International Journal of Social and Development Concerns

ISSN 2524-1478 (Online)

Vol. 24 | Post COVID-19 Recovery and Sustainable development
Vol. 24 Article 12 | July 29, 2025

From Apartheid to Democracy: A Critical Analysis of South Africa's Transition from Conflict Environment to Sustainable Peace

Authors: [1]Paul Oganda Moruka and [2]Samuel Alfayo Nyanchoga
[1]Tangaza University. **Website:** www.tangaza.ac.ke
[2]The Catholic University of Eastern Africa. **Website**: www.cuea.edu
Correspondence: Paul Oganda Moruka. **Email:** pauloganda.PM@gmail.com
Cite as: *Moruka, P. O., & Nyanchoga, S. A. (2025). From Apartheid to Democracy: A Critical Analysis of South Africa's Transition from Conflict Environment to Sustainable Peace. International Journal of Social and Development Concerns, 24(12), 173–188.*
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16557828

Abstract: *South Africa's transition from apartheid to democracy represents one of the most remarkable political transformations of the late 20th century. This study examines the multidimensional aspects of this transition, analysing the interplay between historical grievances, negotiated settlements, and institutional reforms. Using a qualitative case study methodology grounded on racism theory and nationalism theory of conflict, the research highlights the role of inclusive political dialogue, particularly the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA), in dismantling apartheid structures. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) is examined as a critical mechanism for addressing past injustices, while the study investigates persistent challenges of socio-economic disparities that continue to fuel structural violence and inequality. The findings reveal that while South Africa made significant strides in averting civil war and institutionalizing democracy, the sustainability of peace requires continuous efforts toward social justice, inclusive development, and equitable governance. The study concludes that the transition succeeded in political democratization but fell short of comprehensive socio-economic transformation, offering valuable lessons for other nations emerging from internal conflicts.*

Keywords: *Apartheid, democratic transition, conflict resolution, Truth and Reconciliation Commission, peacebuilding*

1.1 Introduction

The transformation of South Africa from a deeply divided, conflict-ridden apartheid state to a democratic society stands as one of the most significant political transitions in modern history. This metamorphosis, achieved through negotiated settlement rather than violent revolution, offers critical insights into peaceful conflict resolution and post-conflict reconstruction. The apartheid regime, formally institutionalized in 1948 under the National Party, engineered a legal and social system grounded in racial segregation, economic exclusion, and political disenfranchisement of the black majority (Thompson, 2001).

The internal resistance, led prominently by the African National Congress (ANC), the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC), and various civic movements, challenged the state's legitimacy while increasing international pressure through sanctions further isolated the regime. By the late 1980s, South Africa was on the brink of collapse, creating conditions conducive for negotiation rather than continued confrontation. This article examines the mechanisms of transformation, analyzing how South Africa navigated from systematic oppression to constitutional democracy. While celebrating the remarkable achievement of peaceful transition, the research critically evaluates the extent to which structural inequalities have been addressed and sustainable socio-economic transformation achieved. The central research question guiding this investigation is: To what extent has South Africa's transition from apartheid successfully addressed structural inequalities and achieved sustainable socio-economic transformation.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

In this section, theories guiding this study are triangulated. These includes the Racism theory of conflict and Nationalism theory of conflict.

Racism Theory of Conflict

The Racism Theory of Conflict provides a powerful analytical lens for understanding South Africa's apartheid-era conflict and post-transition challenges. This theory, rooted in the work of Frantz Fanon (1963) and contemporary scholars like Joe Feagin and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (1997), posits that systemic racism is embedded in laws, institutions, and economic structures, creating inevitable social conflict. In South Africa's context, apartheid represented the epitome of structural racism through legislation such as the Population Registration Act (1950), Group Areas Act (1950), and Bantu Education Act (1953). These laws created a racially stratified society where opportunities and basic rights were determined by race, making conflict inevitable rather than incidental. The theory illuminates how the post-1994 transition, while dismantling legal apartheid, has not fully addressed the structural racism embedded in economic and social systems. As noted by Mamdani (1996), this creates what he terms the "afterlife of colonial governance," where formal equality coexists with persistent racialized inequality.

Nationalism Theory of Conflict

The Nationalism Theory of Conflict, drawing from Benedict Anderson's (1983) concept of "imagined communities" and Ernest Gellner's work on nationalism, explains how the assertion of national identity becomes both a source of conflict and a tool for liberation. In colonized societies, nationalism emerges as a reactionary force against domination and a foundation for political mobilization. Under apartheid, the regime's strategy of fragmenting African identity into ethnic Bantustans sparked a counter-nationalist response. African nationalism, championed by liberation movements, refused these imposed ethnic divisions and instead framed the struggle as one for national liberation. The Freedom Charter (1955) exemplified this nationalist vision, emphasizing unity, land redistribution, and equality. The post-apartheid period has seen the evolution of this nationalism into efforts to build an inclusive "rainbow nation," though tensions persist between this inclusive nationalism and ongoing economic grievances that fuel new forms of populist nationalism.

1.3 Methods

This study employs a qualitative case study methodology to examine South Africa's transition from apartheid to democracy. The single-case design allows for in-depth analysis of the complex,

multidimensional transformation process within its historical context. Grounded in Racism Theory and Nationalism Theory of Conflict, the research analyzes how structural racism created inevitable conflict and how post-apartheid nationalism struggles with inherited inequalities. Data collection relied on secondary sources including academic literature, government documents, Truth and Reconciliation Commission reports, State Capture Commission findings, and statistical data from 1948-2024. Thematic analysis organized findings around three key areas: historical conflict environment, transformation mechanisms, and post-transition challenges. Limitations include reliance on secondary sources, temporal distance from events, single-case constraints on generalizability, and potential language barriers excluding non-English perspectives. Despite these constraints, the comprehensive documentation of South Africa's transition provides sufficient depth for robust analysis of democratic transformation processes.

