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Background to the Workshop

Origins and Planning

Since 1999 a group of PhD researchers from various universities has been engaged in research on community intervention projects concerned with reconciliation, healing and advocacy work beyond the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in South Africa. Various local organisations in the field were interested in collaborating with these independent researchers who were to document and evaluate their interventions. The opportunity to combine their work into a series of case studies arose initially from a networking initiative and pooling of interests between several NGOs, support groups, the researchers and the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (CSVR). Subsequently, the research team of six PhD students from various countries conducted in-depth fieldwork with the following organisations in Cape Town and Johannesburg: Institute for Healing of Memories, Centre for Ubuntu, Trauma Centre for Survivors of Violence, Khulumani Survivor Support Group, National Peace Accord Trust. A research report was compiled for each intervention in consultation with the organisations (Colvin 2001, Kayser 2000a, Kayser 2000b, Neumann 2001, Neumann forthcoming, Schell-Faucon 2001). An integrative report will also be released in early 2002 (Kayser and van der Merwe forthcoming).

Subsequent debates within the collaboration initiatives showed the need for further dialogue among projects that had to date not been in conversation with each other. CSVR decided to host a one-day workshop where further dialogue about the topics that emerged from discussions could be pursued. The workshop was an attempt to build on the case studies and the conversations and debates that ensued among initiatives, among researchers and between the two groups. This report details the proceeds of this workshop, held in Cape Town (with 40 participants from 20 organisations nation-wide) on 25 October 2001.

Aims and Objectives

The aims of the workshop were to:

- Debate the terminology of 'reconciliation' as it has come to be used during and after the operations of the TRC – gain insights into current understandings of the terminology at NGO and grassroots level;
- Examine different approaches to (community) reconciliation and related initiatives
utilised by NGOs and survivor support groups in South Africa;

- Assess the context for pursuing (community reconciliation) and facilitation of further engagement/dialogue about the past after the TRC;
- Initiate debate on the objectives and ethics of interventions in the post-apartheid context;
- Promote dialogue among practitioners on how to identify further needs and deal with key challenges in the field; and
- Promote dialogue between practitioners and researchers to improve documentation, impact assessment and research feedback of interventions so as to enable the negotiation of effective collaboration projects.

Pre-workshop Consultations and Input

A group of representatives from various organisations met with the organisers of the workshop in a consultative meeting on 22 August 2001. Some of the key concerns raised at the meeting centred on aspects to do with the ethics of intervention in general; on the question how organisations can form constructive relations with researchers; on the idea of cross-sector dialogue as a valuable outcome; on different understandings of the term 'reconciliation'; on the language of 'reconciliation' as appropriate/inappropriate in the post-TRC context; and on questions of post-intervention follow-up processes. Out of this discussion the programme for the workshop was derived (see Appendix A).

Report-back to Participants

CSVR promised participants that a workshop report would be produced to provide a thorough record of the proceedings.

The workshop began with a panel discussion on reconciliation, which will be published in a separate CSVR newsletter. The speakers were Glenda Wildschutt (Desmond Tutu Leadership Foundation), Regina Mhlomi (Institute for Healing of Memories) and Shirley Gunn (Khulumani Survivor Support Group).

CSVR is also producing a directory of organisations involved in reconciliation work in South Africa (both those who came to the workshop and others involved in similar areas of work).

Small Group Sessions on Reconciliation

The following session (in groups of 5-7 people) was guided by a set of questions, which were posed by the facilitators to reflect on the experiences participants had with the terminology, understandings and uses of 'reconciliation':

- Is reconciliation an appropriate term? In what ways has the TRC process enabled/constrained our work in this respect?
- How has the TRC shaped the term in a way that has influenced intervention processes? How is the term reconciliation understood in the communities where we work?
• What are some of the key challenges for post-TRC reconciliation interventions? Should we be talking about other terms?

In response to these questions, the following headings highlight participants' priority areas of interest and debate:

**In Response to the TRC - Grappling with the Symbolic and the Practical**

Is reconciliation the word for what we would like to see happen? What would we like the outcome to be? And what definition would be appropriate to reach that? Is reconciliation the right word? Healing Peace? Ubuntu? Justice? Any one word? Is it rich enough, inclusive enough?

In the course of discussions many of the small groups grappled with a paradox in the perceptions around the concept of 'reconciliation': If the main aim of the TRC process was not the focus on individual reconciliation (e.g. between victims and their perpetrators) – what then has such a concept as national reconciliation come to mean in practice? How can people make sense of the concept and contribute towards an understanding of reconciliation? It was evident in all discussions that the terminology of reconciliation, though frequently used, has no clear framework of definition, but led participants to speak of a wide range of issues emerging from South Africa's transitional present. People commented that the TRC did not offer concrete guidelines on reconciliation as practice, nor gave room to explore this issue further through ongoing platforms.

Reconciliation can be looked at as a definition of what it means to suffer under apartheid, in terms of education, culture, as family ties, etc. Suffering is not just about gross human rights violation. The TRC looked at gross human rights violations and that is what we care about now. And that makes it hard because there are so many kinds of suffering and so many other ways of suffering. … You have to change how to think of reconciliation. It is not just a thing that happens out of a conflict between two people in this context.

People critiqued the absence of a social conscientisation process to complement the political process of the TRC. Some claimed it seemed like 'a process designed in the absence of those it was meant to serve.' Reconciliation was seen as a religious frame driven politically without asking how communities perceive it. Reconciliation therefore has become a suspended task that never seeped down to community level. In that sense, people found that reconciliation may have served a process of disempowerment, and that there are more boundaries between South Africans now than before. Others warned not to make general statements, but to value the changes that have taken place while remaining critically aware of the enormous task that still lies ahead.

The discussions explored some of what reconciliation has come to mean in people's day-to-day practices. Asking about 'reconciliation on the ground,' participants reported a sense of being confronted with complex human dynamics in which people experience post apartheid realities in vastly differing ways. They also commented on what they found a paradox - the simultaneous sense of change and stagnation.

The good thing is that the TRC has created a space to speak about
reconciliation, but if you speak to ordinary SA, they still have not confronted their own issues around the things. You still hear 'these black people' … and 'these white people'.

From the discussions it is evident that the TRC has created a particular language. When we speak about issues of transformation and change in relation to the apartheid past we use that language. That is positive in the sense that there is language at all in which to speak about issues relating to the apartheid past. And yet, there is a sense that it is often not an appropriate language or that it is inadequate, not a language that opens the possibilities for people to engage and grapple with the ongoing issues but one that leaves them feeling pressured towards closure, towards forgiveness, towards 'letting go and leaving behind'.

Engaging in a one-day workshop on 'reconciliation' was an exercise resting for us on the assumption that it is people who assign meaning to the term/concept and that it can come to signify a host of things. At best, it may be a concept that does not cease to be debated and contested. Many different meanings assigned to reconciliation emerged at the workshop. It seems to be a concept that is useful in that it allows us to talk about many important issues without resolving them or narrowing reconciliation into one singular meaning.

Over and over participants raised the question:
Who is it that is supposed to be reconciled?

