

Institute for Contextual Theology. Testimony before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, East London, 17 November 1997. [disclaimer](#)

---

We are calling on - Bernard Spong you look like - no you are not there. Wesley Mabuza and David Musomo, to speak up to about 10 'o clock. So the Institute for Contextual Theology and Theology of Liberation.

One of the wonderful things about this audience, this congregation, is that they are behaving very much like an Anglican congregation. They all want to sit at the back! It might be a help if you came to the front so that people who come late don't have a problem and they can just slip in. I notice that there are Roman Catholics who are also sitting at the back! Can you please very kindly...? Thank you very much. Welcome both of you gentlemen. Thank you for being so patient and also being so generous to say you'll allow this whole thing to be finished by...when we have tea! Thank you.

REV WESLEY MABUZA: Thank you very much, Chairperson. I introduce ...[inaudible] who has come in the place of Professor Musomo. He is a member of the executive of ICT. I will do the presentation.

ADMINISTERS THE OATH.

REV WESLEY MABUZA: Sir, we made a brief presentation but we have a much more comprehensive one which will be something that we think will be a contribution to this TRC process. With your permission I would like to proceed. I thank you Chairperson for inviting the Institute for Contextual Theology (ICT) to address this gathering. Firstly, the ICT feels privileged to congratulate the TRC in its achievements in the last two years. A number of acts against humanity have been uncovered within a short space of time. A normal course of justice would have been evaded by the perpetrators of the atrocities. Credit is also due in large part to the TRC method of investigation for all that has been uncovered. Families are now beginning to start a new life with the knowledge that those who killed their loved ones have at last admitted it and in most cases showed where they had buried them, painful as this discovery will always be.

Today marks the beginning of a very important chapter in the truth and reconciliation process, when religious bodies which possess the power to influence the hearts and minds of the majority are called upon to account on how they have used or abused that privilege. Religious bodies, Chairperson, hold considerable sway in society, but they themselves are susceptible to all kinds of influences which at times lead them to commit abuses intentionally or unintentionally. This moment, Chairperson, is also significant because for the first time in the history of our country, religious

communities are called upon to give accounts of their understanding of their mission in the context of apartheid and how they hope to do mission in the future. Standing behind blanket statements made by the SACC on behalf the churches during apartheid has not helped us to understand the theological positions of some churches which we saw in practice contradicting the mission of the SACC (I think this has already been mentioned). Incidentally, it was this factor, among others, that led to the formation of ICT, and this leads me to the next point: What is the Institute for Contextual Theology? The struggle in this country was for justice that would lead to liberation, restoration and reconciliation. The church, however, did not have an appropriate theology to underwrite that struggle. As a response to this reticence or inability to act appropriately, ICT came into being in 1981. ICT fashioned itself according to the prophetic tradition and unapologetically advocated the theology of liberation, determined by the dynamics of the Southern African context. ICT counts itself among those working towards the establishment of God's reign on earth. The first general secretary of ICT was the Reverend Dr. Elliot Ngema, who was then followed by the Reverend Dr. Frank Chikane, who is now in the Deputy President's office. Dr Chikane was succeeded by the Reverend Dr. Mangaliso Mkhatshwa, who is now Deputy Minister of Education. ICT wishes to pay tribute to these leaders, who made highly significant contributions to Contextual Theology and to the liberation of this country.

CHAIRPERSON: Where are you going?

REV. WESLEY MABUZA: To fetch some water, Sir. [PAUSE].