1.4 Literature Presentation and Analysis

Historical Context: The Apartheid Conflict Environment

Apartheid was a formal policy of racial segregation and white minority rule implemented by the National Party (NP) in South Africa, beginning in 1948 after its electoral victory. While racial discrimination and segregation predated 1948, apartheid marked the institutionalization and legal codification of racial domination. The system was devised and enforced primarily by Afrikaner nationalists' descendants of Dutch settlers who sought to preserve their political power, cultural identity, and economic interests in a rapidly modernizing society (Posel, 2001). Key architects of apartheid included Daniel François Malan, the first Prime Minister under apartheid, and later ideologues such as Hendrik Verwoerd, who is often called the "architect of apartheid" due to his central role in designing and justifying its policies, particularly in education and "separate development."(Lowenberg & Kaempfer, 1998).

The official justification for apartheid was framed around the idea of preserving cultural and racial "purity" through a policy of "separate development"(Clark & Worger, 2016), which claimed that different races should develop independently in their own territories. However, the deeper or meta-reasons behind apartheid were primarily economic and political. The policy allowed the white minority (particularly Afrikaners) to secure cheap Black labor while preventing Black South Africans from gaining political or economic power (Lowenberg & Kaempfer, 1998). This aligned with what Robinson (2000) would later term racial capitalism, where economic systems are structured around racial domination to maximize extraction from marginalized populations.

In addition, apartheid was a response to both internal and external pressures. Internally, the white population, though numerically small, feared being outnumbered and politically overwhelmed by the Black majority (Thompson, 2014). The rising urbanization of Black workers and the growing strength of labor unions in the 1930s and 1940s posed threats to white control over cities and industries. Externally, the Cold War environment made Western powers more tolerant of repressive regimes that positioned themselves as anti-communist. The National Party capitalized on this by portraying itself as a bulwark against socialism in Africa, gaining tacit international support in the early years (Thompson, 2014). Apartheid thus emerged not only as a domestic policy of racial control but also as a strategic political project rooted in fears of demographic change, loss of white supremacy, and the desire to protect economic interests. Its architects understood that to maintain domination in a modernizing world, they

would need a comprehensive legal and institutional framework one that regulated land, labor, movement, education, and political participation along racial lines**.**

Institutionalized Racial Segregation

A core mechanism of apartheid's conflict environment was the racial classification system instituted through the Population Registration Act (1950), which categorized South Africans into racial groups White, Black (African), Coloured, and Indian based on arbitrary phenotypical criteria. This legal identity determined access to rights, services, and spatial mobility. By defining personhood in racial terms, apartheid normalized exclusion and hierarchy as state policy. According to Powell (2010) this rigid classification enabled systemic control over the populace, facilitating targeted legislation that reproduced inequality across generations. Galtung (1990) allude that institutionalized categorizations cause harm through bureaucratic normalization by shaping socio-political realities and daily experiences of marginalization. The racial registration framework was the scaffolding on which all other apartheid laws rested, making it both symbolic and functional in entrenching white supremacy.

For instance, The Group Areas Act (1950) physically enforced apartheid ideology by dictating where each racial group could live, thereby engineering spatial segregation through forced removals (Modisane, 2024). Prime urban and economically viable areas were reserved for whites, while Black communities were relocated to underdeveloped, distant townships with poor infrastructure, inadequate housing, and limited access to employment opportunities. This policy intensified urban poverty and fractured social networks by displacing established communities such as Sophiatown and District Six (Von Holdt, 2013). In addition, spatial injustice was not merely a byproduct but a deliberate strategy to contain and control the Black population. Urban planning under apartheid reflected settler-colonial logic, where indigenous people were seen as temporary sojourners in white-owned spaces. These practices remain embedded in the country's urban geography today, contributing to persistent inequality (Jahn, 2022).

Another powerful tool of segregation was the Bantu Authorities Act (1951), which created Bantustans or "homelands" for Black South Africans, thereby denying them full citizenship. Residents of these territories were stripped of national identity and excluded from political representation in the central government. Although framed as an attempt at ethnic self-governance, Bantustans were politically fragmented, economically unsustainable, and devoid of autonomy. Charney (1999) argues that the policy aimed to fragment Black unity and delegitimize anti-apartheid resistance by classifying Africans as tribal subjects rather than national citizens. These so-called homelands were created in marginal lands without infrastructure or employment, reinforcing systemic underdevelopment. The policy exemplifies internal colonialism, where a dominant group maintains political control by isolating and weakening subaltern populations (Otieno et al., 2021).

Furthermore, apartheid's racial segregation laws were grounded in ideological beliefs of racial superiority that justified exclusion as necessary for "civilization" and order (Kaufman, 2012). Drawing on eugenics and pseudo-scientific racial hierarchies, the state disseminated narratives that positioned whites as biologically and culturally superior to Africans. These beliefs informed public policy, education, and media, reinforcing the notion that racial mixing or equality was unnatural and destabilizing. This ideological project aligns with social dominance theory, which posits that societies maintain group-based hierarchies through legitimizing myths. In schools, the curriculum under apartheid

socialized white youth to see racial separation as moral, while Black children were taught subservience (E. J. Otieno et al., 2018). Thus, apartheid's racial segregation was not only institutional and spatial but deeply psychological and ideological (Thompson, 2014).