Are we talking about:
Reconciliation with oneself?
Reconciliation within communities?
National reconciliation?
Reconciliation between victims and perpetrators?

People questioned the terminology of the TRC in this respect asking: Who are the victims? Who are the perpetrators? They identified these categories as problematic, and particularly, ex-combatants said the TRC defences are unable to capture the complexities of moral life under and in opposition to an oppressive system:

Who is it that is to be reconciled? I don't see two people reconciling. There are the beneficiaries and those who continue to benefit, while others have been robbed of everything, their rights, their lives, etc. So who then is the perpetrator? When I came to the TRC, I appeared as a perpetrator. Yes, I participated in a war, but I do not see myself as a perpetrator. At the TRC there is nothing that motivated me to go for a process of reconciliation. I am busy trying to reconcile with my own self. I am a victim, but in the TRC I was a perpetrator because I was in a situation where I had to return the fire. That was my response to the irregularities of apartheid. Responding to what is wrong, trying to correct it. At the end of the day I am being dubbed as a perpetrator of violence. Who is the victim? Who is the perpetrator? Who is supposed to be reconciled?
Anybody who has lived in SA is a victim in a sense, whether you knew what happened or you didn't know or you were raped or tortured or whatever. You were a victim if you could not apply for a job that you would have liked. You were victim if you had to stay in a small shanty house in a township where you couldn't afford elsewhere, if you had to carry a pass.

Another point of critique centred on the sense of closure inherent in the terminology of reconciliation:

One of the flaws of the TRC was to lead us to believe that we have arrived, we have done it and we get interest from all over the world and we possibly think that we have arrived. But do we have the capacity to get there? We need to start living in different ways, start seeing each other in a different way. If you do not try very hard you will never know, especially the older generation. The TRC dumped us with knowledge and then thought we are reconciled. No way.

Finally, participants asked critically about the purposes of reconciliation as a strategy for long-term transformation and questioned whether it may divert attention from more concrete issues:

The TRC has done a couple of disservices to nation building. It has linked truth to reconciliation when its slogan said 'Truth, the road to reconciliation', and secondly, it has linked reconciliation to storytelling, which is also a major flaw because it doesn't mean that if you are telling your story that you are reconciling. It is important that people are able to hear and able to relate to the story. As a beneficiary in this country who seriously benefited, I think reconciliation and the TRC have bought time. Because if we think about where we were in 1994, it was on the brink of civil war and the TRC was the strategy. It pulled us away from the specific, by all the international acclaim it got of how wonderful it all was. So in Cape Town, where we live, we go back and we have the same old South Africa.

Building Relationships – But How?

Several discussion groups centred on the appropriate-ness of the term re-conciliation in the sense of people 'coming together again'. Some participants suggested using the term 'conciliation' instead.

Grappling with the term is very important. The 're-' [in reconciliation] means going back to something that existed, so there might have been a relationship that broke up. But in terms of our country's history, what kind of relationship was that and do we want to go back to that? Often there was no relationship, or nothing that could be called a relationship, so it is not returning that we would wish for. It is not appropriate. Common usage [of the term] in other parts of the world is not the understanding we are coming from. I would question the use of the word, or we give it our own meaning.

Participants debated what is desirable 'at a human level' about the perceptions of reconciliation, for example the aspect of breaking segregation.
Segregation undermines society. But often there is a link between reconciliation and reconstruction. In South Africa it is not like we had a war, and now it has to be restored to what it was. We have never been together. It is a distortion of our past that there once was an ideal way that needs to be rediscovered.

People conveyed agreement that there can be no return to a pre-defined relationship, but that it involves a hard process of negotiating to define what reconciliation in fact means. Participants emphasized that people in SA have not yet defined what they want their future relationships to be like, or how to transform them, whether they be:

- inter-racial
- inter-communal
- interpersonal
- or professional

South African society was described as 'more complex and comprising many more fragmentations' than other societies. Emphasis was placed on the fact that people still 'do not know each other across racial lines', and that they do not experience cross-racial social relations as an everyday 'normal thing'.

There is no template for what people are trying to create here – what the future as a non-segregated society should look like, what that means.

* 

There were many unrealistic expectations around the work of the TRC [in this regard]. I think reconciliation and the interpersonal things cannot come from top down. We cannot legislate that, and we have to take critical note that we come from a society where we have been told what to do all the time – 'blacks there, whites there' – 'that is wrong and that's right'. That is a hell of a hangover for us, it imparts on the way we think and it imparts on the way we interact.

Participants named 'building trust' and sharing stories as key elements in defining what 'having a relationship could mean in the post-apartheid context. Some spoke about 'making it conscious' that relations are not self-evident.

Personal experiences now speak of the quality of relationships between different people, not just about encounter but also about the nature of that encounter, the quality of that encounter.

**Making Meaning, Making Sense – Reflecting on Culture, Identity and Change**

My culture has been devalued, so how do you reconcile with somebody who has always presumed their culture is superior and then comes back now and say we can reconcile. The word reconciliation is not appropriate.

Several people pointed to the idea that reconciliation was conceived as an essentially Western and a Christian concept. At the same time it was clear that it is a concept onto which people projected their ideas, their desires and hopes for change in South Africa. The
concern of coming together after conflict, of choosing an alternative to revenge was identified as common to many cultures in South Africa. Participants shared examples of rituals used traditionally in times of conflict in their families and communities. But they also asked – for all of us, which are appropriate? Making amends and offering restoration was described as part of ‘coming back together’ in most traditions. It was an element found to be a grave shortage of the TRC process, not only in terms of reparations, but in terms of a general understanding (or more lack of awareness) of redistribution as part of healing and reconciliation.

Survivors talked about their assumption that perpetrators at the TRC would be remorseful and willing to make amends – and their surprise when they did not do so. They pointed to a lack of cultural sensitivity that created misunderstandings (among other factors): the victims were surprised and shocked when they were met with the forces of the legal system. The alienation and lack of clarifications with regard to the amnesty process was pointed out repeatedly in this respect.

People also spoke about how post apartheid transformation has challenged identities, how people have felt under threat by the rapid changes. They also commented on 'victim' and 'perpetrator' as diffuse identities, which have lumped people together in categories they do not subscribe to and that have yet political currency, negating the complexities of the roles social actors played during apartheid as well as the many identity formations that existed alongside each other in 'communities'.

Participants identified it as an issue for ongoing consideration who constructs identity and who benefits from keeping people locked within certain (apartheid) identities, especially in terms of race?

Beyond Race?