Thank you Chairperson, I was beginning to be too serious, actually. As the present General Secretary of ICT, I feel very humble before my predecessors. Whatever I do, albeit in different circumstances, is in continuity with the trend set by my predecessors. ICT operates outside the status quo of both church and state, although the ultimate aim is to serve the State which is wider than the governing group of people and the church which is much more profound than the institutional church. ICT nevertheless is proud to be an affiliate of the SACC. Liberation theologians' biblical imperative is to be found in Isaiah Chapter 61, verse 1 – 4, and is quoted in Luke Chapter 4, verse 18-19, particularly the words: "To set at liberty those who are oppressed. For this reason a group of Theologians met together at that critical time of South Africa's history, and using the process of wide and in-depth consultation, eventually came up with what came to be known as the Carus Document, issued as a challenge to the churches. In its short lifetime, the institute has suffered much at the hands of the previous government and from rejection by most churches who have misunderstood its vision and mission. Both government and the churches singled out liberation theology as the devil's theology and thus accused ICT of serving the interest of...[TAPE ENDS] ...[inaudible] have a lot in common between communism, barring atheism and Christianity than the church would care to admit. History nevertheless did vindicate the ICT. Some valuable contributions were made by ICT in spite of all these hostilities. For example training of solid leadership during the lean years of apartheid when there was no overt political leadership; change to the

theological paradigm in South Africa; publication of the Carus Document in 1985, which accelerated the process, promoting a world-wide theological reflection network. For example, the Road to Damascus was a production of that nature, producing parliamentary candidates and church leaders who had close associations with ICT, providing a forum of sharing of experiences and knowledge amongst concerned pastors, theologians and Christians in general. Throughout its existence, ICT has received overseas funding from organisations and church individuals who aligned themselves with the ideals of the institute. A small but significant contribution also comes from its membership, which is world-wide. It is these contributions which have enabled ICT to maintain its independent status. I now come to the essence of ICT as a prophetic movement. ICT operates outside church and government structures in order that it could provide an ongoing independent critique. For this reason, some people now label ICT as the institute of critical theologians, while others label it as the organisation of spoilers. Both labels have become unpopular these days, whereas in the not so distant past, people gained popularity by being critical or by being regarded as spoilers of the system. But had it not been for those critical theologians or spoilers, little progress would have been made. Today the gradual disappearance of those kinds of prophets of old is leaving a vacuum that is difficult to fill. In its critique of the church, ICT stated that some churches in South Africa were engaging in state theology, which meant that churches supported the apartheid regime, based on Romans 13, while conveniently ignoring Revelations 13. May I, with your permission, just debate briefly and coach what you just said, Chairperson, about the fact that it becomes a hidden thing, when you talk about state theology. It is a very closed door, behind closed doors, that happens which is not overtly seen usually as state theology. And other churches resorted to church theology. A very superficial critique of apartheid lacking in in-depth analysis of the prevailing context, whilst stressing the need for reconciliation and peace, at the expense of justice. ICT wanted reconciliation at the time but not at the expense of the poor. The prophetic movement was intended to be in continuity with these persecuted prophets of the past. Those who never took anything for granted. Instead, they raised questions about the policies of both secular and religious leaders that must have kept the nation lively and awake as a prophetic movement does today. But questions are not raised for their own sake. Their aim is to ensure a healthy public policy and just governance for all. Chairperson, ICT is proud to say that throughout its existence in South Africa, it has done just that. For that, it incurred the wrath of the previous government, or was temporarily disowned by the church and regarded as a stepchild because it made both religious and secular leaders uncomfortable. With the knowledge that the resources of this county are enough to feed its people, it equitably distributed, and that this was not the case as the apartheid government preserved them for a few, we aligned ourselves as ICT publicly with the poor and oppressed. We then challenged and approached on theological grounds anything that threatened the well being of the poor and oppressed, while we looked for a way out of our suffering. It is in this light that we published and campaigned against the status quo. Also with the knowledge that apartheid since it was officially endorsed by the then Orange Free State Synod of the DRC in 1935 and was implemented in full swing by Dr Verwoerd in 1958, and that

the non-DRC churches had not done much to oppose it, we adopted the critical stands towards these churches.

