“The ideal of free human beings enjoying freedom from fear and want can only be achieved if conditions are created whereby everyone may enjoy his economic, social and cultural rights, as well as his civil and political rights”

Preamble of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

Transitional justice, as defined by the United Nations, is the full range of processes and mechanisms associated with a society’s attempt to come to terms with a legacy of large-scale past abuses of human rights (UN, 2010: 2). Although the UN acknowledges the equal importance of all human rights for human well-being and explicitly calls for addressing all these rights in processes of transitional justice (UN, 2010: 3 and 7), violations of socio-economic rights played so far a rather marginal role in this context (Carranza, 2008: 329). The neglect of economic and social aspects of authoritarian rule and war-torn societies does not remain undisputed, especially because its consequences can be infringements on the most basic rights, such as the right to life and human integrity. At times it is even claimed that unjust systems kill far more infants through malnutrition and the unavailability of water than they kill adults with bullets and bombs (Asmal, 2000: 16, referring to South Africa under apartheid).

Scholars and practitioners began to explore the socio-economic dimensions of transitional justice only recently. Although the United Nations already recommend comprehensive approaches to transitional justice which include economic, social and cultural rights, they acknowledge that this touches upon an area of international law which is just emerging (UN, 2010: 10). Similarly, scholars writing on this topic are still in the process of further defining the economic and social dimensions of transitional justice and of developing the necessary theoretical background for practitioners. Thus, concepts that are relevant for this relatively new research area need to be explored and boundaries to be drawn.

However, there are good reasons for discussing and promoting a holistic approach to past injustices that considers their economic and social aspects as well as violations of civil and political rights. In many instances economic and social conditions and policies are closely linked to human rights abuses and might constitute a cause, means and/or consequence of conflict and authoritarianism. Ignoring potential links might then mean to ignore an important side of past injustices and could, at worst, lead to the recurrence of conflict and abusive practices.

Notwithstanding financial and temporal constraints, transitional justice, with its various tools to address past injustices, offers opportunities to deal with issues of the still largely undefined economic and social dimensions of conflict and repression. While criminal justice would allow for the prosecution of economic crimes, truth commissions offer the possibility to identify the root causes of human rights violations; the context that made them possible; and those who perpetrated them. They can also make recommendations for the establishment of a just order for the future. In turn, reparations, either as part of administrative reparation programmes or as ordered by tribunals, could help repair some of the economic and social dimensions of conflict and repression. Institutional reform, perhaps the most important tool of transitional justice to deal with such issues, could, if understood in a holistic manner, address root causes of conflict or repression including those of an economic nature, and help transform society.

This paper will provide a selective overview of the issues brought that are relevant in the emerging debate on the economic and social dimensions of transitional justice.
Economic Crimes

Economic crimes are usually understood to include large scale corruption and spoliation of a country’s resources committed by people holding a public office (Carranza, 2008: 311). In academic debates, high-level political corruption was for a long time dealt with under the paradigm of realpolitik, and at times it was even said to have some functional role for the political system of developing nations (Kofele-Kale, 2006: 5). Experience with kleptocratic regimes such as Zaire under Mobutu, the Philippines under Marcos, and Haiti under Duvalier, however, are examples of the severe consequences that corruption and spoliation can have for the population. In order to establish links between economic crimes, human rights and transitional justice, scholars point out that economic crimes entail as an almost inevitable consequence human rights violations; that they constitute a human rights violation in themselves; and that their investigation is a practical necessity especially in transition processes (Carranza, 2008: 329-30).

Spoliation and corruption are often related to a poor record of civil and political as well as economic and social rights. Fraudulent enrichment of elites undermines the legitimacy of their power. To balance this lack of legitimacy and ensure the continuation of their rule, the political elite might resort to political oppression, force and coercion (Kofele-Kale, 2006:30). Resource abundance and unbridled exploitation thereof can provide the necessary finances to sustain repressive regimes (Harwell/Le Billon, 2009: 288). More than just a means to finance repression, uncontrolled resource exploitation can in some instances be linked to a variety of so-called “resource crimes” and human rights violations like forced labour, forced displacements, and trade of UN-sanctioned commodities (Harwell/Le Billon, 2009: 288). Corruption also affects the realization and protection of economic and social rights. High levels of corruption are often associated with high levels of poverty and low levels on the indices for human development (Kofele-Kale, 2006: 2).