The complexities of the definitions of victims and perpetrators, sketched earlier impacted on perceptions of who benefited from apartheid, and consequently, who should reconcile. This was relevant especially when the discussion came to the question of beneficiaries. Several dynamic conversations ensued at the workshop between participants who saw themselves as beneficiaries and victims, and as perpetrators and victims simultaneously, of which the following examples speak for themselves:

We need to discuss the actual term; it is problematic. For instance, I don't understand - whom will I reconcile with? On which basis do we reconcile? They [white South Africans] benefited and then came out and said let us reconcile. (Insertion from a white participant in the group: 'People benefited but they were also affected.') It's true but black and white fought each other (Insertion: 'We were also affected by the liberation struggle. My daughter was killed.') Yes. (Insertion: 'So whom do I reconcile with? I also need to reconcile. Who do I need to reconcile?') Did you go to the TRC? ('Yes.' ...) I understand very well that apartheid did not only affect black people. I agree you are also a victim, but who brought this system that ended up killing and damaging the souls and lives of South Africa's people? It is the white man.
We decided we would be our own institution and got into tourism as a way of opening ground for this reconciliation. But the people who came to us are mainly from abroad. No white South Africans like to get into Crossroads – why? Who do we need to reconcile with? We need to memorialise our people. But white South Africans do not take the opportunity, do not come and honour the sacrifice we made on their behalf, only the people from overseas come. So there is no reconciliation.

When I was young I often woke up from shouting and the police came and we ran. I used to learn that there is no such person as a white, the white is not a person, they are not really human beings. I hated them. Whites also learned that. So now we need to learn personally that it is not so because to be a community, it starts with you, to go out to the streets, you go to the community. Each person needs that education in equality. It is not a matter of colour but it needs to encompass all, all generations as well.

Reconciliation is something we attempt in the church: how to bring differences together, people from diverse backgrounds coming together. That is racial, for example a white church community and black church community. How can we integrate the racial differences?

I ideas of 'people mixing' and cross-racial interaction as a form of repair of relationships were mentioned, yet people commented how poverty ruptures such an idealistic process: 'The question of sharing of resources comes up all the time.' The challenges of making interactions meaningful and sustainable enough to translate into relationship is not resolved by reconciliation as it is applied, rather the opposite.

For me as a white South African reconciliation is a very comfortable word, it lets me off everything. So we can talk about it, it is a very neutralising word and it very often does not allow an encounter. It immediately leads into the conceptual direction of: 'Ja we're all the same and we have all been victims of the past.' The coming to terms with what it is like to be a white South African, a black South African, whatever perspective we hold, reconciliation doesn't even touch on that, that's a major problem.

Why should white people bother to engage? They have no story to tell no reason to heal.

The Politics of Forgiveness

Many comments made by participants revolved around the concept of forgiveness. People
asked about the ways in which forgiveness and reconciliation were linked through the TRC process, questioning particularly how individual acts of forgiveness were taken as substitutes or indicators of 'national reconciliation'. The politics around forgiveness in the practices of the TRC were seen to have conflated many things under the heading of 'forgiveness'. Participants said that the TRC proved unable to decipher what people (victims) who came to testify might have wanted their gestures to mean, and interpreted them as 'forgiving'. They also criticized the TRC's assumptions around the needs and agendas of survivors as 'false homogeneity'.

Many of the survivors present were critical of the repercussions of perceptions that they 'had forgiven their perpetrators' at the TRC hearings. Their day-to-day experiences seem to suggest a more complex picture. Some reported how they have been frequently meeting their torturers on the streets who greet them as if nothing happened. They are not protected; there was a sense of ongoing violation and interactions not taking place on the victims' terms. In a social sense the feeling was that those who benefited from and perpetrated apartheid dictated reconciliation at the TRC.

Even if I were to decide on reconciliation, it would have to be on my terms. How I relate to him was shaped differently [at the TRC]. It was like - because we are in the process of reconciliation and healing it means you are buddies or friends and we want you together. I felt powerless. I wasn't in control of this process, somebody else was. It was really disempowering. It was not on my terms. It was like – reconcile? Oh, we are buddies now. But to actually reconcile, on my terms, on my terms would have been different. If I do not want to speak to you, accept that. I need to draw some lines, boundaries that you cannot cross. But in this process there were no boundaries, it was like – not my process.

In the sense of the above many survivors of violations present at the workshop felt that reconciliation was made cheap by the TRC and that many South Africans treat reconciliation as if it has already taken place, 'as if it were a closed process, finished and over and done with while the perpetrators received golden handshakes'.

Another point mentioned repeatedly was the fact that there was no opportunity for victim to oppose amnesty, a very bitter point. In short, someone said: 'the TRC forgave the perpetrators.' Survivors felt that the amnesty hearings destroyed any sense of dignity derived from the hearings on gross human rights violations.

Reconciliation became linked with amnesty, which was the goal and that is why the TRC process was so flawed. The perpetrators went and applied for amnesty, only if they were implicated. Our relationships are unchanged. Who gains? On whose terms are relationships supposed to be built? Power relations are very important because often the perpetrators is not asking forgiveness from the victim and only speak via their lawyers. If reconciliation is about coming to terms with what I have done to you, it has to be me who comes to you. The power to forgive was with the Commissioners - it was through giving amnesty, which was given by the amnesty committee. The truth was not told for the victims, but for a legal process, it was not for the perpetrators to be vulnerable. The victims were taking the risk and humbling themselves, they were not
speaking via lawyers.

Participants agreed that one of the dangers of reconciliation was in its association with closure. When someone asked if reconciliation was not mainly an issue concerning the churches or the churches' responsibility, others responded that in many church congregations and communities of faith they had been met with the response: 'We have dealt with that. Reconciliation has happened.' The danger of closure remains if reconciliation is seen as a given while many of the emerging dynamics and problems have not been addressed.

The Need for Healing Remains

These atrocities are indelible in the social mind. At the TRC people were unable to differentiate what was reconciliation, what was reconciled there. These atrocities are too difficult to cope with, so the TRC undermined the pain that remained indelible in the normal social lives of people.

Participants raised the questions of continuity in dealing with the legacies of apartheid. Healing is an ongoing process and needs to be placed before reconciliation. Several said through its discourse on national reconciliation the TRC made practical reconciliation a premature issue for many who are still suffering the consequences of apartheid's economic deprivation. Reconciliation as a paradigm served to disconnect present conflict from past suffering.

For people who were involved nothing is changed. Then someone else jumps up and says healing is not tied to monetary values. But how can you talk about reconciliation without nothing to eat, no work, no safe space, no sense of self-worth, no sense of community participation, but great isolation? Can we then talk about reconciliation in such a situation? The conflicts that emerge go like this: 'I stole 20 Rands from you to buy some bread and, by the way, I bought myself a bottle of wine, too.' We have to look at underlying causes, not just current events.

Participants agreed that there still is a great need for ongoing healing process encompassing a broad spectrum of South Africans after the TRC. Many elements around issues of justice and restoration have not been addressed and deter the possibilities of healing. Survivors commented on being engaged in an ongoing search to 'make sense of what happened to me', searching for alternatives to therapy. Others commented on the need for voicing anger, for spaces in which to be angry, where strong anger can be expressed and need not be followed by forgiveness and reconciliation.

Anger and hatred are realities, ignoring them does not help. People are struggling and perpetrators are walking free in wealth. We need to deal with the consequences of dehumanisation, the feelings of inferiority, worthlessness, despair, and being damaged.

Participants painted a more complex picture of the obstacles to healing in the post-TRC set-up. Socio-economic assistance for survival, poverty alleviation is the aspect mentioned
foremost, but it is not disconnected from issues of addressing the 'legacies of dehumanisation'. Material and psychosocial needs are part of the same challenge - to now function in a 'new dispensation' that has no patience or respect for damage and thus perpetuates it.

