and Johannesburg.
Cape Town and Johannesburg, South Africa

Building the capacity of the Rwandan Forum for Reconciliation to conduct community dialogue.
Rwamagana and Kabgayi, Rwanda

MARCH
Contribution to a Panel: Out of Africa?
Palestine, Israel and the ICC
Pretoria, South Africa

Study tour for members of the Burundi TRC.
Cape Town, South Africa

APRIL
The Education Gender Gap in Africa, findings from Afrobarometer Round 5 surveys in 34 countries.
Cape Town, South Africa

Youth dialogue on the Draft National Youth Policy.
Cape Town, South Africa

Responses, Interventions and the Political Will Needed to Address Xenophobia in South Africa.
Cape Town, South Africa

IJR Youth Camp
Tulbagh, South Africa

IJR Community Ambassador Programme
Cape Town, South Africa

MAY
Conference: Healing Communities, Transforming Society: Exploring the interconnectedness between psycho-social needs, practice and peacebuilding.
Johannesburg, South Africa

Book launch and discussion: Manifestations of woundedness-violence and xenophobia.
Johannesburg, South Africa

Launch of the Community Healing Training Manual in Harare.
Harare, Zimbabwe

Race and Identity Youth Dialogue and Poetry Slam.
Cape Town, South Africa

Asset-based Community Development Course (ABCD)
Warrenton, South Africa

Community Healing Implementation Strategy Workshop.
Harare, Zimbabwe

JUNE
Presentation: Business Leaders as Peacebuilders.
Stellenbosch, South Africa

Presentation to SALGA about key issues in terms of justice and reconciliation in South Africa.
Pretoria, South Africa

Book launch: The African renaissance and the Afro-Arab spring.
Cape Town, South Africa

Crafting Change Agents dialogues.
Cape Town, South Africa

Youth activism then and now.
Cape Town, South Africa

JULY
Stakeholders Conference on Transitional Justice Principles in Zimbabwe.
Nyanga, Zimbabwe

PUBLIC DIALOGUE SERIES
Trauma, Memory and Representations of the Past: Transforming Scholarship in Humanities and the Arts Mapping the Past, Plotting the Future.
Cape Town, South Africa

Elaboration of a communication strategy for Burundi TRC.
Bujumbura, Burundi

Community leaders dialogue on gender.
Cape Town, South Africa

Two learner workshops.
Cape Town and Kimberley, South Africa

Ashley Kriel Memorial Lecture.
Cape Town, South Africa

AUGUST
Afrobarometer consultation with the Secretary to Swaziland’s Cabinet.
Youth roundtable dialogue on the SDGs.
Cape Town, South Africa

Community histories engagement with Matzikama Municipality.
Vredendal, South Africa

Transitional Justice in Africa Fellows Programme.
Johannesburg and Cape Town, South Africa

SEPTEMBER
FirstRand’s CSI conference – Beyond Painting Classrooms.
Johannesburg, South Africa

UNDP – Crafting a reconciliation path for Iraq.
Iraq/Qatar

OCTOBER
Stockholm, Sweden

Afrobarometer presentation to the Swaziland Government’s Principal Secretaries Forum and Secretary to Cabinet.
Mbabane, Swaziland

PUBLIC DIALOGUE SERIES
Trauma, Memory and Representations of the Past: Transforming Scholarship in Humanities and the Arts Mapping the Past, Plotting the Future.
Cape Town, South Africa

Elaboration of a communication strategy for Burundi TRC.
Bujumbura, Burundi

Community leaders dialogue on gender.
Cape Town, South Africa

Two learner workshops.
Cape Town and Kimberley, South Africa

Ashley Kriel Memorial Lecture.
Cape Town, South Africa

NOVEMBER
Presentation on key issues in South Africa to the South African Council of Churches expert consultation.
Johannesburg, South Africa

South Africa’s Reconciliation Processes.
Cyprus/Paris, France

Pretoria dialogue on deepening participation in SDGs.
Pretoria, South Africa

The role of SADC Civil Society in Promoting Mediation, Justice and Reconciliation.
Gaborone, Botswana

DECEMBER
Afrobarometer first SA Round 6 dissemination event.
Johannesburg, South Africa
Organisations form part of larger societies and are often in themselves a microcosm and reflection of the larger society. The IJR has therefore formulated an internal objective that seeks to align institutional practices and policies with its core values of justice and reconciliation. It is a guide to carrying out the organisation’s work with integrity and to “walking the talk.”