Although the phenomenon of corruption and spoliation need not necessarily be an issue in accounts of past injustices, many authoritarian or conflict-ridden states simultaneously experienced personal enrichment of the ruling elite to the detriment of their population. The examination of economic crimes is often a major demand of people who saw the fraudulent enrichment of their rulers contrasted with their own poverty and abuses of their rights. Therefore, practitioners from the poorer countries claim that transitional justice cannot be confined to civil and political rights but must recognize mass poverty as an object of justice (Carranza, 2008: 315). They then call for holding responsible those who deliberately contributed to perpetuating a state of mass poverty and possibly restoring to the state and its people what has been wrongfully acquired by the perpetrators of economic crimes.

Legal instruments and guiding principles are already in place to address the issue of economic crimes. The UN Convention Against Corruption that took effect in 2005 requires states to prevent and criminalize corruption and take measures to recover stolen assets. Several regional organizations such as the Council of Europe and the African Union have equally developed conventions for the fight against corruption and thus enhanced the international recognition of corruption as a serious crime. In order to deal with resource crimes related to spoliation various legal tools could be deployed. These legal remedies include, among others, humanitarian law against pillage and prohibitions against forced labour, attacks against civilians, destruction of property, displacements and similar crimes that can go along with resource spoliation. Also, UN Security Council resolutions against the trade in certain commodities could provide a basis for the prosecution of fraudulent enrichment of repressive elites (Harwell/ Le Billon, 2009: 291).

One reason for the inclusion of economic crimes in the chronically underfunded transitional justice processes are the practical benefits that could be derived from asset recovery. Following the
establishment of guilt in criminal justice processes, the recovery of assets could be initiated. The recovered funds could then be used for the financing of necessary post-conflict reconstruction, reparation payments, establishment of a new order and development efforts which are to be made in the phase of transitional justice. Furthermore, to take away the financial resources of perpetrators of human rights or humanitarian law violations can be a step to counter their ability to maintain impunity and safeguard a crucial source of power despite their being officially ousted of their offices and functions (Carranza, 2008: 314). In this respect, asset recovery could serve to prevent a recurrence of conflict or a possible return of the old abusive elite which is a key aim of transitional justice. More research is needed on the relationship between economic crimes and transitional justice in order to determine the best way to integrate the investigation of economic crimes in transitional justice; the impact of such crimes on the conflict or oppression that happened in the past; the possibilities of avoiding their recurrence; and the best form to provide reparation for the victims of such crimes. Open questions include how adequate existing transitional mechanisms are for addressing economic crimes; and how existing mechanisms to prosecute economic crimes outside of the transitional justice setting can be adapted to help address the specific problems raised by economic crimes in the context of transitional justice.

**Economic Policies**

The potential relevance of economic policies in the context of transitional justice is mainly twofold. On the one hand, economic policies might be designed to support and sustain authoritarian regimes or conflict and war. On the other hand, oppressive regimes might be instated in order to make the pursuit of certain economic policies possible. Their inclusion in transitional justice processes might thus be important because of their role in establishing the truth of what happened and why; the impact they have had on human rights and humanitarian law; and because a successful transition might require a discontinuation of old abusive and repressive practices (Addison, 2009: 111).

In the political discussion of the reasons for the occurrence of military regimes and dictatorships in Latin America, it is sometimes suggested that a link exists between the economic policies pursued and the degree of repression. Drawing on the experience of Latin American authoritarian regimes, the pursuit of neo-liberal economic policies and austerity measures was found to be closely linked to violations of civil and political as well as economic, social and cultural rights, as organized labour and leftist activists became a likely target for repression. Workers unions were viewed as a strong opposition and “identified as the principle force behind excessive government spending” (Pion-Berlin, 1983: 43). Thus, to deter unions and workers from exerting influence, governments resorted to a wide range of oppressive means from banning strikes and placing unions under military control to arrests and killings of opposition activists (Conklin/Davidson, 1986: 256). The relevance of these theories for transitional justice deserves academic attention.

