

## CAS COOVADIA TRANSCRIPTION

Interviewer: Fiona White (FW)

Speaker: Cas Coovadia (CC)

FW: What is your personal understanding of non-racialism?

CC: Ok, well, I mean, I think my personal understanding stems from the history of the anti-apartheid struggle, both through the ANC and the UDF, the proxy to the ANC in those days. Certainly, what I grew up with was that our struggle is for a democratic, non-racial South Africa, which means a South Africa in which more people are equal in the eyes of the law, and equal as far as resources and empowerment and so on goes, irrespective of race. And then there's a whole lot of other stuff, gender and creed and so on. We always believed that in that context, the nature of the struggle was such that we always recognize that we needed to categorize people into race, tactically, because the reality of the situation was that the black African people, for want of a better term, were the most oppressed, while Indian and Coloured people were oppressed as well, the degree of oppression was not as severe as that of the black African people. So the different races at that time found themselves under different conditions and different contexts. Certainly in the congress movement, we always believed in mobilizing people around their context. So to look at race in that time was in my opinion a tactical issue, not a issue of principal, and we also as congress always believe that a critical element of a non-racial society would be to address those particular oppressive conditions of the African majority, that if we did not address those we would not achieve a non-racial society.

So in that background, my understanding of non-racism is that 94 should have seen the birth of a society where at a level of principal, colour should not be a factor, but that does not mean that we become non-racist with the signing of the constitution, racism will still be in our society for many years to come.

But we needed to have the leadership continuously promote non-racism, and again tactically within the context of the promotion of the non-racism, say politically we now have a democrat constitutional democracy. But again, it might pan out economically and in some other areas that we still support some racial divisions and we need to tactically support that in a way that still promotes a non-racist society. So we should as far as non racism goes, have a country that creates opportunities for all people irrespective of race, identify particular blockages that might be there as a result of issues related to education and socialization and so on, that in our condition, given the makeup of our population would manifest itself primarily around black Africans. But that is because of our history, because of our population, not because of race. So to me, that's the understanding of non-racialism.

FW: Given your understanding then and now, how do you feel the idea of non-racism has travelled?

CC: I think the reality that since 94 I think racial boundaries have actually perhaps become more poignant than pre-1994, have become more apparent, I'd say. And I believe that is because our leadership at various levels and various strata of society have by and large reduced to race issues of exclusion that are informed more by other factors like some legacies of apartheid, if you look at the spatial connotations and so on. Poor education in primarily black African schools, again which is a legacy of apartheid and because black African people are in the majority, it's going to manifest itself most

there. That has a kickback in the ability of the majority of our people to be able to become involved in our economy and in a whole range of stuff. Now I think that what we should have done is we should have categorized that as a problem that manifests itself among the majority of our population, and not categorize that constantly as a race issue, because the moment we categorize that as a race issue, we then need to have tradeoffs between different races, and that to me amplifies the racial problem. So there's absolutely no doubt that, and the last municipal elections are manifestations of this, that the Indian and coloured community by and large don't see the ANC as seeing on their behalf, and they begin to switch allegiance, which in itself is not particularly bad. I think your political allegiance should depend on the party that meets your needs and your beliefs, and things changed. At one time it might be the ANC and at another time it might be someone else. But I think that primarily, people have reacted that way because the ANC in my view has emphasized a racial issue instead of actually emphasizing the core problems which are poor education, not having broken through the spatial patterns of rhythms and so on.

So I think that race has become more amplified, particularly in the last few years, and also because a populism has crept into our politics, that there are some leaders that are actually trying to gain support through populist ideas, and one of those ideas is the issue of race. So statements like all whites are criminals and thieves, I mean I have a number of white comrades who totally were involved in the anti-apartheid movement in those days, who told me bluntly that they did not work for the ANC and will never again work with the ANC because somebody in the party stands up and says something like this, and no one takes them to task for it. So why should I be voting for a party that considers me to be a criminal? So I think that that for various reasons, some because we have actually avoided looking at the critical issues of delivery that we fail at, so we made that into a race issue, and secondly because of proactive strategy advice to leaders that actually use race to build up support.