Economic Exclusion and Dispossession

One of the most enduring legacies of apartheid was the economic exclusion of the Black majority through systematic land dispossession. The foundation of this exclusion was laid by the Natives Land Act of 1913, which restricted Black land ownership to only 7% of South African territory (Adam & Moodley, 2013). Under apartheid, this limitation was maintained and enforced, effectively denying Black people the ability to accumulate wealth through agriculture or land-based enterprise. Land, being both an economic and cultural asset, became a site of structural deprivation. Rage (2010) notes that land dispossession not only erased livelihoods but also cultural autonomy, creating dependency on white-owned labor markets. The lack of restitution mechanisms meant that generations of Black families were locked out of economic opportunity, with post-apartheid efforts at land reform proving slow and insufficient.

In addition, apartheid's job reservation system further entrenched economic inequality by enforcing racial boundaries in the labor market (Thompson, 2014). Through a system of industrial color bars, Black workers were confined to unskilled, low-paying jobs in mining, agriculture, and domestic service, while white workers were guaranteed access to skilled, supervisory, and professional roles. Robinson (1983) described this system as "racial capitalism," where exploitation was organized along racial lines to maximize white economic gain. These policies ignored merit and education, placing race above competence in employment decisions (Von Holdt, 2013). For instance, Parsons (2007) found that during apartheid era there was a wide wage gaps between racial groups even for similar labor, reflecting the institutionalization of economic disenfranchisement. This economic structure ensured that Black workers remained labouring under oppressive conditions while whites benefited disproportionately from national wealth.

Another instrument of economic exclusion was the Bantu Education Act (1953), which formalized inferior education for Black South Africans (Act, 1953). Designed not to empower but to domesticate, Bantu education taught obedience, vocational subservience, and acceptance of apartheid ideology. Minister of Native Affairs Hendrik Verwoerd infamously stated that there was no need for Black students to receive academic education, as their societal role was limited to manual labor. Swilling et al. (2016) highlight that underfunding, overcrowded classrooms, and poorly trained teachers characterized the system, stifling intellectual and economic potential. This deliberate stunting of educational growth curtailed upward mobility and created generational poverty. Human capital theory suggests that education is a key driver of economic advancement; by denying this to the majority, apartheid ensured a structurally unequal economy (Gamede, 2017).

Moreover, Black South Africans were systematically denied access to financial services, entrepreneurship opportunities, and business development programs (Gamede, 2017). State institutions and commercial banks excluded Black individuals and communities from credit markets, home loans, and business licensing. Even informal entrepreneurship was policed and limited in township settings. Dependency theory, Gessi (2024) offers a useful lens, explaining how economic underdevelopment is perpetuated to maintain the dominance of a core elite. In this case, the white minority preserved

economic supremacy by withholding resources needed for Black economic independence. The result was a dual economy where formal sectors were dominated by whites and informal sectors unregulated, undercapitalized, and unstable—became the only option for Black livelihood. Even in the post-apartheid period, these structural imbalances have persisted, contributing to one of the highest unemployment rates among Black South Africans.

Political Oppression and State Violence

The apartheid state maintained its dominance by systematically criminalizing political opposition. Under the Unlawful Organizations Act (1960), key anti-apartheid movements like the African National Congress (ANC) and Pan Africanist Congress (PAC) were banned, and their activities driven underground (Milton, 1987). This created a political vacuum for Black South Africans, leaving them without legal avenues for representation or advocacy. Maharaj (2008) argues that the regime's strategy was not only to suppress dissent but to delegitimize it by labelling it "terrorism" or "subversion." The banning of political parties curtailed civic engagement and created a climate of fear and intimidation. Activists risked imprisonment or worse for participating in protests or distributing pamphlets, effectively turning South Africa into a one-party state governed through repression.

Legislation such as the Terrorism Act (1967) and Internal Security Act (1982) granted law enforcement agencies near-unlimited powers to arrest, detain, and interrogate individuals without formal charges or legal representation (Powers, n.d.). These laws legalized the indefinite detention of suspects, often in solitary confinement and without trial. Dudouet, (2006) notes that such measures institutionalized state violence, embedding it into routine governance. Torture, forced confessions, and psychological manipulation were common in detention centres like John Vorster Square. The state's abuse of legal frameworks exemplifies how authoritarian regimes use law as an instrument of coercion rather than justice. Structural conflict theory Lawrence (2003) explains that when authority becomes illegitimate, it relies increasingly on force rather than consent a pattern clearly observable in apartheid-era South Africa. In addition, the apartheid government routinely responded to nonviolent protest with lethal force, as exemplified by the Sharpeville Massacre (1960), where police killed 69 unarmed protestors, and the Soweto Uprising (1976), in which hundreds of schoolchildren were gunned down for opposing Bantu education (Coffey, 2022; Powell, 2010). These events highlighted the regime's zero-tolerance approach to dissent and its readiness to use state machinery for extermination. Von Holdt (2013) argues that such brutality was not accidental but indicative of a government that viewed any call for equality as an existential threat. These massacres attracted international condemnation and catalyzed global solidarity movements, including economic sanctions and cultural boycotts. However, the immediate effect within South Africa was heightened repression and militarization of public spaces.

The death of anti-apartheid activist Steve Biko in police custody in 1977 became a global symbol of the regime's brutality. Biko, founder of the Black Consciousness Movement, advocated psychological liberation as a precursor to political emancipation. His arrest and subsequent fatal beating revealed the state's fear of ideological empowerment among the Black population. His murder, documented and publicized internationally, galvanized resistance and intensified scrutiny on South Africa's human rights violations. Biko's ideas and martyrdom illustrate how ideological resistance was met with equally forceful repression. The apartheid state feared not just actions but consciousness reflected in its attempts to control education, speech, and identity. This reveals a deeper psychological warfare, where violence targeted not only bodies but minds.