The case of Cambodia where economic policies resulted in impoverishment and famine illustrates a different potential link between economic policies and transitional justice. Strict state planning and orthodox communist practices such as those implemented in Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge had severe consequences. In an effort to become self-sufficient and transform into a modern industrial state the Communist Party controlled agriculture by putting all food and natural resources under government control and implementing high quota for food production. These measures were accompanied by regulations that forced Cambodians to work long hours and rationed food (DeFalco, 2011: 146). As a consequence of the unrealistic and impossible targets set by the Communist Party, Cambodia suffered one of the worst famines in recent history (DeFalco, 2011: 143). The real death toll remains contested, but
estimations range from 500,000 to one million, and to this one would have to add even more cases in which undernourishment caused severe physical and mental health problems (DeFalco, 2011: 146-7). One could object that famines have been a regularly occurring phenomenon all over the world and can therefore not be treated as deliberate human rights violations. The case of Cambodia, however, shows that a case might be made for holding a state accountable for famines caused by catastrophic economic policies pushed through by the means of repression (DeFalco, 2011: 147).

Another aspect of economic policies finding their way into the debate of transitional justice is the assessment of the economic legacy of authoritarian regimes and conflict-ridden societies as a whole. The economic arrangements under authoritarianism will influence the chances of establishing a stable democracy (Addison, 2009: 115). For similar reasons, scholars demand that more attention is paid to war economies and their impact on transitions (Mani, 2008: 257). Economic stability and development as support for a young democracy might play an important role for the success of transitional justice. To achieve these aims economic arrangements under authoritarian rule need to be examined and possibly changed. Problematic features include unproductive expenditures, excessive rent-seeking practices and macro-economic destabilization (Addison, 2009: 119). Efforts to change these features can help to eliminate the financial power base of the old elites and their repressive institutions like military and secret services (Addison, 2009: 119). The money released through such measures could be used to establish a fairer distribution of the burdens and benefits of society and thereby strengthening the new democracy.

One example for the impact of economic policies on transitions is the issue of sovereign debt. Often, in the midst of all other problems that a transition entails, a transitional state finds itself landed with a sovereign debt that was incurred in order to sustain the prior regime and facilitate the human rights violations it committed, or came about through systemic corruption, for example where former government members contracted project loans whose proceeds went into their own pockets and which the state guaranteed (Michalowski/Bohoslavsky, 2009: 92). With regard to debt that was taken up to finance the human rights violations of the former regime, to investigate the history of these debts and their role in contributing to the commission of human rights violations, and to establish responsibilities in this respect, may in itself contribute to achieving some of the goals of transitional justice. Indeed, exposing connections between lending and gross human rights violations could make an important contribution to truth-finding (Michalowski/Bohoslavsky, 2009: 93). It might also be considered to what extent it should be possible for the transitional state to repudiate such debt. Debt repudiation could signal a break with past crimes, as well as freeing up considerable resources for the state in transition, which are arguably vital to strengthening the new democracy (Michalowski/Bohoslavsky, 2009: 96) Moreover, in many transitional countries, the debt policies of an oppressive regime that governed without any democratic participation or control decisively shaped the future of the country when it returned to democracy, as the new government’s political leeway will often be severely limited and conditioned by the debt burden (Michalowski/Bohoslavsky, 2009: 93). In such a situation one can clearly see the rationale behind including the repudiation of this debt as crucial to transitional justice approaches.

All in all, the inclusion of economic policies as an issue for transitional justice might serve the purpose of establishing a more comprehensive understanding of the causes of human rights violations and help to learn lessons from the past and create a just future. In this context, a future research agenda should include, in particular, an investigation of the link between economic policies and oppression and conflict.
Structural Violence

Although poverty could be the ground to claim that some economic, social and cultural rights are violated systematically, it is rarely addressed as such due to its complex nature and its various interlinked causes. In contrast to economic crimes, poverty often lacks specifiable perpetrators who can be held accountable. Poverty is anchored in the structures of society.

What turns poverty into a relevant issue for transitional justice processes is its manifestation as a form of structural violence. Johan Galtung defined structural violence as “violence that is built into the structure and shows up as unequal power and consequently unequal life chances” (Ho, 2007: 4) with ethnicity, class, and gender as some of the possible determinants of discrimination. In the case of structural violence, the victims are not always identifiable as individuals but it is still possible to identify communities and groups that are adversely affected. In its attempt to address the human rights violations of past authoritarian rule or violent conflict, transitional justice mechanisms so far neglected structural violence and instead focused on crimes proper (Miller, 2008: 237). This is questioned not only by those who suffered from marginalization and impoverishment but also by practitioners and scholars who acknowledge the close relation of structural violence and conflict and/or authoritarianism.