FW: Are you referring there to the youth league, or to others?

CC: The youth league, ya, to the youth league in particular I guess. But in some way to with the blessing of the ANC, because the ANC has not taken the youth league to task for it, in a very real way. And you have statements a couple of years ago, I can't remember which member of parliament it was, but a minister standing up in parliament and saying well if white people don't like it and they want to go to Australia then they are welcome to go. That's just a populist way of avoiding the real problems that are being raised.

FW: I was going to ask you why you think the ANC has embraced the race issue, populism, is that one key reason, is there any other reason why as a party this has happened?

CC: Well I think we've just lost the values we grew up with, and we've lost those values because for the first time in the history of the ANC we are faced with the issue of being in control of and having a significant say in resource allocation, and that's created a leadership both in government and the party, a significant core leadership not all of them, that's actually utilizing all sorts of strategies to ensure that resources are allocated in a way that suits them. And I think that's what it's all about at the moment, and we've lost focus on the real problems in the country. And when people are criticized for that they

raise the race issue. It's a public debate, has become very popular at the moment. It's a violent public debate. Any constructive criticism is immediately reduced to race, and by and large the criticism around the inability of us to govern properly and to deal with the critical issues that need to be dealt with around resource allocation and corruption, around patronage, and the moment voices are raised against those than the immediate defense is not to tackle the issues but the defense is a racial defense. And in my mind that actually detracts from fighting the real issues around racism that remain in society. So what we should be doing is identifying where the real issues are, deal with those robustly.

FW: When you say the core leadership chooses to allocate resources in a way that suits them, are you talking about in a personal way, or for party gain or community gain?

CC: I think a lot of it is personal, and I think that informs how they conduct themselves both in the party and in government. I think that relationship with government that a number of categories of civil society have, including business, is primarily based on patronage and personal gain, and that informs how our resources are allocated. The topical one on the ministry of police, it doesn't need a rocket scientist to see that procurement rules were violated, that a minister who raised the issue and tried to deal with the issue was fired, that the minister was appointed after signing those deals, that the way it was fashioned was to actually suit one particular applicant, and it's not a big jump from that to reach the answer that that happened because someone is getting a kickback. What the reaction of government should have been was to ask some people to resign, and to have an independent investigation. Instead we constantly try to protect those who have done wrong. And here's a chapter in our institution that have made serious allegations against individuals. In most democratic countries, those individuals would have resigned. In our country, those individuals are protected. Now that's all got to do with resource allocation.

FW: That's an interesting point. Let me go back to asking you about the key features that define a non-racial state, or a non-racial society.

CC: Well, let me talk about a feature that should NOT define a non-racial society, and that is to deny that non-racialism exists. It is not realistic to think that in one or two decades we are going to get rid of racism. We are never going to get rid of racism, it hasn't happened in any country in the world. It's a natural human tendency to differentiate on the basis of the colour of the skin, and that's going to continue. And I don't think we need to be fussed about that to be honest.

But how do we channel that positively, instead of always looking at that negatively to actually have public debates in a positive way, talk about how the diversity in our racial composition can actually be used to promote non-racialism in the country. Instead we use it as a tool to actually divide; we can use it as a tool to actually unite. I think that one of the tragedies of that is that we try to foist that sort of attitude towards race onto the younger people who are coming through, and that's my problem with the youth league. They are interacting with young people and forcing on them a view about race that is actually divisive and not united. And when I speak to young black professionals, they absolutely think that this is nonsense. But unfortunately it's given the problem that I talked about in the education system, given that history, lots of young people in our country are still disempowered as far as education

is concerned, and unemployed, and that's cannon fodder for that sort of stuff. I have a 16 year old daughter, and I remember on one occasion I asked her, do you have any black people in your group of friends? And she turned around to her mother and said, mother, I don't understand the question. And I said I just asked do you have any black people because you should have black people and she said, why? As a matter of interest I do, but what's the issue? She told my wife, I understand your and dad's involvement and I understand the history, but don't make your belief my belief. Race is not an issue for me, and don't make it an issue. The thing is that we are making it people's issues.