At the time, we thought that the problem was the wrong abstract theology, which they inherited from Europe, but now we realise that that theology was used as a scape-goat in a situation where the reality was that the churches, especially white members of these churches, had benefited a lot from apartheid. Regrettably, one feels in hindsight, that when we talk of the problem of the churches during apartheid, we are essentially talking about those who controlled them, our white fellow Christians. We would like the commission to note that this aspect has a lot of implications for restitution and reconstruction. If Christians had raised their voice from the beginning and rejected all privileges, things would have been different. Why ICT's reluctance to support the TRC? Chairperson, I now come to the most delicate part of this presentation. When ITC first received the invitation to participate in this hearing, we wrote back to Dr Piet Meiring, stating ICT's reluctance to participate in the TRC process. This was not intended as a publicity stunt, nor did it arise out of ignorance of what goes on, nor was it motivated by attempts to encourage anarchy, nor a feeling of self-righteousness. ICT's reluctance to lend unqualified support to the TRC process stems from a deeper analysis and scepticism. Let me elaborate briefly:

1. The question of perpetrator and victim. We found the summons of both activists and upholders of the system to account for their actions confusing. To us this meant equating the perpetrator and the victim as if they are equally culpable. Although we did not expect the TRC to pass judgement, we at least expected it to distinguish between those who should give accounts of their deeds and those who should feel free to comment on the situation. This, of course, did not only apply to the ICT and the religious communities, but to our former liberation movements as well. We felt that such an approach was trivialising the process. It has become clear, Chairperson, during some searching's of the TRC, that for some perpetrators, the TRC is a non-event, and therefore of no consequence. ICT's problem was the message this would convey would be conveying concerning the prophetic movement. We changed our mind out of respect for the constitution upon which we all agree, and the very person sitting on this panel.

2. A concern about the society beyond the TRC process. While a lot of hidden activities have been uncovered by the TRC investigating units, ICT is concerned that virtually all perpetrators of such gross violations are getting off with impunity. To the extent that we are not calling for executions or life imprisonment. We cannot be accused of expecting Nuremberg type of trials. Lack of a mechanism that makes the perpetrators take responsibility for their actions is causing some resentment to say the least. ICT's concern, Chairperson, is about what happens beyond the TRC process. Are we all going to look back in the next five years with sadness at the waste of money, human resources and valuable time? If so, we wondered whether all these resources could not have been channelled to other uses which could better build communities which had suffered for so long from degradation and deprivation. It is clear that people on the ground do not understand what the National Reconciliation

Act is all about, since racism and exploitation still abound. The bitterness caused by our gory past has not yet subsided. All this cannot be ignored if our future is to be built on a sound foundation. To date, Chairperson and members of the commission, we still have not found an answer to our question. Our AGM this year, however, has mandated ICT's steering committee to set up a task force, whose task would be to work out guidelines for a society beyond the TRC process.

3. TRC for the churches. We had also thought that churches needed their own TRC, instead of being called to account at this process. Our problem is that the present process arose out of a political settlement. As such, it is limited by the terms of agreement in what it can do. Even the interpretation of the terms so familiar to Christian theology, for example reconciliation, justice, truth, reflect these limitations. Christians know very well what the meaning of reconciliation is and what its implications are. They also know the biblical understanding of justices and what their implications are. The present process has not mentioned terms such as restitution or penance or God's role, which relates to the terms it uses. It would not be proper for us, however, to expect this of the present process. Rather, we thought that Christians would talk amount themselves and work out what they could do. The same could be expected of other religious communities.