Mechanisms of Transformation

Negotiated Political Settlement

A cornerstone of South Africa's transformation from apartheid to democracy was the negotiated political settlement, which emerged from a realization among key actors that neither the apartheid regime nor liberation movements could achieve a decisive military victory. This recognition spurred covert dialogues in the late 1980s between the ruling National Party and imprisoned African National Congress (ANC) leader Nelson Mandela (Maharaj, 2008). As Mandela himself recounts, the desire for peace and mutual survival compelled adversaries to the table (Matlosa, 1998)). These dialogues culminated in the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) in 1991, a broad-based multiparty forum that institutionalized the negotiation process and laid the groundwork for a transitional democratic order. The inclusion of diverse political actors reflected a deliberate strategy to promote inclusive dialogue and deescalate political violence. As Olugbenga-Jay (2021) emphasizes, the South African case exemplifies a "negotiated revolution," where political transformation occurred not through insurgency but through deliberate compromise.

Despite its historic significance, the negotiation process faced several existential threats, most notably the Boipatong massacre of 1992 and the assassination of South African Communist Party leader Chris Hani in 1993. These events nearly derailed the transition by inflaming ethnic tensions and discrediting negotiations among grassroots supporters. However, the continued engagement of leaders from both the apartheid regime and the ANC highlighted an extraordinary level of political pragmatism. As Maharaj (2008) notes, pragmatism and restraint became survival mechanisms for all parties, as they recognized that continued conflict would lead to mutual destruction. The decision to proceed with talks in spite of mass violence signals a departure from zero-sum politics toward a more deliberative peacebuilding model, reinforcing Galtung's (1996) framework of "positive peace," where resolution is rooted in structural transformation rather than temporary ceasefires.

The legal articulation of this political settlement was the 1993 Interim Constitution, a critical milestone that established the framework for democratic governance while also ensuring protections for minority groups (Lawrence, 2003). It codified political rights, established principles for a final constitution, and enabled the first democratic elections in 1994. Importantly, it created a power-sharing arrangement during the transition, reflecting what theorists describe as "consociational democracy (Coffey, 2022), wherein deeply divided societies share power to maintain stability. This transitional legal order allowed for the retention of institutional knowledge while introducing progressive democratic norms, facilitating institutional continuity in the midst of systemic change.

The most compelling element of South Africa's negotiated transition was its emphasis on mutual compromise over maximalist demands. Former adversaries including the ANC and the National Party accepted that lasting peace required trade-offs: the ANC deferred immediate radical economic redistribution in exchange for political power, while the National Party relinquished control in return for institutional safeguards and legal continuity. According to Gessi, (2024), this elite pacting reflected a form of "strategic bargaining," wherein both sides perceived negotiation as the least costly path to stability. Although some critics view this as a betrayal of revolutionary aims, the settlement arguably enabled a relatively peaceful transfer of power in a region long plagued by post-liberation conflicts.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC)

One of the most innovative mechanisms for transforming South Africa's post-conflict landscape was the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), established in 1995 as part of the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act. Led by Archbishop Desmond Tutu, the TRC embodied the restorative justice model, prioritizing truth-telling, accountability, and national healing over retributive justice. This approach reflected a departure from the Nuremberg-style tribunals and aligned with African communitarian philosophies like Ubuntu, which emphasize social harmony and collective restoration (Tutu, 1999). The commission's mandate granting amnesty in exchange for full disclosure was based on the belief that exposing truth would foster reconciliation and prevent cyclical violence (Harrison et al., 2007). This model has since been adopted in other post-conflict societies and is widely cited as a hallmark of transitional justice innovation.

The TRC's public hearings allowed both victims and perpetrators to narrate their experiences in a formal, nationally televised forum. This strategy served as both symbolic and procedural justice, offering victims recognition while compelling perpetrators to confront the moral weight of their actions. According Lawrence(2003), the process marked a crucial moment of national reckoning, transforming private pain into public memory. It also aligned with Lederach's (1997) theory of conflict transformation, which posits that sustainable peace requires reconfiguring relationships at the personal, communal, and systemic levels. In practice, this helped humanize the narratives of the apartheid era and build empathy across racial and political lines, particularly among younger South Africans.

Nevertheless, the TRC faced robust critique for prioritizing truth over justice. Many victims were dissatisfied with the lack of prosecutions and the commission's limited power to enforce reparations. This critique aligns with Adam and Moodley (2023) assertion that reconciliation processes must balance truth with justice to avoid what she terms "impunity through forgiveness." Indeed, some former apartheid officials exploited the amnesty process to escape accountability, while victims often received inadequate or delayed compensation. This shortcoming underscores a broader challenge in transitional justice: how to achieve restorative aims without undermining principles of legal justice and deterrence. Such critiques suggest that while the TRC succeeded symbolically, its material outcomes were uneven and sometimes demoralizing to victims.

The TRC also failed to fully address structural violence and the economic legacies of apartheid. Its focus on gross human rights violations meant that systemic inequalities such as land dispossession, educational exclusion, and economic marginalization were largely sidelined. Matlosa (1998) observes, this narrow mandate prevented a more radical confrontation with apartheid's socioeconomic foundations. Thus, while the TRC facilitated interpersonal reconciliation, it did little to advance structural transformation. Theoretical frameworks like Galtung (2023) concept of structural violence emphasize that true reconciliation requires dismantling systemic inequities not merely documenting abuses. In this light, the TRC can be seen as an important but incomplete mechanism of transformation.