This MTO allows for initiatives that promote the IJR’s core values. MTO 5 has become a tool against which the organisation can measure itself and its levels of inclusivity. For the IJR, reconciliation does not just begin in the communities, but at the office. Through our staff and HR practices, our goal is to live out our organisational mission through cohesive in-house practices. This is done by means of events, learning seminars, and open dialogues and discussion. In 2015, we hosted internal sessions that dealt with the power of perceptions and the importance of shared values and communication. This means that difficult conversations, such as the ones that the IJR facilitates in society about gender, race and various intersectionalities, are also conducted internally.

This internal view of the organisation ensures that human resource management becomes more than just implementing policy and trying to ensure that labour laws are observed. At the IJR, we are passionate about our employees and believe in our employees living a balanced lifestyle. This means that the IJR’s HR policies and procedures go over and above the basic guidelines of statutory labour laws of South Africa. The organisation’s HR policies reflect this dedication by including benefits such as paid sabbatical leave, optional six months’ maternity leave benefits, a work-from-home benefit one day a week and flexible working hours. This is further evident from the IJR’s low staff turnover. From an HR perspective, this shows that staff at the IJR are not only committed and loyal to the organisation, but they are satisfied with the benefits that the IJR can offer, despite the organisation’s funding dependency.

In order to ensure that programme work and insights are shared across the organisation, one- to two-monthly learning seminars are hosted by staff members. During these seminars, IJR staff take turns to share in-depth insights about their work experience, obtain input from colleagues on current projects and provide platforms for conversation. In addition, the IJR hosts its in-house Pressclub meeting on Monday mornings to discuss matters that were reported in the media during the previous week. At the meeting, the IJR Communications team presents news highlights that are of relevance to the Institute, which is followed by a discussion about potential official responses through various media channels. The meeting itself allows for a discussion that is not guided by a particular agenda but an opportunity to interrogate recent local and global events through a justice and reconciliation lens.

The IJR has a consultative and inclusive culture, where staff have the freedom to express their views. This allows staff to feel secure within their respective job portfolios, but the entrenchment of such a culture takes more time to implement than top-down designs. Strategic shifts require lengthy processes and consultation, as was the case in 2015 with discussions about the potential restructuring of the Institute to allow it to maximise its strengths. This process took at least three months and eventually, at the strategy meeting at the end of 2015, staff began to feel more secure and open to the concept of change.

This section speaks to the IJR’s MTO 5: Democratic, fair and inclusive practices guide the Institute’s processes, policies and operations.
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# FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

## STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION AS AT 31 DECEMBER 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Current Assets</td>
<td>12 198 249</td>
<td>10 292 547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property, plant and equipment</td>
<td>465 485</td>
<td>540 395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>11 732 765</td>
<td>9 752 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>13 076 164</td>
<td>8 710 042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>11 496 058</td>
<td>7 650 625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>1 580 107</td>
<td>1 059 417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>25 274 414</td>
<td>19 002 589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDS AND LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>15 904 224</td>
<td>14 284 626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities</td>
<td>9 370 190</td>
<td>4 717 963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>407 504</td>
<td>708 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating lease liability</td>
<td>262 363</td>
<td>176 795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants received in advance</td>
<td>8 700 322</td>
<td>3 833 042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDS AND LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td>25 274 414</td>
<td>19 002 589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## INCOME STATEMENT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANTS AND DONATIONS</strong></td>
<td>29 376 385</td>
<td>30 584 846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARNED INCOME</td>
<td>1 039 304</td>
<td>375 478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET INCOME</strong></td>
<td>30 415 689</td>
<td>30 960 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS</td>
<td>(5 021 447)</td>
<td>(4 707 915)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMME AND PROJECT COSTS</td>
<td>(26 317 646)</td>
<td>(26 519 185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET OPERATING (DEFICIT)/SURPLUS</strong></td>
<td>(923 404)</td>
<td>(266 776)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET INVESTMENT INCOME</strong></td>
<td>605 360</td>
<td>603 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET GAIN ON INVESTMENTS</strong></td>
<td>1 034 623</td>
<td>545 635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER INCOME</strong></td>
<td>903 020</td>
<td>114 652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET SURPLUS FOR THE YEAR</strong></td>
<td>1 619 598</td>
<td>996 835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# DETAILED STATEMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE INCOME

