**What should restitution NOT be?**

Restitution is not charity. As mentioned in the introduction, the greatest misconception is that *charity* and *restitution* are the same thing, and it is crucial to differentiate. But what is the difference on a deeper level? A starting point is the motive of the giver/s and this determines whether or not this is seen as restitution or charity. If the question is: “What could we do for the poor?” it is charity. If the question is “Is this my responsibility and why?” it starts touching on restitution.

Restitution should not be perpetrator-centred, but focused on the victim. It is also important that the perpetrator not decide what the restitution should look like – it is for the victim to decide.

* Given that injustice is not a once-off event, restitution should also not be a once-off process or act. It should be long term and sustainable.
* Restitution is not about making the offenders feel good.
* Restitution should not perpetuate the dysfunctional racist power relationships. Power dynamics are often unseen because they are so familiar to both oppressors and oppressed.
* Restitution should not have a termination date, as in law where wrongs that happened a very long time ago lapse over a certain time period.
* The authenticity test of restitution is linked to the motives behind the “restitution” action, and at times, this is simply a ‘gut feeling’ about whether or not the act is sincere. How do you test within each context the sincerity of restitution? Tools to test the context in which restitution is done will be an important contribution of the Restitution Foundation.