Constitutional and Democratic Reforms

The 1994 democratic elections marked a transformative moment in South Africa's political history, signalling the dismantling of apartheid and the birth of inclusive governance. For the first time, all citizens, regardless of race, participated in national elections, resulting in the election of Nelson Mandela as the country's first Black president (Saka, 2021). This political milestone was not only a symbolic

triumph over decades of racial exclusion but also laid the foundation for a representative government grounded in universal suffrage and political pluralism (Lodge, 1994). The peaceful nature of the elections reflected both the effectiveness of the negotiated settlement process and the willingness of South Africans to embrace democratic norms.

A critical development that followed the 1994 elections was the adoption of the 1996 Constitution, which institutionalized democratic governance through a rights-based legal framework. Recognized globally for its progressive nature, the Constitution enshrined civil, political, and socio-economic rights, thereby addressing both the formal and substantive dimensions of citizenship (Klug, 2010). In contrast to apartheid's legal infrastructure, which systematized racial exclusion, the new constitutional order aimed to protect dignity, equality, and freedom for all. Its formulation, which involved broad public consultation, further enhanced its legitimacy and embedded it in the national consciousness.

To ensure that constitutional democracy was not merely theoretical, South Africa established independent institutions commonly referred to as Chapter 9 institutions tasked with safeguarding constitutionalism. These included the Constitutional Court, Human Rights Commission, and Public Protector, all of which were granted substantial powers to review legislation, investigate abuses, and promote accountability (Steytler, 2017). Their independence was a deliberate move to avoid authoritarian relapse and to check executive overreach, an essential safeguard in transitional societies where political institutions are often fragile.

Nevertheless, while these democratic reforms have significantly transformed South Africa's governance landscape, challenges remain in ensuring their full realization. Persistent socio-economic disparities and instances of institutional overreach threaten to undermine democratic consolidation (Matlosa, 1998). Moreover, the gap between constitutional ideals and lived realities has fuelled public disillusionment, especially among youth and marginalized communities. Thus, while the architecture of democracy is firmly in place, the process of deepening democratic culture and achieving substantive justice continues to evolve (Beall et al., 2005).

Security Sector Transformation

One of the most formidable tasks during South Africa's transition was transforming the security sector, historically a key pillar of apartheid repression. Prior to 1994, security institutions including the South African Defence Force (SADF) and the South African Police were primarily designed to protect the white minority state (Steytler, 2017). Following the democratic transition, the establishment of the South African National Defence Force (SANDF) involved merging apartheid-era military structures with former liberation movement armies, such as the ANC's Umkhonto we Sizwe and the Pan Africanist Congress's APLA (Williams, 2002). This process was a major step in redefining the military as a non-partisan institution serving the whole nation.

Equally important was the restructuring of the police force from a coercive instrument of minority rule to a democratic service accountable to all citizens. The formation of the South African Police Service (SAPS) sought to reflect new values of community service, transparency, and equality under the law. Institutional reforms included revised codes of conduct, new training curricula emphasizing human rights, and mechanisms for civilian oversight. These reforms aligned with broader goals of transitional justice, aiming to rebuild public trust and ensure that security provision became a public good rather than

a tool of fear (Faull, 2007). However, despite these integrative reforms, the legacy of authoritarian policing culture has proven difficult to eradicate. Reports of police brutality, corruption, and uneven enforcement of law continue to undermine the ideals of transformation. Scholars have argued that without a fundamental shift in institutional ethos and leadership accountability, deep reform will remain elusive (Faull, 2010). Moreover, the increasing militarization of policing in response to crime has raised concerns about the potential reversion to repressive tactics reminiscent of the apartheid era.

Furthermore, Mabunda (2025) explains that the success of security sector transformation must also be evaluated in terms of its capacity to foster national reconciliation. The inclusion of former adversaries in unified forces was not only a technical achievement but also a symbolic gesture of national healing. Yet, lingering divisions within communities and perceptions of unequal treatment by security agencies suggest that transformation must go beyond structural integration to address historical grievances and build a more equitable security culture. Sustained investment in community-police relations and a clear commitment to democratic norms remain essential for long-term peace.

Post-Apartheid Challenges and Limitations

Persistent Structural Inequalities

One core challenge in post-apartheid South Africa is the enduring structural inequality that privileges a small elite at the expense of the majority. New Agenda (2024) argues that policymakers consciously rejected a developmental state model and instead embraced neoliberal financialization, resulting in chronically low investment in productive sectors and perpetuating wealth concentration (Mohamed, 2024). Government choices to liberalize capital flows and deprioritize redistribution entrenched inequality, fulfilling dependency theory's warning that political transition may preserve economic stratification.

In addition, high unemployment rates, particularly among Black South Africans and youth, further compound this exclusion. (Levy, 2025) shows how the early optimism of the democratic settlement faded as inequality remained unaddressed in substance, despite formal progress in governance indicators between 1996 and 2010 (Levy, 2025). Today, South Africa ranks persistently among the most unequal societies globally, demonstrating that economic mobility has not kept pace with political enfranchisement (Okatta et al., 2017).

Moreover, educational disparities exacerbate exclusion, as Black learners continue to receive poor-quality instruction and insufficient resources. Spaull (2013) highlights the skills mismatch resulting from the apartheid-era education system, which persists in marginalized schools, contributing to unemployment and a workforce unprepared for the demands of a modern economy. This reinforces intergenerational poverty and hinders meaningful participation in the knowledge-based sectors of the economy (Otieno et al., 2018).