So to me the challenge that, I just think that how we begin dealing with this is that to a certain extent is that what's happened is that we come to 1994, we have democracy, and because we are a new government and we need good people in that government, we pulled in a whole lot of people who were working in civil society in the anti-apartheid struggle, and we basically give a leadership acumen at civil society level. That vacuum had been taken up by people who don't have the history of the struggle, who are growing up in a society that is consumerism, that has values of instant richness, of keeping up with your neighbours, of debt, all those sort of things. And that's what actually informing the values in civil society. I think that there's a need for those of us who were involved in those days who don't have any agenda, who don't see any needs to aspire to positions in government or anything of that sort, who won't get caught up in the resource issue, to actually start coming to the fore and publicly start debating these issues and raising these issues.

It's not easy, it's not comfortable, but I think we need to start doing that and the more we debate these things in public, the more we talk about the underlying problems of the country that need to be addressed, and the more we start putting ideas on the table about how these should be addressed, how the current political terrain is actually an obstacle to addressing these issues, that's how we are going to start rebuilding civic society. To me, America with all its faults, has some good ideas. Its local religious groups, its local soccer team, its local sports groups, it's that richness of society where we get people involved, and through the nature of that involvement, we are actually benefitting from that idea. So it doesn't need to be pulling people into mass rallies, people want to get on with their lives, but around their lives there are a whole lot of institutions that can be formed. I mean, I've always told the guys at the foundation that this is something that in whatever spare time I have I support, because I think its stuff like this, with credible people.

FW: So do you see, when you talk about people coming out, and it's interesting because it resonant with some interviewees who say we are the moderate voices. Interestingly it's what de Klerk said to me on Monday, which is funny, and you know he was talking about both sides, the Afrikaner and the youth league, and he was saying in the ANC, where are the moderate voices? So do you see the foundation playing that role?

CC: yes, the foundation must play that role, but I think it's got to come from all sides, so you know I mean Cyril's article in the Sunday Times, I came up with a transformation article in the Business Day. I think it's got to come from all quarters, we've got to show that it doesn't need to be engineered, we just need to create the space, and I think if some so called better known people come out to give others the confidence, and I think that we need to let the flower bloom, essentially. And create the environment

where ordinary members of the public can actually come out and talk about their concerns around these issues, and I think that will capitalize an effort to begin to interact with people in institutions and so long.

FW: Just on this point, looking at features and understanding how to build a non-racial society, one interviewee from the ANC alluded to the idea of social engineering, on a more practical level, because we were talking about transformation on a national level, but also breaking down stereotypes on an individual level. Now, is that something...? I mean I'm just curious, because no one else has mentioned it, but I'm wondering if it's something that people would ascribe to.

CC: What does he mean by that?

FW: you know, creating schools, the government actually taking a stronger lead in creating scenarios in which different race groups are compelled to live together.

CC: I don't think that works. I mean, you see, I think the other fallacy of a non-racial society is that you only believe you are non-racial if everybody is mixing and living with each other. I don't think you can enforce that, the bottom line is that I was brought up in a way that was informed by a particular culture in the Indian community at that time. I mean, socialized in that way for many years. By forcing me to interact with you, it's not necessarily going to change, ok? I'll interact with you if I find things in common with you, if we have the same ideas, and I think that something that needs to germinate and take root over a period of time, and that's why I was interested in my daughters response. You know, and to put it bluntly, over a period of time, if my daughter doesn't find black people that she has things in common with, and by that I don't mean going to go to a black girl and look for things in common, but through interaction, she's just going to run out of friends. The numbers just dictate again. So I don't think you need to force it. I think over a period of time the numbers will dictate again, and you know there are times when I have social gatherings at home where there might only be Indian people, because I have a group of friends from the old days, who we have been meeting regularly and we continue to meet. There are times when I have people from all races at home, there are times when I might, given what I'm meeting for and so on, and the sort of people I want to get together, be only white people. Quite honestly, I'll pick up the phone and invite people that I want to have at my home at a particular point, and people with similar interests and so on. And I think that interests will begin to become common interests across race groups over a period of time. So I don't have a problem with regularly events that bring people of different races together, but to have schools or that actually force people to be together, I think we're just ignoring history, culture, and I don't think that sort of social engineering works, I don't think it healthy. But having said that, I think that where we see social engineering of the kind that stops people from getting together when they do want to get together, that's the sort of racism we must identify and we must review as robustly, quickly and thoroughly. I mean, you know if suddenly at my daughters school, suddenly I find a situation where my daughter wants to start an initiative that basically says look, I want to invite people of different race groups, I don't want to force anybody, I want to invite people, because I believe we need to share interests across racial groups, and I find that the school deliberately stops that, then I must act. I must act. But if the school says that we want compulsory sessions where people of different races... oh, I have problems with that. So I think we

