

**PRESS STATEMENT BY REV. PROFESSOR MUSA XULU**

**FORMER CHAIRPERSON OF THE CRL RIGHTS COMMISSION SECTION 22 COMMITTEE ON THE CHRISTIAN SECTOR**

**ON THE ALLEGED INVOLVEMENT OF STATE SECURITY STRUCTURES IN THE CRL'S CAMPAIGN AGAINST CHRISTIAN ORGANISATIONS AND LEADERS**

**For Immediate Release**

I believe South Africans, and especially the Christian community, must now confront a deeply disturbing possibility. What began publicly as a debate about the CRL Rights Commission's Section 22 process and proposals concerning the regulation of religion may in fact involve something far more serious: the apparent use of state-security structures against Christians and organisations opposing the CRL Chairperson's agenda.

I make this statement following my recent affidavit concerning a telephone conversation I received on 14 May 2026 from a person identifying himself as Mr Vincent Mnguni Mothutkung, who stated that he was acting on behalf of the National Intelligence Agency and/or State Security Agency. In that conversation, I was informed that the Chairperson of the CRL Rights Commission, Ms Thoko Mkhwanazi-Xaluva, had allegedly referred me for investigation regarding legal opinions concerning the Section 22 Committee process which had already been circulating publicly.

Even more disturbing were allegations made during that discussion that Christian organisations and leaders, including FOR SA, Church Defenders and others opposing the current CRL process, had allegedly also been referred to State Security structures for investigation, profiling and/or possible surveillance.

I have placed these matters on oath because I believe the South African public has a right to know that such allegations now exist. Although I must emphasise that I cannot independently verify the identity of the individual who contacted me, the broader context within which this conversation occurred cannot be ignored. The National Security Strategy 2024-2028 publicly identifies the "mushrooming of charismatic churches" as a domestic national-security concern. The same document expressly references the CRL Rights Commission's 2017 Report on the "Commercialisation of Religion and Abuse of People's Belief Systems", which was compiled by Ms Mkhwanazi-Xaluva during her previous term as the CRL Chair.

This is not a minor or accidental development. The phrase "charismatic churches" refers to a recognised stream of Christianity involving millions of South Africans. Yet this broad religious category now appears in a national-security framework alongside organised crime, violent extremism, corruption, cyber threats and terrorism.

This raises profound constitutional and moral questions. As I stated publicly when I resigned as Chairperson of the Section 22 Committee in January 2026, I became increasingly alarmed by what I witnessed inside the CRL process itself.

I observed:

- procedural irregularities,
- exclusionary conduct,
- hostility toward Pentecostal and Charismatic churches,

- attempts to marginalize dissenting voices,
- and sustained interference by the CRL Chairperson in the work of the Committee.

I repeatedly warned that the process was becoming toxic, predetermined and unrepresentative. I further warned that the Committee was increasingly being used as a front for a broader agenda of State involvement in the regulation and control of religion. At the time, these warnings were dismissed. However, recent developments now raise the deeply troubling possibility that opposition to the CRL process may not merely have been treated as disagreement, but potentially as a matter requiring state-security attention. This is especially concerning in light of previous public denials by the CRL that it had any involvement with state-security structures regarding the National Security Strategy and its references to charismatic churches. If the allegations now contained in my affidavit are accurate, then those denials become increasingly difficult to reconcile with the facts emerging from within the process itself.

The issue here is not whether the State may investigate criminal conduct where genuine criminality exists. Of course it may. The issue is whether a Chapter 9 institution established to protect religious rights has instead participated, directly or indirectly, in portraying lawful Christian organisations, leaders and movements as security concerns because they opposed a controversial State-linked regulatory agenda. That would represent a grave departure from constitutional democracy.

South Africans should be extremely careful whenever broad religious categories begin appearing in security frameworks, particularly where those same communities are simultaneously being targeted through exclusionary regulatory processes. Our Constitution protects religious freedom, freedom of association, human dignity and freedom of belief precisely because history teaches us how dangerous it becomes when ideological disagreement is treated as a security problem.

I therefore call for:

- full parliamentary oversight of these developments,
- clarification regarding the CRL's engagement with state-security structures,
- investigation into the inclusion of "charismatic churches" in the National Security Strategy,
- and urgent constitutional scrutiny of the CRL's Section 22 process.

No democratic society should permit the blurring of the line between legitimate constitutional dissent and national-security suspicions



Rev Professor Musa Xulu \_\_\_\_\_ 17 May, 2026

Former Chairperson: **CRL Rights Commission Section 22 Committee on the Christian Sector**

**CONTACT: 0793924247**