In order to defend the importance of addressing structural violence in transitional justice processes, scholars refer to the often adverse consequences of discriminating practices. Understanding structural violence as directed against a particular group of society clearly points to its incompatibility with human rights provisions which emphasize the principle of non-discrimination. When lack of access to the most basic provisions of life subsistence, health care and education arbitrarily disadvantage some rather than other people, the resulting poverty is no longer the outcome of mere state incapacity but a discriminatory practice. Moreover, the impoverishment of certain groups of society can be deliberately used as a tool of oppression and violence at the hand of authoritarian regimes (Muvingi, 2008: 165). Reinforcing political exclusion, economic marginalization further cements the situation of the powerless and makes them more vulnerable to the arbitrariness of the regime.

Therefore, an argument can be made that transitional justice mechanisms need to investigate structural violence as a tool of oppression and source of power of the regime (Muvingi, 2009: 181) in order to acknowledge adequately the suffering of victims of structural violence and their entitlement to equal realization of economic and social rights. In addition, investigating these past injustices highlights necessary changes in the societal structures of a post-authoritarian regime.

Apart from being a tool of oppression in authoritarian regimes, economic disparities are often regarded as a root cause of conflict and civil war. Structural arrangements like access to well-paid jobs, education and health care that are to the benefit of only some groups create grievances among the disadvantaged. Although the role of economic inequalities as a trigger for conflict is disputed in the literature on civil war (e.g. Collier/Hoeffler argue against this, while Gurr points out the role of political entrepreneurs and group specific inequalities that turn economic disparities into a cause of conflict), it is perceived as a grave injustice by the affected population (Muvingi, 2009: 163). Thus, even if economic grievances did not cause the conflict they can be regarded as an aggravating factor and often form the grounds on which propaganda and scapegoating unfold. Structural violence does not only play a role as the root of conflict but can be used, just as under authoritarianism, as a tool for weakening opponents. In addressing structural violence in post-conflict settings, transitional justice could perform the crucial task of preventing a recurrence of conflict (Muvingi, 2008: 167) and investigating the full range of violence committed during the conflict. In order to reach reconciliation among the conflicting parties it might be necessary to correct the structures which allowed severe injustices and inequalities (Miller, 2008: 287).
Structural violence as an issue for transitional justice is not as straightforward as to deal with economic crimes. The lack of people to be held accountable for structural violence makes such injustices unsuitable for criminal prosecution and even in truth seeking processes it is difficult to assign responsibility (Mani, 2008: 255). Furthermore, the prosecution of individuals could hardly be a remedy for a complex problem like structural violence (Muvingi, 2008: 165). It will often be possible to trace back discriminating and oppressive institutional arrangements to long before the occurrence of the latest conflict or the rise of an authoritarian regime. In some instances institutions and arrangements are inherited from colonial powers which already marginalized certain groups of society. But even in cases in which the regime under scrutiny in transitional justice processes itself is responsible for or allowed structural violence, it is difficult to single out those who have to take responsibility.

Until this branch of law is more firmly established, scholars advocate truth commissions as the most appropriate framework to address structural violence. These commissions serve both as a “tool of diagnosis” of past injustices and can set the agenda for long term policies in the new state (Laplante, 2008: 347). Understanding the past and taking it into consideration when shaping the future helps to prevent the recurrence of conflict, to facilitate reconciliation and to create just institutions. Despite warnings that ignoring economic inequalities as a cause of conflict will lead to a recurrence of violence (Miller, 2008: 287), or that the neglect of economic inequalities serves merely to protect the interest of the privileged at the expense of the poor (Muvingi, 2008 182), truth commissions so far largely avoided such issues. The evolving scholarly engagement with social and economic rights might give incentives to shift the focus of truth commissions and transitional justice processes in general towards a more comprehensive evaluation of past injustices.

The Protection of Socio-Economic Rights and Development in the New State

Another emerging concern in the debate of economic and social dimensions of transitional justice is the role of socio-economic rights and development in the new state. Both aspects are closely linked especially if development is understood as human development, i.e. the improvement of human living conditions and life chances, rather than economic growth. Under authoritarian rule or in conflict situations the violation of socio-economic rights is often a common feature mainly affecting marginalized and excluded groups. At the same time, development was often not possible due to adverse conditions that hindered economic growth. Beyond these commonalities it is nevertheless important to distinguish development and the realization of economic and social rights since they give rise to different problems.