Storytelling emerged as one element in the process that 'has truly helped', but participants found that it has become essentialised as 'the healing tool'. Someone commented that 'it is only one aspect that people found meaningful in specific contexts and moments, it is mainly a sense of purpose that people are missing, purpose in life and means to make your own survival.' The issues of healing through narrating memories and healing through socio-economic empowerment are often presented in terms of 'either – or', yet participants commented that they need to be integrated in interventions:

The support groups helped. People hear the story and the next one hears it and people become healed that way. But the question of the children remains. So people bring the Bible and come with the religious way – God will be there and he will judge us according to our work done on earth. But then they are told to reconcile, but they haven't got a space for that. The churches are doing good work, but the issue remains – how do I survive?

The issue of socio-economic deprivation and inequality was the one that participants returned to most frequently in the debates.

On Reparations and Repair

The question of reparations was one raised by the survivors, ex-combatants, ex-political prisoners from several self-help and support groups. Their expectations of and frustration with the government dominated several discussion groups:

The government has done nothing for us. We are still living under the apartheid regime, the office has shifted but the system has not. Some say they are suffering more than under apartheid.

The government should make the perpetrators contribute, and then people would reconcile – skills, small businesses funding, to sell something. The government is one of democracy but only in theory. We see some in government; there are perpetrators and getting big packages. They do not even make a fund for victims. They know these things; ome of them know me and were there with me in the past, but now they are in parliament busy making money.

For the support groups advocacy work and lobbying government is a priority to which they also invite others to shift their focus. Survivors present made the experiences of suffering, deprivation and pain that many South Africans are faced with every day tangible in the comfortable space of the workshop.

You can't go and say you forgive when you are hungry. People see this guy driving this lovely vehicle and I am hungry. How can they have so much? You know when you are hungry you can't think. I was so hungry in prison. I am so
hungry now. My friends, you cannot even think.

Some of the NGO facilitators commented on their experiences when implementing support programmes: 'People now simply want money for bread. They may not immediately see the value of long-term thinking and planning for development.'

The overwhelming material needs, the need to battle poverty and fight for survival was pointed out as the biggest obstacle to healing and peace in SA. It seemed a paradox that those disadvantaged are still struggling most and the need for further re-integration assistance for struggle veterans and survivors was stressed, also the issue of general financial assistance for those too damaged to function in social terms.

The pressure to move on with the nation-building process is negating the powers that control the lives of ordinary people and sweeping unresolved issues under the carpet. It is very frustrating for people who have lost so much, not only their dignity, but also their ability to make a living for themselves in the post-conflict period. They are now unable to. It is very difficult for the people to sit and watch how the rest of society carries on with their lives and have totally forgotten that they experienced what they experienced as a result of the decision they made to contribute to the kind of society we are now, and aspire to.

In the discussions it was pointed out that the term 'reparations' has many meanings assigned to it as well. Socio-economic needs are most pressing but do not stand in isolation from the non-material needs. There was a message to NGOs that different programmes need to collaborate to meet the needs of disadvantaged communities and groups of survivors. Participants asked: 'What does 'restoring dignity' really mean for people? It means much more than telling your story. It is also about education and training, about a sense of self-worth and purpose.' However, participants agreed that the efficiency of interventions focusing on the 'non-material' side of healing depended on basic needs being covered.

One of the things that strike me as we speak is that we are saying that it needs to be a personal process from the bottom up, but for that to happen the conditions need to be suitable. I need to have a job, I need to have a way of supporting myself and basic human rights, so I think part of reconciliation is fostering the process of putting the social, political, economic conditions in place. And if you don't, you won't have reconciliation in the short while, it may be a dream only.

Community Processes – Accepting Damage and Attempting Healing

Several discussion groups debated to what extent healing interventions should focus on individuals. Some questioned if people necessarily experienced themselves as individuals in need of healing or see themselves as part of a broader collective, through which they may or may not claim damage. Participants identified the communal level as the one where most needs to be done and where least is being done at present. They critiqued the NGO sector as often focusing on individuals or specific groups, such as survivors of violations. A debate ensued about how to define 'community' as a concept. Communities are complex entities. They should not be lumped together as politically and socially homogenous
There are such diverse experiences within groups, racial and communal – who the hell is the community? – It is a myth of homogeneity of a group that would have the same interests, the same emphasis and the same needs. That myth needs to be dispelled.

Communities remain fragmented. There is a sense of pervasive damage, of broken-ness, but it is not addressed or discussed openly in most cases. Somebody called it a gap of forgetting between past and present referring to the lack of respect reported by veterans of the armed liberation struggle: 'There is no sense of respect for damaged people, no time and patience for our brokenness.'

People also commented on the notion of 'hierarchies of suffering' having been created in communities through the TRC process where some claim – 'I am more of a victim than you, so and so suffered worse.'

The question of community processes of healing and restoration was raised as an open-ended reminder:

The process was right for the whites - we forgive them. That is how it was in the TRC - all are forgiven, it's forgotten, and now we must get on with our lives. It is not thought about in terms of rebuilding relations in our communities, but along the racial divide. It is necessary to rebuild relations in our communities – but how? People turn against each other? We also need a national process in this regard – but not in terms of reconciliation. What about physical locations where there is tension?

Finally, the question of the cultural meanings (or lack thereof) of 'reconciliation' was raised again with emphasis when participants spoke about their experiences in implementing interventions in 'communities'.

We need to reverse the process from top down to bottom up. We need to redefine the term reconciliation, and look for what is culturally appropriate in communities that have suffered. They are in a better position to say – for me this is what reconciliation is, what it means for people. … Take the cases where community members were burned as impimpis. What does reconciliation mean in communities like that, where such incidents happened? People are still living in those communities. Going back to the scene, having names cleared, having the children looked after – these are concrete needs. All these are part of a healing process.

**Interventions and the Future - Who Is Civil Society?**

Touching upon the practices of implementation of interventions in the field of activities related to 'reconciliation' (i.e. concerned with issues of the apartheid past and legacies of conflict) the question of antagonism and competition between different organizations was raised. Participants saw the role of NGOs as not taking over government's responsibilities while holding government accountable, and to create, facilitate and support pilot processes.
Participants explored possibilities for working together among their organisations, and discussed possibilities and obstacles in past collaborations they experienced. These centred on competition over funding, different ideologies, different constituencies, etc: 'We should stop pretending that we do not have differences, part of the problem is not wanting to confront our differences. It is appropriate to compete.' Concerns were also raised about the ethics of intervention:

I think we have to be very ethical and self-critical in relation to the way in which we write funding proposals saying that we are 'doing reconciliation', but it may just be really a nice set of words said in relation to getting money from foreign funders. So we need to be very aware.

The question of sustainability of interventions was raised. We should not be 'a fly-by-night circus like the TRC where everybody comes, but then nothing happens beyond that.' There was awareness that different communities have different needs and therefore individual responses are needed. NGOs have a role, yet they are often not coordinating among themselves and could be more effective. The question of the transformation of institutions and institutional cultures in NGOs came up.