4. Lack of economic dimension: We also felt that the present process was silent about the economic dimension of reconciliation. We understand that there are other processes taking place, as well as structures that deal with other issues, but when we talk of national reconciliation, we expect a body with the stature of the TRC to go beyond listening to killings and torture, to include the category of those who benefited directly or indirectly economically. Chairperson, we are thinking here of both black and white South Africans. We did not know at the time that the category of business people would be added. Our focus was not only on business people, but on everyone who had been enriched by apartheid while others were dying in the bush and the townships, and police offices. We felt that these were the people who should be compelled to plough back their wealth towards reconstruction and reparation. In this regard, Chairperson, we align ourselves with the recent view expressed by the Stellenbosch academic, who made a submission to this commission that those who possess more than R2 million in cash and assets should be taxed for reconstruction. But we wish to go further and reduce the R2 million to every R1 million, to increase the slice of the cake. We also want to make a call to others who benefited in the same way to make an extra contribution. These are the people who should be raising the R3 billion needed for reparation. Chairperson, we do not think that this is unrealistic. A number of people are still homeless, poor and crammed in townships which were originally intended to be transit camps to fulfil the white by night dream, promised to its voters by the apartheid rulers of the past. There is no hope that these open jails could ever be dismantled for the next half a century. This is not what the struggle was about. It would be different if we were all starting from scratch. For the majority, unfortunately, things remain as they were. To conclude, Chairperson, at the fifth point.

5. Lack of clarity about categories: Finally the criteria for creating categories was not clear. Who should really be called to the TRC? Is it the foot soldier or the commander? We thought that all those impositions of responsibility needed to do the accounting. If ministers or leaders of religious communities were asked to make an appearance, why were teachers or university lecturers not asked to make an appearance? There are many ways of killing a nation. One of the most cruel ways of doing this is by attacking the nation's psyche and by so doing, destroy its mind. Putting it to sleep, driving it to drunkenness and violence. Destroying children of future leaders and future builders of the economy of that particular nation. Chairperson, we want to submit that the architects of most of this were academics in the employ of the apartheid system. Certain universities are known to have been factories of all the commodities apartheid needed in order for it to succeed. Besides those who studied at the so-called bush colleges, know what it means to be taught by academics who were actually soldiers or reserve soldiers. These people, chairperson, were not under any duress. They were willingly upholding the geology of apartheid. Yet these have been forgotten or not forced to account to this commission.

Having clarified the points of our reservations, the present process however, is a reality and we cannot wish it away. Therefore, a way forward, very briefly, is a need to devise a mechanism of reconciliation beyond the TRC process, to work out a way of restitution that will not tax the tax payer further, to call on the religious community to have their own TRC, to work towards the establishment of a national bank by the churches. We believe, as ICT, that our submission will receive the attention it deserves, so that while we work towards reconciliation, the essential channels of justice will not be ignored. Thank you chairperson and members of the commission.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. Did you say your colleague was going to participate in answering questions?

REV. WESLEY MABUZA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Dr Mgojo?

DR. K MGOJO: Mr chairperson, our only disadvantage is that we didn't get that text. So we shall be asking questions having not studied the text. Having said so, the theology of liberation – how far has the theology of liberation been influenced by what is called "black consciousness" or "black theology"? Are these things related? Is that the basis of this theology? "Black consciousness" or "black theology"?

REV. WESLEY MABUZA: That is correct, Commissioner. We talk of theology of liberation in the context of contextual theology and that would involve black theology, and that would be influenced by all the other dynamics: black consciousness, economic conditions and so forth, in the country.

DR K. MGOJO: Thank you. Would I be right to say that the concern of the Contextual Theology, mostly, related to what is happening now is that you think that

there is a lack of restorative justice? You have said that even perpetrators, they just go free, having not been asked to do anything. Is that your basis that it lacks, in fact in your very short submission, you have also quoted some of the flaws of the TRC and when a person reads around this, you find that things have been made easy for the perpetrators. Am I right?