So far, transitional justice practices offer two different approaches for dealing with the redemption for abuses of socio-economic rights and their realization in the new state. With the intention of ending the previous injustices the new South African constitution, as well as the Guatemalan peace agreement, assign an important place to economic and social rights for everyone (Arbour, 2008: 22-3). Although the protection and realization of all human rights is important for a successful transition, this way of dealing with the past is controversial. The main objection is that such an approach neglects the sufferings of the victims of past human rights abuses. While all people as citizens of the state can claim the realization of their socio-economic rights, victims of human rights violations might have an especially urgent claim which has to be treated preferentially. Thus, the remedy of past injustices has to be distinct from measures that benefit the population at large (Roht-Arriza/Orlovsky, 2008: 172).

The case of South Africa could illustrate this point since the social and economic cleavages between black and white citizens continue in the post-apartheid state and no efforts were made to even out old inequalities. Such examples support demands that a merely constitutionally guaranteed protection
of socio-economic rights is not sufficient to address and rectify past injustices. Therefore, some scholars and practitioners suggest the usage of reparations as a means to deal with previous violations of rights, especially the social and economic rights of marginalized groups. Reparations could then take the form not only of monetary compensation but also, for example, of provision of health care and education (deGreiff, 2009: 37). This would constitute a means to rectify past wrongs and realize the rights of the formerly marginalized so that they can attain an equal standing with all other citizens. Morocco’s Equity and Reconciliation Commission applied this approach and recommended, inter alia, “communal reparations to strengthen the economic and social development of specific regions that were particularly [...] marginalized and excluded” (Arbour, 2008. 19). A question that is raised in this context is whether victims should indeed benefit from such a preferential treatment. Since financial resources are usually scarce in transitional states their allocation requires difficult decisions. In a state with a large proportion of poor people it might constitute another injustice or give rise to new grievances, if resources are preferentially allocated to only some groups of the poor rather than equally to all.

The conceptual link made between development and transitional justice is less focused on the violation of individuals’ rights and more forward looking than the debate about socio-economic rights. The importance of development for a successful transition can be established in different ways. At the individual level some scholars suggest that poverty reduces people’s capacity to aspire and makes them adapt to the situation they live in. Human development might then strengthen their capacity to claim rights and fight for their realization which makes them less vulnerable to abuses of their human rights (deGreiff, 2009: 45). On the level of the state, development can be regarded as a means to strengthen the rule of law and democracy by providing the needed financial resources. At the time, the establishment of accountable institutions and democratic rule, as an outcome of transitional justice processes, can help to create a climate in which development and economic progress become possible (Duthie, 2008: 299). There is a potentially virtuous circle here, with development strengthening democracy and democracy enabling (further) development. Therefore, it can be argued that transitional justice needs to take into account such links in order to prevent sustainably the recurrence of severe human rights violations.

By linking transitional justice to development the concept of transitional justice is immensely broadened. Some argue that this unnecessarily distracts attention and drains resources in a process which has only limited time and finances at its disposal (Duthie, 2008: 308). Furthermore, other actors working in development and reconstruction are already committed to these issues. But in addition to the otherwise often technical and apolitical development efforts, transitional justice could contribute to strengthening the focus on human rights and help transforming the past into a just future.

Many open questions remain to be addressed when considering the linkage between transitional justice and development and socio-economic rights. For example, are transitional justice mechanisms well placed to look into these issues or would this overstretch limited resources and expertise? Could a broadening of the concept of transitional justice be counterproductive in making it more difficult to reach a consensus within the country based on which a transition can be initiated? In more general terms, can the aims of transitional justice be achieved by ignoring, postponing for later or delegating to different actors, issues of development and of violations of economic, social and cultural rights, or is an inclusive approach necessary to guarantee a successful transition? Closely linked to this is the fundamental conceptual question of the extent to which transitional justice can and should go beyond concerning itself with corrective justice to include, and aim to achieve, distributive justice. With regard to addressing past violations of economic, social and cultural rights as part of transitional justice, what
should be the relationship between transitional justice mechanisms and the general state obligation to promote these rights for all to the highest ascertainable level?