Consensus existed among participants that interventions in future may work towards offering what someone called a 'package for reconciliation' adding other workshops and services to interventions aimed at healing, and taking care 'not just leave people with the emotions and no means to survive'. Some pointed out ironically, the danger when intervention's potential design works against the objectives of organisations:

People are tired of the national propaganda of reconciliation. They say 'Yes, there are still issues …' but they don't respond. So who is driving the reconciliation agenda? In another way maybe it can still be 'sold' to the communities, maybe as diversity, or anti-racism, transformation, moral reconstruction, but then those terms are not taken seriously anymore either.

Deferring Outcomes - Processes of Dialogue

If I just see you and we happen to share does that mean that that's okay or compulsory. Having come to the meeting does not mean that I am automatically forgiving. The fact that we are talking does not mean that I am forgiving; it is not automatic.

* 

What does it mean to try and define reconciliation, and is that a valuable exercise to have a singular definition for reconciliation? … That raises the question what does it mean to say there is no definition? And is that a situation that we have moved into, where all of us have a different definition of reconciliation and some of those can be reconciled with one another and some can't, and thus the term comes to mean everything and nothing at the same time.

Emerging from the discussions and their sometimes-chaotic nature was that people have not found a common language yet in which to talk about issues of change and transformation.
There exists the need to ensure understanding all the time. The question of the common ground upon which to have a conversation was raised and people pointed out that the beginning of a conversation may be to accept that reconciliation is not a reality, and that it may not happen at all, and that people should not begin a conversation with the expectation that reconciliation is the outcome. Talking about reconciliation in such a context can then become one way of grappling with and commenting on the changes participants experienced. Participants identified the notion of dialogue as itself being a value. Critical thoughts voiced were that many day-to-day practices in SA do not reflect reconciliation.

TRC was a lovely big event. But now people say they have moved on. People say they have made a statement, apologised and moved on. It is something now in the past. They are forgetting that for most it is just actually the beginning, realising that there has been a problem at all. And something begins to happen. In most denominations we work with people would say: 'We have dealt with reconciliation. We were in this major conference, we apologised and 'boom' - close the case. People say let's move on with the future.

Participants also identified a need for an open-ended conversation not only about the meanings of reconciliation, but also about the meaning of creating a society together in the context of apartheid's multiple legacies of division.

Are people willing to engage in debate? What does constructive debate mean? What are areas where we may not want to engage?

*  

Cape Town is such a divided city. I look at Cape Town and I think that 1994 has not even come, in a town where racism is so rampant; you cannot believe it is 2001. Whites are coming from all over SA into this lovely haven, which is CPT where people can divide themselves racially as much as they want. The whites are building themselves places of comfort where they don't have to interact with anybody. They live in their lovely small townships where they can buy everything; they can work there, live there, whatever they want. So we are heading into a situation where we are completely divided in the future. So if we really want reconciliation here, that means dealing with major things. The economy cannot be delayed, people like Pam Golding who in the end decide who lives where. We tried to find a place coming from Durban, and there was a nice place, lovely complex. And they told us: 'No it is sold out.' When we knew very well that it is just that they have agreed with everyone who is buying that they'll make sure that we maintain this 'in the colour we'd like to have here'. So it is practising apartheid at the end of the day.

Participants pointed out certain complex issues which needed further discussion: The paradox between the need to forget as healing and the need to keep memory alive as healing, the need to commemorate and mourn and the need to make a living and move on from the past. People commented on the great value of the TRC providing an opening in time after which issues of the apartheid past can be spoken about.
The TRC has, to an extent, taken away the fear of speaking of these past things at all, the sense of being afraid that there might be impimpis (informers). For the first time in our lives the nation is asking us – sit there and speak, that in itself is a huge deal! Before people would not speak to you about that because once you opened you mouth about the government - Down you would go. So that is a crucial impact – I am now able to criticise the government. It is unbelievable I can do that.

Thematic Discussions

The afternoon comprised of five small groups engaging participants in discussion about specific focal areas that practitioners and audiences of interventions had identified as problematic in the consultations before the workshop. The discussions were very lively, and there was a general sense that time was too short and that the issues raised should be discussed further and in more depth.

Addressing the Needs of Victims, Perpetrators, Beneficiaries, Ex-Combatants

Guiding questions:

- Which groups do our programmes target/exclude?
- What transformation needs does each group have?
- How do we engage these needs?
- Do we address the relationships between these different groups?

Discussants in this group were mainly survivors of apartheid violence who are currently engaged in support groups and self-run economic projects. Many commented on the multitude of continuities of apartheid with which they are faced in daily life. One example mentioned several time evolved around present-day interactions with perpetrators of violations:

How do you face the person that tortured you – how do you face the guy? When I see him in the street, how should I react? When I am in one room with him, I am afraid if this person says something I am going to blow my top. … That's why we need counselling. I know I could stand up and kill the guy, and at the end of the day I will end up in prison.

The frustration of seeing former perpetrators alive and well enhances the feeling of being 'left behind' by all those who benefited from the transition in the country.

The victims they have got nothing!! The perpetrators are living the same lives or better as before, the new government is doing fine, but we who fought for this democracy we don't enjoy it. They enjoy now what we fought for.

People also pointed out the many expectations that the TRC process raised for people who are still destitute today and whose needs have not been met.

I need an operation now and have lots of health problems. The TRC does not
provide for that, health care, for our children. People ask – 'why did you go to
the TRC, you got nothing, they just wanted your story but what have you got?'
People are getting angry.

The discussion further evolved around the complexities of groupings subsumed under the
heading of 'victims' and centred on the fact that the term conflates the diversity of existing
needs. Urgent cases of despair are not given attention because of this as well. The need for
further advocacy work with regard to reparations was emphasized repeatedly.

**Community Engagement and Outreach Strategies**

Guiding questions:

- How do we inform individuals and communities about our services?
- How do we recruit participants for our workshops?
- Should reconciliation initiatives do more to publicise or educate communities about
  our services?
- How much local interest/demand is there for our interventions/training?
- Should community engagement be pursued only through relationships with locally
  based organisations?

The discussion here grappled with some self-reflexive questions for NGOs and their
interventions. Someone asked:

We do many workshops, but their effectiveness is in question. Do we really reach people?
Do they have a meaningful experience through our interventions or do we just do them for
a job?

Participants spoke about the significance of carefully choosing entry and exit point for an
intervention. They warned of raising expectations that could not be met. Aims of a project
need to be clearly defined and they need to be clearly communicated to the target audience.
People who will participate in the intervention need to be informed around timeframes,
proposed outcomes and expectations. Many practitioners advised the building of long-term
relationships with community structures and individuals who participate in the
interventions. They stressed the importance of building capacity during the intervention so
that communities can continue the work themselves with many advocating a proactive and
developmental approach. Finally, the group debated the usefulness of protocol and
respecting existing community structures and ways of operation, especially of intervening
as outsiders.

We need to follow community protocol and structures. It matters a lot who you are working
with. People from the outside often do not understand the dynamics within the community.
Outside interventions often focus on individuals - that is what the NGOs receive money for,
not to really involve communities. But that is where more of our focus should lie.