[UNKNOWN]: Chairperson, we are only interpreting and also elaborating on what the membership of the ICT on the ground has said. We work with cells which are contextual theology units. Those are people at grassroots level who reflect on what is happening, who reflect on the feelings, who reflect on everything they are experiencing. What has been coming through is that there is some kind of resentment to the fact that people go away with impunity and people are not calling for the execution of others, they are not calling for the jailing of others, but they are saying some form of mechanism that will show that people are taking responsibility for what they have done would in fact be a step ahead. People have quoted, for example, one of the cases during submissions here at the amnesty hearings, from Derby-Lewis for example. Sorry to mention a name, but we have to. Saying he has gone back to the law, and said that the law does not require me, to even to say sorry, but we know that some other people have said sorry. So we in the happening, but we are saying people want something more feasible out of the process.

REV. WESLEY MABUZA: I just also want to add that I think the main test of any process is its delivery and what is happening at the moment seems to be more delivery for the perpetrators than there is for those who were victims, and in addition as we mentioned in our submission earlier, is that just even looking at face value, there is very little difference of that kind of recognition from those not just who were perpetrators, but the group to which those belong. To show that kind of acceptance of the past and attend to it with the humility it deserves. There is a claiming of rights, almost unequalled even before apartheid, from those who had rights even before. And therefore the delivery is really the one that should determine, rather than ourselves pontificating on whether the TRC is a good process or not.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just to add one more thing, Chairperson. This is one of the reasons why ICT felt that the churches should have their own TRC, because with our church authority, church leaders and so forth, it is possible to get through to the membership, who are people that are part of the community and some of whom are involved in these kinds of atrocities, or whatever was happening in the past.

DR K. MGOJO: Thank you, that is very interesting. Earlier this morning, there was a question which was posed by Reverend Finca about the churches themselves and now there is a suggestion here that the churches need to have their own TRC. How is this going to happen: Will the churches be judging themselves when they have this TRC or not?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you very much for that question. We wouldn't know what turn the churches would follow, but I think that the opening address of

the Chairperson of the commission has already said that it will not be to sing praises to the church. There are many things we would like to say about the church, but I think some of us would be dishonest if we were to say those things in this kind of forum. We want to believe that we belong to the church. There are contradictions. Our own church, the Methodist Church, for example is now being led by a black person who has to account for the deeds of white leaders, and so these are some of the things that I think can be clarified. The fact that the church can go further than that and the fact that the church has already, in its own way begun to look at, I don't think that the church begins to look at repentance by an act of parliament. It looks at repentance from its own position and I think this needs to be recognised. We want to believe that then we will be free to speak to our own body what we want to say because we want to correct and build it. It is difficult at this stage, to just stand up and say the church was this or that, because we belong to the church, and we are not forced to belong to it.

DR. K MGOJO: Last question, Mr Chairperson, so that the other people can ask a question. ICT has worked very closely with the SACC and many people believe that there was ICT because there was the SACC. Most of the people who formed the ICT are the people who came from that kind of background. How is the working relationship going to happen between the ICT and the SACC?

REV. WESLEY MABUZA: I thank you very much, sir. I think we need to look at how the two bodies operate. The first one operates from the fact that it is more of an institution which is answerable to churches and church leaders and thereby there are some constraints where we like it or not, because there are certain things that the SACC cannot just do without going through the heads of churches, and going through is the operative word. But with the ICT, ICT is a freewheeling body and would like to remain that way and there are lots of convergences with what the SACC does. We want to believe that we compliment what the SACC does and I am sure that the SACC would be the last body to want to see this child die, and so I am sure that I speak for the general secretary. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: I hope that you are not getting too agitated, because time we can sort of adjust. We were going to have tea at 11, but I think we ought to finish this and we'll sort of just move things up, so Bishop Michael it gives you time to recuperate. Any...Bongani?

REV. B FINCA: James King Burman...I don't know if I'm pronouncing the name correctly, the Chief Executive of the Institute of Race Relations published an article in the Daily Despatch of October 7<sup>th</sup>, where he makes a stinging attack on Liberation Theology, and how it inspired violence in the townships. I am not quoting verbatim, but he says that the people who come before the amnesty committee now to apply for amnesty for necklacing people in the townships are nothing but victims of the propaganda that came from Liberation Theologians who are now sitting back and not taking ownership. He calls for the churches and for the Theologians who were involved in this to use the avenue of this hearing to make public confessions and ask

for forgiveness. I would like you to comment on that. I think he expects us to raise the question and get an answer. I don't know whether you saw the article.