Furthermore, the supposed vehicle for economic inclusion, Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (BBBEE), has often benefitted a narrow elite rather than promoting widespread empowerment. New Agenda (2024) indicates that rather than restructuring capital ownership, economic benefits accrue to entrenched insider networks, reinforcing elite dominance rather than dismantling it (Mohamed, 2024). The result is a limited trickle-down effect, leaving the broader Black majority economically marginalized despite formal equality under the law.

Land Reform and Agricultural Transformation

Land reform in post-apartheid South Africa intended to redress colonial and apartheid dispossession, yet redistribution outcomes remain modest. Anseeuw and Mathebula (2008) estimate that approximately 10.7% of farmland has transferred to beneficiaries by 2018, falling far short of the 30% target (Mnisi, 2024). This suggests that the "willing seller, willing buyer" method has been ineffective in achieving structural change in land ownership. In addition, the primary reason for under-performance is lack of post-settlement support. A study of nearly 2,000 redistributed farms shows that access to infrastructure, technical assistance, and integration into agricultural value chains significantly influences farmer success Gandidzanwa et al. (2021). Without these supports, many beneficiaries struggle to make farms viable, leading to subsistence-level production or resale of land.

This underperformance perpetuates rural dualism: white commercial farms continue to dominate productive agriculture, while Black smallholders remain marginalized and food insecure (Cousins, 2010). The failure to integrate smallholder farms into the broader agrarian economy undermines the transformative potential of land reform and reinforces rural poverty, highlighting the limitations of policy design divorced from implementation realities. Growing frustration over slow progress has reinvigorated the debate over expropriation without compensation. While this move aims to accelerate land redistribution, it also triggers concerns about investor confidence and agricultural viability. The tension reflects the broader challenge of balancing restorative justice with economic stability, demonstrating that structural transformation remains contested and politically sensitive**.**

Governance Challenges and Democratic Erosion

Despite a strong constitutional framework, South Africa's democratic institutions have been severely tested by governance failures and corruption, particularly during the Zuma era. The Commission of Inquiry into State Capture revealed widespread misappropriation within state-owned enterprises, estimated at over ZAR 1.5 trillion between 2014 and 2019 (Meyer & Luiz, 2018).This level of systemic state capture illustrates how patronage networks subverted institutional accountability and eroded public sector integrity.

Levy (2025) documents the paradox of early institutional effectiveness followed by progressive decline: while the founding constitutional settlement promised upward mobility and inclusive governance, it failed to tackle entrenched wealth concentration and governance deficits, resulting in declining scores on government effectiveness and corruption control from 2000 to 2022 (Mohuba, 2023). The gap between constitutional design and actual performance underscores the fragility of democratic consolidation when institutional capacity weakens.

Decentralization has also created conditions conducive to corruption. Mseleku (2025) argues that despite its normative promise to enhance participation and accountability, decentralised procurement systems have been increasingly captured by local elites (Mseleku, 2025). This highlights that decentralization alone is insufficient if local political capture and weak oversight persist. Nevertheless, the judiciary and civil society have played crucial roles in resisting democratic erosion. New Agenda (2024) notes landmark Constitutional Court interventions such as declaring political appointments invalid and reinforcing the powers of the Public Protector that helped constrain executive overreach (New Agenda, 2024) These acts of judicial independence provide a counterweight to erosion and affirm South Africa's ongoing struggle to translate constitutional ideals into institutional reality.

1.5 Conclusion

South Africa's transition from apartheid to democracy represents a remarkable achievement in peaceful conflict transformation, successfully dismantling legal apartheid structures and establishing constitutional democracy without civil war. The negotiated settlement, Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and institutional reforms created foundations for democratic governance. However, the transition's limitations are equally significant persistent structural inequalities, unemployment, and poverty demonstrate that political democratization has not delivered comprehensive socio-economic transformation. The racism theory of conflict explains why legal equality proved insufficient to eliminate racialized inequality, while nationalism theory reveals tensions between inclusive nation-building and material grievances. This experience offers valuable lessons for other post-conflict societies: sustainable peace requires addressing both political and economic dimensions of structural violence. While South Africa achieved political accommodation, the incomplete socio-economic transformation continues to threaten long-term democratic consolidation and social stability**.**

1.6 Recommendations

South Africa must implement comprehensive economic transformation through progressive taxation, state-led employment programs, and accelerated land reform beyond "willing seller, willing buyer" models. Educational reform requires massive investment in disadvantaged schools and technical education aligned with economic needs. Governance strengthening demands transparency in public finance, enhanced anti-corruption capacity, and citizen oversight mechanisms. Social cohesion strategies should include inter-community dialogue and economic empowerment programs. Finally, establishing a 30-year national development vision with multi-party consensus and constitutional protections will ensure long-term transformation transcends electoral cycles and achieves sustainable democratic peace.