**Local versus Foreign Intervention Models**

Guiding questions:
• What have we borrowed from foreign intervention models?
• What have we borrowed from our own South African traditional practices?
• What have we invented for ourselves?
• Do we need to be more guided by local needs and practices?

This discussion group proved to be one of the most engaging and in-depth debates. Participants shared about many cultural practices in South Africa that impact on interventions, but that are often not recognized as relevant to the intervention work of NGOs. They commented on the complexities of integrating what is seen as specifically 'Western' and 'African' approaches in resolving conflict and handling post-conflict situations. Yet they also said that in most cases the target groups of interventions (i.e. 'communities') are combining and balancing elements of both traditions all the time.

We use our own rituals anyways, washing with water, slaughtering a cow. We work with the spirits, so that they would tell us what is happening. There is a need to respect cultural practices in resolving conflict.

* 

So a mix of Western and African practices is nothing unusual, to incorporate this. In African tradition there is also talking, but it is not like counselling. The old shaman has a power of talking. He has the power of prayer while doing the ritual. He is helping the young ones to come back together because that anger from killing is still there, and he is helping to get that anger out.

* 

For us the professionals are those who can talk to spirits. That is very important. But what about the psychologists who come? How can they be made to understand?

* 

We are using the counselling, which is the Western approach. But what is the counselling? Psychotherapy? … We also try to integrate rituals, not in such a way like slaughtering, but using images and candles. We talk about a circle of light, about cycles from birth to childhood to adulthood to death. When we tell stories, we light candles to commemorate the dead. So there is something for people who go to church and also for those who don't.

* 

Such aspects can be incorporated in interventions. These things happen anyways, but people [from NGOs] should be aware of things other than counselling. So the counselling helps, but the people there also give you pills, which I don't like. So I am using both methods.

The discussion touched upon the cultural destruction that apartheid perpetrated. People
pointed out the need to integrate traditional elements from various South African cultural practices into interventions to meet the needs of target groups. The discussion grappled with the challenges how one may combine elements when working with diverse cultural (and racial) groups. Affirming African practices was also seen as a means of empowerment for communities and for interveners.

People now are starting to take their African culture more seriously. Before it was put away from themselves, but now we are realising the richness and we are finding our way back, even though we grew up learning that [our practices and ways] are not good. That is why we are now going to the sangoma. If you have a problem that is where you go, even people who would not go there before.

Finally, the group debated ways in which cultural elements could be made an integral part of academic and practical training for interveners who get educated in Western traditions and practices such as psychology.

In South Africa, if you get trained as a psychologist you don't get trained in cultures. The only time you learn about culture is when you talk about the esoteric things. It is something out there - we don't talk about that in psychology. That is strange, isn't it? I was at university ten years ago, it might have changed; but then you didn't hear about ways of healing and talking in an African way, you only learn about one way.

Participants also emphasised the dynamic nature of cultures, especially in a place and time of transition. They questioned the impact this has on intervention work, resulting in demands for flexibility and careful listening and learning.

Life is difficult and complex in our times. The way things used to happen 20 years back is so much changed. There is not enough time to talk about these issues. What is foreign, what is western – how do we bring it together? There is a lot of talk about it – but what does it actually mean?

The group ended on an optimistic note saying that interveners from different cultural groups should listen to and teach each other to change the imbalances of a still dominating set of European and North American approaches and theoretical models:

We need to be more guided by local intervention measures that are already happening, but be respectful. We are becoming more sensitive to what people need, but we are not there yet. We do not really understand enough, many of us, but we are beginning to listen and then can adapt the interventions.

The Relationship between Research and Intervention

Guiding questions:

• What kind of research has been useful for intervention programmes and what have been the benefits?
• What makes for a constructive relationship between researchers and practitioners?
• How can practitioners gain more access to and control over research?
• How can researchers be more responsive to practitioner needs?

The Ethics of Intervention

• What is the moral basis for our intervention?
• What benefits do our work hold for targeted groups?
• Who are we as practitioners and what gives us the right to do this work?
• What is an appropriate relationship between practitioners and supposed beneficiaries?
• What form of accountability can be built into our interventions?

The two topics above were combined into one group because of their interconnectedness. Participants pointed out the importance of the relations between research and practice, and the need to consider both from an ethical viewpoint.

Practitioners benefit from research. Documentation is important. Most work we do is informed by European schools [of thought], and we need to fit things into situations that are not nearly fit for the circumstances [in other countries] that the models were made for. So we need research to adapt the models, and consciously reflect on those experiences. And we need practice to adapt those models as we go along. We need an active relationship between research and intervention.

People debated at length what kinds of research could be useful, and what constructive relationships between researchers and practitioners could look like. They shared a variety of creative options from their current intervention work, ranging from creating jobs for ex-political prisoners as data collectors and authors of conference papers to using trail journals and video as both research and intervention tools. All agreed that there can be very fruitful relations between researchers and intervention projects, but that such relations need careful consideration, negotiation and time (that may often not be available).

Participants also pointed out the need for interventions designed to meet the 'real needs' of its target audience to be ethical, which in turn requires ongoing research to ensure monitoring, evaluation, and if needed, adjustment. Conveying soft skills like conflict resolution or offering workshops that focus on healing individual trauma often needs to go hand in hand with hard skills training and empowerment as well as with creating concrete opportunities for participants in the formal economy.

There was emphasis on the need for long-term relations and trust building for research to be effective and useful to those researched. Participants cautioned about assumptions that feeding into broader evaluation processes is enough to justify research (which is in itself an intervention) – those with whom research is conducted need to see more direct benefits like a transfer of skills and the opening of opportunities to participate in research processes in a role that is more than being a subject of academic interest.

It was acknowledged that there are few people in interventions currently who meet the double challenge of being both good practitioners and researchers. Even if one has skills in both fields, the operational processes require a different distance or closeness to the actual
intervention process, which can make 'action research' difficult. Shortages of capacity to think through and also document processes in NGOs lead to a range of ethical dilemmas, foremost the one whether one should put most energy into meeting urgent needs or invest in the 'luxury' of sitting back to reflect on the actual intervention process.

Clarifying Intervention Outcomes

Guiding questions:

- How do we assess whether we are effective in delivering a useful service?
- What change do our interventions facilitate?
- What individual and community changes are we pursuing?
- What are measurable indicators of change? What process/instruments do we use to measure these indicators?

The discussion evolved around similar issues to the one on ethics outlined above. The areas of intervention work that could be seen as 'related' to reconciliation in the broader sense are vast (trauma work, reconciliation intervention, healing work, conflict resolution, support groups, empowerment programmes, gender projects) and the links between different fields, objectives and practices need to be explored further. People agreed that the main aim of most interventions is to affect and to assist with transformation of people, institutions and communities. A challenge is that interventions are often aimed at evoking change while at the same time trying to assist people with coping with the changes of transition. The balance is often between offering platforms and means for challenging the status quo while at the same time assisting individuals and deprived communities with stabilising their (violent and unstable) environments. It is good that NGOs set different priorities for themselves, but there is not enough communication about where and when they could complement each other and when they should beware of copying each other's processes.