REV. WESLEY MABUZA: Yes, in fact I was hoping that this would not come up, because we have already responded to K. Burman over the air, we had a talk with him. But I just want to say, firstly, I think ICT would not like to associate itself with anything that is becoming an insult to people who are suffering. And one can unfortunately not use very strong words to call K. Burman to order, because you cannot say to someone who is suffering and is having a big stone on that person's neck, and when that person is trying to remove the stone, you say it was caused by others. It is an insult and despising the mentality of people. Our response also was we were not aware that each and every person who was throwing and stone was reading liberation theology. I just think that it was a far-fetched generalisation and unfortunately he has this history of denigrating all the people who were fighting for the people who were oppressed. SACC has gone through his tongue lashing and it is most unfortunate that he should belong to an organisation that is the Institute of Race Relations. I think that we could say more, but I think all I can say in summary is that we will not accept the insult that is levelled at people who are trying to do something against their suffering, but saying they are influenced by other people. It's what the government used to say and now we hear K. Burman saying the same thing.

CHAIRPERSON: I just want to add to what you say. I haven't myself responded to him. I would make no bones about the fact that I tried to be an exponent of liberation theology. I don't apologise for that fact. But I think it is extremely odd for anyone to say that we who were the exponents of this, who then were the ones who were putting the fires out in this country. I mean, we were the ones who actually tried to stop people from necklacing, but more than that, we were the ones who kept begging the government, the previous government when our people were dying, begging them: "Don't do this", and we stood between this country and catastrophe. I would not, myself, I am glad I mean, but I just want to say that it is worse than an insult actually, because people put their lives on the line to prevent this country going down the tubes. We were the ones who were involved with the Peace Accord. We were going around in aeroplanes and all over the place, trying, we would be in Natal to try and stop the violence that was happening there and I mean, if you asked who were the people who were in the forefront, you would almost always have found that it was some church leader or other, who were the ones who were seeking to bring about peace and to be treated with such - no, I have always said to people let us be laid-back. I will try to be laid-back. Yes, Thomas.

MR T. MANTHATA: I would like to know what contact did the ICT have with either the victim or the perpetrator and/or both of them during the activities of the TRC? Or do I understand you to say that because of the confusion that you have, you had nothing to do with either of the people concerned in this whole activity?

REV. WESLEY MABUZA: Chairperson, we have not had much contact, because we are busy reflecting on this. However, the Department of Ministries does have

programmes in the Vaal Triangle, they have been going, they have been having meetings with people over the weekends and so forth, and they have been coming back, most of those are victims. We have not had contact with the perpetrators. That's one thing. The second thing that we have mentioned in this submission is that there is a task force looking at the ways of working out some guidelines for a reconciliation process beyond the TRC process, because we believe that the TRC process does come to an end, but what kind of society do you want beyond that? The people leave. And they are busy working on those, looking at it from different angles: social, theological side and so forth. Perhaps something could be worked out then in terms of who is important in the process.

MR T MANTHATA: Yes, I am saying this because we have been asking people to provide with the healing of the council and of course, further, I don't know how you are going to enter the whole process of reconciling if you do not start it at the beginning and you are going to start it at the time when the TRC shall have ended. OK, fine. I go further to ask how do you envisage the church created TRC? Would you say the church created TRC would, as we talk in the TRC, have an implementing body, or the churches, will they institute an implementing body and that would perhaps be the SACC?