References

Act, B. E. (1953). Act. *PUBLIC LAW*, *18*, 67. http://govtrackus.s3.amazonaws.com/legislink/pdf/stat/64/STATUTE-64-Pg217a.pdf

Adam, H., & Moodley, K. (2013). South Africa: The opening of the apartheid mind 1. In *The politics of ethnic conflict regulation* (pp. 226–250). Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315003641-10/south-africa-heribert-adam-kogila-moodley

Adam, H., & Moodley, K. (2023). *The opening of the Apartheid mind: Options for the new South Africa* (Vol. 50). Univ of California Press. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=v1DhEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR11&dq=origin+of+apatheid+and+proponents&ots=5ZVVh_jry7&sig=XmMVhPJavnzae_28TKtJ6xD1edQ

Anseeuw, W., & Mathebula, N. (2008). *Land reform and development: Evaluating South Africa's restitution and redistribution programmes*. https://ageconsearch.umn.edu/record/108281/files/Land%20Reform%20and%20Development%20Evaluating%20South%20Africa_s%20Restitution%20and%20Redistribution%20Programmes.pdf

Beall, J., Gelb, S., & Hassim, S. (2005). Fragile Stability: State and Society in Democratic South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, *31*(4), 681–700. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057070500370415

Charney, C. (1999). Civil society, political violence, and democratic transitions: Business and the peace process in South Africa, 1990 to 1994. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, *41*(1), 182–206. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/comparative-studies-in-society-and-history/article/civil-society-political-violence-and-democratic-transitions-business-and-the-peace-process-in-south-africa-1990-to-1994/AF4F7B90DBFB3481C1B95AAA82716B4A

Clark, N. L., & Worger, W. H. (2016). *South Africa: The rise and fall of apartheid*. Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315621562/south-africa-nancy-clark-william-worger

Coffey, R. (2022). The Sharpeville Massacre, 1960: African Activism and the Press. In R. Coffey, *The British Press, Public Opinion and the End of Empire in Africa* (pp. 169–212). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-89456-6_5

Cousins, B. (2010). What is a 'smallholder'? Class-analytic perspectives on small-scale farming and agrarian reform in South Africa. In *Reforming land and resource use in South Africa* (pp. 102–127). Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780203839645-13/smallholder-class-analytic-perspectives-small-scale-farming-agrarian-reform-south-africa-ben-cousins

Dudouet, V. (2006). *Transitions from violence to peace: Revisiting analysis and intervention in conflict transformation*. https://edoc.vifapol.de/opus/volltexte/2011/2522/pdf/br15e.pdf

Faull, A. (2007). Corruption and the South African police service. A review and its implications. *Institute for Security Studies Papers*, *2007*(150), 20. https://journals.co.za/doi/abs/10.10520/EJC48810

Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, *27*(3), 291–305. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343390027003005

Galtung, J. (2023). A structural theory of imperialism. In *Imperialism* (pp. 59–108). Routledge. https://api.taylorfrancis.com/content/chapters/edit/download?identifierName=doi&identifierValue=10.4324/9781003101529-5&type=chapterpdf

Gamede, N. W. (2017). *Human capital development in South Africa: Perspectives on education in the post-apartheid era*. University of South Africa (South Africa). https://search.proquest.com/openview/cccaa7cd9e5f997c8dede6510d70102f/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2026366&diss=y

Gandidzanwa, C., Verschoor, A. J., & Sacolo, T. (2021). Evaluating Factors Affecting Performance of Land Reform Beneficiaries in South Africa. *Sustainability*, *13*(16), Article 16. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13169325

Gessi, I. (2024). *Underdevelopment and unequal exchange: An examination of dependency theory with a focus on Latin America*. https://unitesi.unive.it/handle/20.500.14247/24000

Harrison, P., Todes, A., & Watson, V. (2007). *Planning and transformation: Learning from the post-apartheid experience*. Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203007983/planning-transformation-vanessa-watson-philip-harrison-alison-todes

Jahn, P. (2022). *The rise or fall of South Africa: Post-Apartheid conflict transformation*. https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:1666566

Kaufman, S. J. (2012). The end of Apartheid: Rethinking South Africa's 'peaceful'transition. *African Studies Association Conference*, *29*, 1–50. https://live-sas-www-polisci.pantheon.sas.upenn.edu/sites/default/files/kaufman.pdf

Klug, H. (2010). *The constitution of South Africa: A contextual analysis*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Lawrence, A. G. (2003). *Transitions to economic democracy: Corporations, collective action, councils and codetermination in twentieth century Germany and South Africa*. City University of New York. https://search.proquest.com/openview/14df5b88bd835eeb11c29673fd721f1d/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

Levy, B. (2025). Democratic legitimacy and its vulnerabilities: The case of South Africa. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, *51*(4), 624–647. https://doi.org/10.1177/01914537251316820

Lodge, T. (1994). *South Africa: Democracy and development in a post-apartheid society*. https://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/items/ff04b985-e1dc-4ef5-9d8b-084e79b64dce

Lowenberg, A. D., & Kaempfer, W. H. (1998). *The origins and demise of South African apartheid: A public choice analysis*. University of Michigan Press. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=3UQ37ZNKzFgC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=origin+of+apatheid+and+proponents&ots=HeDd6s9GzV&sig=T1rRA-yqMaSIIZJy4K7TwwkIRQo

Mabunda, D. Q. (2025). Transforming policing in South Africa: Towards an ideal police service. *Balkan Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, *11*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.2478/bjir-2025-0001

Maharaj, M. (2008). *The ANC and South Africa's negotiated transition to democracy and peace*. http://www.gimmenotes.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/transitions_anc.pdf

Matlosa, K. (1998). Democracy and conflict in post-apartheid southern Africa: Dilemmas of social change in small states. *International Affairs*, *74*(2), 319–337. https://academic.oup.com/ia/article-abstract/74/2/319/2333595

Meyer, K. Z., & Luiz, J. M. (2018). Corruption and state capture in South Africa: Will the institutions hold? In *Handbook on the geographies of corruption* (pp. 247–262). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://www.elgaronline.com/abstract/edcoll/9781786434746/9781786434746.00021.xml

Milton, J. R. L. (1987). Criminal Law in South Africa-1976-1986. *Acta Juridica*, 34. https://heinonline.org/hol-cgi-bin/get_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/actj1987&section=6