## INCOME

### Donations and grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDD Ghana</td>
<td>7 031 858</td>
<td>10 554 396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA</td>
<td>6 975 446</td>
<td>7 625 997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BfdW</td>
<td>1 380 713</td>
<td>1 581 399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BfdW accrued income</td>
<td>467 040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>2 234 837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Society Foundation - South Africa</td>
<td>1 366 018</td>
<td>1 078 982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Funder - Netherlands</td>
<td>2 405 664</td>
<td>1 415 710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Norwegian Embassy</td>
<td>5 515 962</td>
<td>3 757 671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Embassy</td>
<td>410 686</td>
<td>515 809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian High Commission</td>
<td>580 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Netherlands Embassy</td>
<td>1 51 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha Foundation</td>
<td>300 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konrad Adenauer Foundation</td>
<td>70 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude Leon Foundation</td>
<td>144 615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Free State</td>
<td>251 077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>86 426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Danish Embassy</td>
<td>- 1 644 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investec</td>
<td>- 500 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACT Sudan</td>
<td>- 337 006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich Boll Foundation</td>
<td>(7 765)</td>
<td>335 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian Embassy</td>
<td>- 130 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Heritage Council</td>
<td>- 170 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General donations</td>
<td>12 407</td>
<td>4 580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Earned income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales of resources</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture service contract</td>
<td>686 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees received</td>
<td>352 986</td>
<td>375 040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net investment income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net interest earned on earmarked funds</td>
<td>30 613</td>
<td>1 892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain on investments</td>
<td>1 034 623</td>
<td>545 635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend income</td>
<td>94 895</td>
<td>91 380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest earned</td>
<td>479 852</td>
<td>510 052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net interest on earmarked funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gain on foreign exchange</td>
<td>903 020</td>
<td>114 652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income</strong></td>
<td>32 958 690</td>
<td>32 290 165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DETAILED STATEMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE EXPENDITURE
FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income (per schedule)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 958 691</td>
<td>32 290 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>31 339 093</td>
<td>31 293 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and administration costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>2 299 117</td>
<td>1 964 877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and operating costs</td>
<td>2 580 520</td>
<td>2 376 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office relocation cost</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>196 989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on disposal of asset</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad debts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board &amp; AGM</td>
<td>93 855</td>
<td>93 667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit fees</td>
<td>47 956</td>
<td>59 470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 317 646</td>
<td>26 585 414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core programme costs</td>
<td>737 039</td>
<td>674 848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>11 617 820</td>
<td>9 405 809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: staff costs relating to projects</td>
<td>(11 064 638)</td>
<td>(8 905 747)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training &amp; strategic planning</td>
<td>81 407</td>
<td>117 542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>92 452</td>
<td>44 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs</td>
<td>9 998</td>
<td>12 955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 580 607</td>
<td>25 910 566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications &amp; Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building an Inclusive Society</td>
<td>2 270 154</td>
<td>2 294 892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Kriel Youth Project</td>
<td>940 158</td>
<td>783 561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory, Arts and Culture</td>
<td>1 643 424</td>
<td>1 754 965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools Oral History Project</td>
<td>763 566</td>
<td>789 955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Healing</td>
<td>1 082 760</td>
<td>1 213 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>338 317</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating for Reconciliation</td>
<td>1 302 313</td>
<td>1 288 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Justice and Reconciliation in Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Dialogues and Interventions</td>
<td>7 711 803</td>
<td>6 585 778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Reconciliation Barometer Research Project</td>
<td>2 007 827</td>
<td>1 092 799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Economies</td>
<td>1 704 044</td>
<td>1 643 968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrobarometer</td>
<td>6 485 024</td>
<td>8 824 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Justice &amp; Economic Crime</td>
<td>1 064 868</td>
<td>1 389 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dialogue</td>
<td>252 041</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees for management and administration costs</td>
<td>(1 985 689)</td>
<td>(1 750 337)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NET SURPLUS / (DEFICIT) FOR THE YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 619 598</td>
<td>996 835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FUNDRAISING AND DONOR RELATIONS

The IJR would like to thank the following donor agencies for their continued support:

Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)
Brot für die Welt
Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD Ghana)
Embassy of Finland, Pretoria
Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Pretoria
Heinrich Böll Stiftung, Southern Africa
Investec Asset Management
Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung (KAS)
Royal Norwegian Embassy, Pretoria
Australian Aid
Bertha Foundation
Claude Leone Foundation
Department of Agriculture, Western Cape
George Mason University
Open Society Foundation – Human Rights Initiative
Private Funder, Netherlands
UK Aid – DFID
UNDP
University of the Free State

Visit us online to make your secure donation and we will provide you with your Section 18A certificate to include on your income tax return or see our banking details below:

Account name : Institute for Justice and Reconciliation
Account number : 071524355
Account type : Cheque
Bank : The Standard Bank of South Africa
Branch : Rondebosch
Branch code : 02-50-09-00
Swift code : sbzazajj