**Transitional justice and corporate complicity**

Investigations of gross human rights abuses, in practice as well as in the academic debate, no longer solely focus on the state as the main perpetrator of violations. In order to comprehensively address human rights violations, the inclusion of other actors such as corporations that were directly or indirectly involved in crimes might be necessary. The relevance of looking into the issue of corporate complicity in the context of transitional justice becomes clear when examining the example of South Africa. When Nelson Mandela became the first black president of South Africa in 1994, a Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) was established to investigate and document human rights violations committed under apartheid between March 1960 and May 1994 (Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act 34, 1995: Art.3), including the role of corporations in apartheid South Africa (see Barnard-Naudé, 2008). The TRC concluded that ‘Business was central to the economy that sustained the South African state during the apartheid years’ (TRC South Africa Report, 2003: 58) and that ‘the degree to which business maintained the status quo varied from direct involvement in shaping government policies or engaging in activities directly associated with repressive functions to simply benefiting from operating in a racially structured society in which wages were low and workers were denied basic democratic rights’ (TRC South Africa Report, 2003: 140).

Research carried out in the context of a British Academy funded project on ‘Linking Transitional Justice and Corporate Complicity’ (for more information see [http://www.essex.ac.uk/tjn/research/economics.shtm](http://www.essex.ac.uk/tjn/research/economics.shtm)) demonstrated that there is no one-size-fits-all answer to whether it is necessary to include corporate accountability into a transitional justice process in order to achieve the goals of transitional justice, but that this rather depends on the historic, political and social context of the conflict/oppression and transition. In Colombia, for example, the issue of linking corporate accountability and transitional justice is of topical importance, as the inclusion of corporations into the current transitional justice mechanisms is under discussion, and many cases in which corporations are accused of human rights abuses, mainly for their cooperation with the paramilitaries or the guerrilla army, are currently pending in both Colombia and the US. There is thus a view that it is important to include corporate accountability into the transitional justice processes, and to find appropriate mechanisms through which this can best be achieved. In Argentina, on the other hand, the transitional justice mechanisms were and still are clearly focused on the violation of civil and political rights and the role of corporations was not considered to be part of this process. Only in isolated cases have attempts been made to hold corporations to account for their role in human rights violations carried out under the last dictatorship. Clearly, the success of the transition in Argentina is largely perceived as dependent upon the end of impunity of and the criminal trials against the main individual perpetrators of the violations.

Regarding the mechanisms through which corporations can be held accountable for their complicity in human rights violations in the particular context of transitional justice, the traditional focus of transitional justice on criminal trials needs to be overcome if corporate accountability is to be included in transitional justice mechanisms. While criminal trials can play a role in determining the culpability of corporations and send a strong message with regard to the seriousness of their involvement, corporate criminal liability is limited, both at the international level and in many countries at the domestic level. In the context of transitional justice, civil and extra-legal remedies seem to provide much more promising mechanisms to hold corporations to account. Despite potential problems with such an approach, the issue
of corporate accountability might best be addressed already at the truth-finding stage, for example by including it in TRC investigations, as this would mean that the role of corporations would form part of the narrative of what happened in the country.

Many questions in this context are in need of more research. What needs to be further analysed is the role of liability for corporate complicity in achieving the objectives of transitional justice; the mechanisms through which this liability can be achieved; and whether the remedies for complicity need to be adapted to the special circumstances of the transitional context. Issues that need to be addressed in this context are, in particular, the role of corporations in creating and/or aggravating the oppression or conflict; the relationship between reparation programmes and remedies against corporations as private actors; what role civil litigation can play in order to establish corporate liability in this context and provide adequate compensation; and whether the aims of transitional justice can be achieved where litigation takes place in foreign countries (e.g. litigation in the US under the Alien Tort Claims Act) instead of in the transitional country itself.

The clarification of these conceptual concerns not only increases the understanding of the essential role of corporations for successful transitions but might more importantly help countries undergoing transitions as well as relevant stakeholders to design adequate processes that take due account of the responsibility of both the State and corporations and create awareness of the responsibilities of corporations that carry out business in situations of conflict or oppression.

**Looking ahead**

The economic and social dimensions of transitional justice are still an emerging field of research. Although not every case of transitional justice necessarily needs to address economic and social dimensions of past injustices, in many instances this is crucial for establishing a more comprehensive truth and transforming unjust arrangements more thoroughly. Practical experience and developments in the scholarly debate on the role of socio-economic dimensions of transitional justice highlight the importance of addressing these issues in transitional justice processes and the need for further exploration of the issues that should be included to achieve a more holistic approach to transitional justice. However, they also acknowledge the limits to and problems with integrating the economic and social dimensions into such a holistic approach.
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