Mnisi, T. E. (2024). *A Decolonial Analysis of the Post-Apartheid Media Representation of Student Protests in Institutions of Higher Learning in South Africa* [Master's Thesis, University of South Africa (South Africa)]. https://search.proquest.com/openview/492965d84fc94f29805c3883f2385c6e/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2026366&diss=y

Modisane, O. (2024). *South Africa's Role in Conflict Resolution: A Case Study of Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Peacebuilding Initiatives in the Democratic Republic of Congo*. University of Johannesburg (South Africa). https://search.proquest.com/openview/9869b9de3e1c23f10853398d2731b7a8/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2026366&diss=y

Mohamed, S. (2024). Persistent and obscene inequality. *New Agenda: South African Journal of Social and Economic Policy*, *2024*(93), 17–32. https://doi.org/10.10520/ejc-nagenda_v2024_n93_a3

Mohuba, D. (2023). Legislative Framework Governance, State Capture and Performance of South Africa's State-Owned Enterprises. *Journal of Public Administration and Development Alternatives*, *8*(2), 18–32. https://doi.org/10.55190/jpada.2023.242

Mseleku, Z. (2025). Decentralisation, Governance, and Corruption: Evidence from the Commission of Inquiry into State Capture in South Africa. *African Journal of Public Administration and Environmental Studies*, *4*(1), 67–90. https://doi.org/10.31920/2753-3182/2025/v4n1a4

Okatta, T. O., Otieno, E. J., Ndege, W. M., Mutavi, T., Okuku, M. T., Odero, V. O., & Mwendwa, D. K. (2017). *Promoting a Bi-partisan Approach in Responding to the Contemporary Socio-economic Challenges in Kenya.* https://repository.tangaza.ac.ke/handle/20.500.12342/958

Olugbenga-Jay, O. (2021). Keys to sustainable and enduring societal peace in intractable conflicts: A theoretical and empirical justification in apartheid South African peace process. *International Journal of Peace and Development Studies*, *12*(2), 46–63. https://academicjournals.org/journal/IJPDS/article-full-text/D9289A867316

Otieno, E. J., Okatta, T. O., Ndege, W. M., Mutavi, T., Okuku, M. T., Odero, V. O., & Mwendwa, D. K. (2018). *The Emerging Social Work techniques in Youth Empowerment programs: A case Study of Youth Empowerment Organizations in Nairobi County.* https://repository.tangaza.ac.ke/handle/20.500.12342/959

Otieno, J. E., Gichimu Karanja, B., & Okuku, M. T. (2021). *Primary Socialization on the Formation of Child Behaviors in Kenya: Systematic Review*. https://repository.tangaza.ac.ke/handle/20.500.12342/1227

Parsons, K. A. (2007). Structural Violence and Power. *Peace Review*, *19*(2), 173–181. https://doi.org/10.1080/10402650701353612

Posel, D. (2001). Race as common sense: Racial classification in twentieth-century South Africa. *African Studies Review*, *44*(2), 87–114. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/african-studies-review/article/race-as-common-sense-racial-classification-in-twentiethcentury-south-africa/EB235D7E45B7D501FC4B2D53E2DD974F

Powell, D. (2010). The Role of Constitution Making and Institution Building in Furthering Peace, Justice and Development: South Africa's Democratic Transition. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, *4*(2), 230–250. https://academic.oup.com/ijtj/article-abstract/4/2/230/2356993

Powers, P. (n.d.). *Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act 1984 Introduction Compared to the Northern Ireland (Emergency Provisions) Act 1978 or the Internal Security Act 19821 in South Africa, the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act 1984 is one of*. Retrieved July 28, 2025, from https://heinonline.org/hol-cgi-bin/get_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/modlr47&section=53

Rage, A.-B. (2010). *Achieving sustainable peace in post conflict societies: An evaluation of South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission* [PhD Thesis, Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch]. https://www.academia.edu/download/106887609/rage_achieving_2010.pdf

Robinson, C. J. (2000). *Black Marxism. The Making of the Black Radical Tradition (2nd*. https://philpapers.org/rec/ROBBMT-5

Saka, M. (2021). Feasibility of Democratisation in Sub-Sahara Africa, A study of South Africa after Apartheid system. *AEGIS: Journal of International Relations*, *4*(2). https://scholar.archive.org/work/q5hk4quo7nadzp7su6kzvsqf3m/access/wayback/http://e-journal.president.ac.id/presunivojs/index.php/AEGIS/article/download/1129/813

Spaull, N. (2013). Poverty & privilege: Primary school inequality in South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *33*(5), 436–447. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0738059312001381

Steytler, N. (2017). *The constitutional court of South Africa: Reinforcing an hourglass system of multi-level government*. https://uwcscholar.uwc.ac.za/items/c7491831-9c30-4e13-a0a4-28b80c9c627f

Swilling, M., Musango, J., & Wakeford, J. (2016). Developmental States and Sustainability Transitions: Prospects of a Just Transition in South Africa. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, *18*(5), 650–672. https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2015.1107716

Thompson, L. (2014). *A history of South Africa*. Yale University Press. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=xiuFAwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA1763&dq=Thompson,+L.+(2001).+A+History+of+South+Africa.+Yale+University+Press.&ots=inncY05fnR&sig=IBCZzVOnKqLHlKHUhUPz1LBT3Cw

Von Holdt, K. (2013). South Africa: The transition to violent democracy. *Review of African Political Economy*, *40*(138). https://doi.org/10.1080/03056244.2013.854040