REV. WESLEY MABUZA: Thank you Chairperson. I think that ICT is presenting this proposal with humility. We are not instructing the churches or religious bodies to have a TRC. We are saying that if it is a reasonable option, that could be taken over and the ...[inaudible] would then be discussed. It would not be proper for us to actually state exactly we see. We are presenting something here within a limited space of time. If we were to be asked, for instance, to work together with the churches on this kind of thing, then working with them would present something. But this is an idea that we thought would be reasonable to the churches. That is not just reasonable but necessary. There is a lot that still needs to be said. There is a lot that still needs to be corrected. There is a lot within our own denominations that needs to be worked at. There is a huge amount and we do not believe that this process has started it, but we don't think that it can end there with the churches. For the churches always have an ongoing thing about truth and reconciliation?

CHAIRPERSON: I think I should - is that your last question? Because I'm trying to - there's somebody else here. Virginia wants, and would think that we ought to be going to tea. Are you feeling frustrated?

REV. WESLEY MABUZA: I'm all right.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. Virginia?

MS V GCABASHE: Thank you Chairperson.

CHAIRPERSON: You'll be allowed at the very most, two...

MS V GCABASHE: My question is very short, so maybe Tom can use my time. You said in your submission that ICT made a significant contribution to the change in this country and you also mentioned your concern for the poor and poverty. Now my question is: What practical programme do you have or envisage in trying to combat poverty in the townships?

REV. WESLEY MABUZA: Thank you Chairperson. I think it's a huge question and maybe two of us will answer it. Let me just say that ... [intervention]

CHAIRPERSON: Can you make it brief, so it will have to be only one of you.

REV. WESLEY MABUZA: If it's long, then we won't be asked further questions, sir. Let me just say that I think we are focusing on one direction, and we are focusing on the poor. But I think that we also need to focus on the wealthy and the greed in this country and therefore all that needs to be taken into account. I think it should be a holistic approach. There is enough to share. Secondly, ICT is presently engaged in a very, very in-depth study, research study, done on the ground on the situation of poverty, because we realise that poverty could not just be a question of money, it could also be a structural thing. And so, these we believe could be of assistance to the churches in terms of you have to go to the source in order to be able to come back with a proper response. If I may give you a brief example, sir. The brief example is that if you look at taxi violence for instance, which constitutes that kind of in the drivers, you have to go to the source and say it was the removal of people from their places of work and cramping people together, no transport and so forth. So you've got to look at those kinds of things and say how do you address that kind of thing? So we are busy working on that kind of thing.

CHAIRPERSON: Maybe, box me after this ... [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just to add Chairperson, we have recently had a workshop and what was coming through at that workshop on the theological side, the biblical side, was that Jesus did not only focus on what people would eat, but he focused on de-wealthing the wealthy and His injunction was to challenge them to share, to give and so forth. And we though we would take that seriously. There is a publication coming up, including that, but incorporating also the case studies that are being done in communities. And apart from that we thought we would join those who are calling for the establishment of a bank by the churches. That is what people are calling for at an international level, but we want to take that seriously as the nation here in South Africa. And lastly, at the AGM it was decided recently, the AGM of the institute has decided recently that we should in fact begin to look at ways of combating poverty, but focusing on ... [inaudible] Yes, there are campaigns that are put in place. The question of looking at the credit bureaux and all those things, but also more importantly, what the government can do about restructuring the debt and also joining the campaign for the jubilee when we get to 2 000. Because there's a huge debt internally but there's a huge debt also externally. How do they restructure the internal apartheid debt? How do we lobby for the rolling of the debt overseas?

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very, very much. There are some points that we would correct in your views about the commission, but we are thankful that you have got this point about life after the TRC, because the TRC has a very short shelf life, and we hope very much, I mean the churches and religious communities and others in civil society will realise that reconciliation and all that is really a national project. It isn't something that's going to be done when we hand in the report to the President on the 31<sup>st</sup> July. We won't then say to him that the country is reconciled. Some contribution will have been made towards this. Thank you very much.

---

This verbatim transcript was provided by the TRC and is reproduced here unedited. RICSA does not assume responsibility for any errors.