Like in several other groups, the discussion had a focal point on the question whether to prioritise intervention work centring on socio-economic upliftment or that aimed at conveying 'soft skills' and dealing with psychosocial issues. People agreed that the two aspects be integrated.

The flipside is if you are not doing the kind of work we do [soft skills and healing] and only focus on economics and creating jobs. There are lots of people who went through trauma who are given opportunities, but they cannot make use of them. They can't maintain work; they cannot maintain relations with their colleagues. The two processes [of healing and economic empowerment] need to go together.

Yet people also commented that processes addressing individual elements of intervention still happen too much in isolation of one another, and do not make joint use of their capacity. They also commented on the legacies of apartheid divisions that are still present in organisations.

It is about working with identity because we were such a segregated institution for so long, it is very hard to break out of that mould of habit. The way it was run, almost along military lines. And again it is hard to encourage people to take ownership of their identity. Many of
the black people think it was a white-run institution. We just happened to take orders in any case. Now we find a lot of it is changing, but many things are so engrained. Even when it is break time or teatime you stick to your groups because you are more comfortable. So even though structurally it is different now, socially it is not, and culturally that stuff is still there.

Participants also emphasised the need for setting clear aims in order to evaluate interventions effectively. Critique was levelled at 'quick feedback on how wonderful it all went' that often remains superficial at the end of a workshop and does not allow for conclusions about the impacts of workshop interventions. Self-criticality of interveners and the ability to question one's impact are needed. At the same time people pointed out the difficulties of measuring something as complex as personal change, healing and reconciliation. They stressed the importance of designing processes with multiple opportunities for follow-up, space to 'digest and reflect' and further interventions measures, rather than once-off events. It remains a question to be asked throughout intervention processes:

What are indicators of long-term change for the better?

Building Sustainability and Linkages

Guiding questions:

- How do we ensure that our interventions provide sustainable change?
- When are one-off interventions appropriate?
- What kind of linkages should be developed between reconciliation and income generating programmes?
- How can programmes better link up to provide a more integrative service?

One of the key problems identified by this discussion group was that many interventions manage to create an arena in which participants can experiment and experiences alternatives to their everyday experiences. At the same time they mostly return into an unchanged and often unfavourable environment in which the positive effects of the intervention are often difficult to sustain in the face of economic hardship and ongoing violence and conflict.

If you set a reconciliation agenda, then you cannot move in and out but have to build sustainability into the programme. We were blamed in the past, rightfully so, that we come and go and leave people bruised. So now there is more follow-up. That is very important.

The dilemma of affecting a faster pace of transformation at individual level while the social realities of many people remain untouched is not easy to resolve.

We do hard skills training, but also the challenge is that the economy is not structured so that it can absorb endless income generating activities. How many women can you have selling boerewors until you have a fight? How many crafters? And you need a high level of skills to participate in the formal economy, so what are we really talking about when we say 'income generating activities'?
Participants once more emphasised the need for strong partnerships among NGOs in facilitating many-faceted interventions, but also pointed to the existence of competition and mistrust as elements preventing collaborations.

We keep on saying we must try and work together but we are not even resolving our own differences and competitions, so it is just talk. What are the obstacles preventing collaboration? - Competition for resources, real and perceived. The fact that we don't even understand our own roles in the bigger scheme of things is a problem. We need to understand that we are only one factor in civil society. We need a better understanding of our responsibilities in relation to those of other actors, for examples the churches and their responsibilities or the government's responsibilities. We need to know: this is where we slot in and this is our specific contribution into the larger game. This is our niche and these are all the other players and we can link with them, whether they it is the state, NGOs, CBOS etc. Different roles are not clearly discussed and spelled out.

NGOs need platforms for dialogue to build these relationships. We assume that it will happen by itself because we often work in the field of facilitating the relationship building of others, but it doesn't happen. – There are as many issues and anxieties among us as with other relations that need to be build in South Africa.

Another problem mentioned were shortages of capacity and resources in most interventions where few skilled people run many processes at once. People pointed out that it is very important not to compromise on thorough follow-up processes as part of good intervention designs.

Feedback and Commentary

A CSVR intern, Thomas Helmberger interviewed 20 workshop participants to assess their experience of the workshop. What follows is a summary of their feedback.

What did the Workshop Achieve?

Most of the interviewees mentioned the great opportunity of having together a wide range of organisations and practitioners working in the same field. This allowed, on the one hand, to get to know more closely what others are doing (struggling perhaps with the same issues, exchange of experience) and marked, on the other hand, the "good beginning of a process" in which organisations might try to collaborate more closely and maybe align and co-ordinate their working fields more. The probable benefit of this emerging platform of networking is also reflected in what people suggested as follow up (see below).

The focus on reconciliation led to a re-evaluation of the concept of the various participants. While some stressed that they were re-thinking their personal understanding of reconciliation, many others expressed that their eyes were opened towards the fact, that there are many different ideas of reconciliation prevailing in South Africa (who reconciles
with whom? what about the intimidation in KwaZulu-Natal? etc.)

Some highlighted the interesting panel discussion in the morning. Many found the group discussions in the afternoon very fruitful – and difficult to decide which to attend because they found all to be relevant topics.

To learn that there is still a degree of anger amongst people was a major insight for some participants. On a more positive tune, others realized the enormous task ahead for civil society in order to achieve sustainable reconciliation and healing.

Limitations

When asked what could have been done better, the most common response was "The time was too short!" Many interviewees particularly expressed their feeling of being rushed in dealing with the small group thematic discussions. This lead to a sense that important issues were being cut short. Hand in hand with the lack of time goes the argument that the programme was too packed.

Reflecting their experience in the groups, some mentioned that there needed to be space for some personal story-telling. One person raised concerns how the emotions that might (and did in that case) emerge in such a workshop should be handled.

Some individual comments:
' The net should be cast wider, organizationally and regionally.'
' In the beginning there could be better profiling of participants.'
' The choice of the venue could have been considered differently, for instance by empowering community based projects for catering (and facilitating).' 
' There was a call for more practical and less theoretical deliberations.'
' Where was the reparation issue?'
' Some workshops could have been more focused.'

Suggestions for Follow Up

Many respondents said "How do we maintain the interest?" Some highlighted the necessity of continuing the process of bringing various NGOs, academics and practitioners together. Some suggested that there be a "joint venture" of different groups to keep the process going (possibly through rotation).

There was also a call for some action and practicable measures to be able to 'touch the grass-roots people', to 'address their REAL issues' which are most often economic ones.

In the light of the sense of lack of time there was a loud cry to allocate more time, more than one day, for a possible next workshop.

Way Forward

There was no immediately apparent way forward that emerged at the end of the workshop or through the follow-up interviews. The workshop provided a useful space for dialogue and reflection and opened potential organisational linkages that could lead to increased
cooperation. The way forward should be broadly concerned with creating further spaces for
dialogue on issues relating to reconciliation by providing additional opportunities with
more time to look at the particular issues raised in greater detail, possibly driven by clearer
intervention goals.

**Programme for Community Reconciliation Workshop**

**Session 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8h30-9h00</td>
<td>Register participants</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9h00-9h10</td>
<td>Setting the tone</td>
<td>Introduction, Objectives and Origins of event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9h10-9h45</td>
<td>Open up reconciliation as a controversial topic</td>
<td>Panel discussion – three panellists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9h45-10h00</td>
<td>Engagement of participants with panellists about concept.</td>
<td>Questions for panellists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10h00-10h45</td>
<td>Creative way of getting to know each other</td>
<td>Introduction by participants to each other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11H15-12h00</td>
<td>To allow participants to reflect in small groups about the term reconciliation, its use within the context of the TRC and in the community.</td>
<td>Small group discussion on the term reconciliation and the key challenges for reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12h00-12h30</td>
<td>To allow groups to share ideas about questions discussed.</td>
<td>Report back by groups in plenary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13h30-16h00</td>
<td>To reflect on issues of intervention with references to research, ethics, outcomes, sustainability and linkages. Groups divided by choice of topic</td>
<td>Round 1 Topical discussion in focus groups: 1) The relationship between research and intervention 2) The ethics of intervention 3) Clarifying intervention outcomes 4) Building sustainability and linkages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) Community engagement outreach strategies  
6) Addressing victim perpetrator, ex-combatant and beneficiary needs  
7) Local versus foreign intervention models

| 16h00-16h30 | Way Forward and Closure |

### Participating Organisations

**Database for CSVR Workshop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Tel</th>
<th>E-mail/Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fanie Du Toit</td>
<td>Institute for Justice and Reconciliation</td>
<td>083 266 1766</td>
<td>689 7465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>082 674 3547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>686 5070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Haupt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Doxtader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Colvin</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>447 7605 082 403</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cjc5r@virginia.edu">cjc5r@virginia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmin Nordien</td>
<td>UMAC</td>
<td>072 214 2451</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jasmin@umac.org.za">jasmin@umac.org.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baba Zide</td>
<td></td>
<td>448 3717</td>
<td><a href="mailto:baba@umac.org.za">baba@umac.org.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntombi Mosikari</td>
<td>Khulumani JHB</td>
<td>011 403 4098</td>
<td>011 403 4396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>082 773 1695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Gunn</td>
<td>Khulumani CT</td>
<td>Telefax 696 2663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potiphar Nkhoma</td>
<td>Trauma Centre for Victims of Violence</td>
<td>465 7373</td>
<td>462 3143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevin Gallagher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:potiphar@trauma.org.za">potiphar@trauma.org.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgina Mbambo</td>
<td>Quaker Peace Centre</td>
<td>685 7800</td>
<td>686 8167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Marco-Thyse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:qpc@hon.apc.org.za">qpc@hon.apc.org.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonda Perez</td>
<td>UCT Medical School</td>
<td>447 8757 406 6623</td>
<td>447 8955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oupa Makhalemele</td>
<td>Robben Island Museum</td>
<td>409 5190 418 9468</td>
<td>411 1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Phone Numbers</td>
<td>Email Addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Parlevliet</td>
<td>Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR)</td>
<td>082 439 6396 422 2512</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mbparl@ccr.uct.ac.za">mbparl@ccr.uct.ac.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val Dovey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo van der Merwe</td>
<td>CSVR Cape Town</td>
<td>021 422-0258</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hydmerwe@csvr.org.za">hydmerwe@csvr.org.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly Dewhirst</td>
<td>CSVR Johannesburg</td>
<td>011 403-5650</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pdewhirst@csvr.org.za">pdewhirst@csvr.org.za</a> <a href="mailto:cernest@csvr.org.za">cernest@csvr.org.za</a> <a href="mailto:bharris@csvr.org.za">bharris@csvr.org.za</a> <a href="mailto:tmofokeng@csvr.org.za">tmofokeng@csvr.org.za</a> <a href="mailto:hramoleta@csvr.org.za">hramoleta@csvr.org.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnita Ernest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronwyn Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlhoki Mofokeng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Ramoleta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Afrika Mhlapo</td>
<td>Khumbula (Paarl)</td>
<td>955 4195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sondlo</td>
<td></td>
<td>955 4195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Ross</td>
<td>UCT Dept Anthropology</td>
<td>650 3679</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ross@beattie.uct.ac.za">ross@beattie.uct.ac.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undine Kayser</td>
<td>UCT Dept Anthropology</td>
<td>465 7820(h) 082 420 7176</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kayser@beattie.uct.ac.za">kayser@beattie.uct.ac.za</a> or <a href="mailto:undinekayser@iafrica.com">undinekayser@iafrica.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina Mhlomi</td>
<td>Institute for Healing of Memories</td>
<td>696 4230 082 7393980</td>
<td><a href="mailto:healing@mspring.co.za">healing@mspring.co.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themba Lonzi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zandile Nhlengetwa</td>
<td>KwaZulu/Natal Project for Survivors of</td>
<td>031 305 3497 033 342 1378 082 465 1514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td>033 394 7841 082 4378174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenda Wilschutt</td>
<td>Desmond Tutu Peace Trust</td>
<td>425 7002</td>
<td>418 9468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Van Wyk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuyani Nkululeko</td>
<td>Direct Action Centre for Peace and Memory</td>
<td>461 1371 082 438 54 76 082 7219447 082 427 0005</td>
<td>461 4387 <a href="mailto:wcat@iafrica.com">wcat@iafrica.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booysen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Patrick</td>
<td>SACC</td>
<td>011 241 7805</td>
<td>011-241 7810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matholengwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch Madhlope</td>
<td>Indwe Transformation Trails</td>
<td>082 753 4403</td>
<td>011 483 2320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoan van der Heyden</td>
<td>SA Wilderness Centre for Peace and Memory/ECO Therapy Institute</td>
<td>790 1725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Ludwig</td>
<td>Khib Women's Centre</td>
<td>9592812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuyisile Sondlo Appoles Sheehaam</td>
<td>Human Rights Media Centre</td>
<td>6962663 697 5638 083 3372260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Mphalele</td>
<td>Khulumani CT</td>
<td>591 2256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette Ryan</td>
<td>IHOM Intern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khanyisa Fatyi</td>
<td>CCR/UCT SRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginn Fourie</td>
<td>UCT Medical School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Chapman</td>
<td>AAAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Yvetterzyan@yahoo.com">Yvetterzyan@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kfatyi@hotmail.com">kfatyi@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1 University of Cape Town; University of Virginia; University of Cologne; Humboldt University Berlin

2 Funding for this research was provided by the Templeton Foundation and the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

3 see annex

4 Representatives from Institute for Healing of Memories, Quaker Peace Centre, Direct Action Centre for Peace and Memory, and the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation were present at this meeting.

5 Thomas Helmberger, a CSVR intern, also conducted a number of interviews with workshop participants to evaluate their experiences of the workshop. A brief summary of this feedback is included at the end of this paper.

6 These documents and the case studies will be accessible from CSVR's website: [http://www.csvr.org.za/](http://www.csvr.org.za/)

7 The following quotes are original voices from tape recordings of the debates in the small groups.