need vigilance, we need to be serious about non-racism, and I remember I was on a platform with somebody who was very big on racism and used to accuse us all of different things, and a couple of years ago she incidentally has disappeared from the scene because she got involved in this fiducial saga. And she was a black woman, and I was on the platform with her, and I said something I believe in – the burden to create a non-racial society lies on non-racists among us. The racists aren't going to create a non-racist society. And so the expectation is higher on me than terreblanche. And she took me to town on this. And I told her why should terreblanche worry about non-racialism, he's a racist? But the onus is on me to talk to people he talks to, to actually convince them about a non-racist future in this country, by actually showing that we're not going to stop people from mixing, and the value of mixing and sharing culture. So I firmly believe that. The onus, the burden of creating non-racist societies is falling on non-racists, and we need to be non-racist in our approach.

FW: What do you think about different elements of society and the role you would see with them playing? Also your own experience within the banking sector? And I'm talking about things like media, education, and business – if you want to talk particularly maybe about business, and the role it can play in building a non-racial society.

CC: One, I think for business leaders to constantly be out there promoting non-racism as a strength of our country, two to in their business practices to demonstrate that they being non-racist in their approach, and so when we come to employment issues. To me, it's not to tick the box that you've got 5 whites and 150 black Africans and 50 Indians, ok, but to actually in a responsible way, raise issues that might be genuinely inhibiting them actually creating a workforce that is more representative of our country. Now whenever I talk to my friends, they are telling me that there is no employment issue in this country. Prove to me there's no racism in this country. Don't bring me people with degrees in humanities; bring me people with degrees in commerce and science, and so on. Now, I think business people need to move from criticism mode, and say that government, you sort the education system out, we need more such people, it's not our problem, to actually move to say, and it's actually interesting, Michael Jordaan from FNB, I told them that I am going to be out in the public space, saying why nationalization doesn't work. And Michael said yes, you absolutely need to be out there, but we need to start saying as an industry how we can go the extra mile to play our role in addressing the underlying issues that give rise to that sort of rhetoric, like poverty, lack of education and so on. How are we going to get the banking sector to do our bit to address these issues? So I think there is a realization in business that the underlying issues are not just issues for government, they are government's issues for the whole country, and business plays a critical role. And sometimes we are just too hard on ourselves. I chair the national business initiative, and the work they are doing in education, in skills development, in sustainability, in economic linkages issues, we're doing phenomenal work. If I look at what we've done under the financial sector charter, although there have been a whole lot of problems related to it, you know in the five years to the end of 2008, we've ploughed in just over R50 billion rand into low income housing – you know if you look at the amount of jobs that created. We've ploughed in over 15 billion rand into funding of black SMES, and that sort of stuff. Now, should we be doing more, absolutely. But I think that what my bugbear always is is that we always seem to be taking past each other rather than talking to each other. SO I mean I think we need to, critical people in business, in government, in labour,

need to actually sit down and make each other uncomfortable, and out the real issues on the table and swear at each other, and do whatever is necessary, but come out of that with a vision that says these are our 3 critical priorities. And there are going to be sacrifices on all sides, but these are the sacrifices that we are prepared to make. And I think that we can do that.

But at this point in time, we still very much and with all due respect, why doesn't government do this, and why doesn't business do this. With all due respect, government are elected people, they've got to be held to a higher standard. And I don't think they are showing the sort of responsible and rational leadership that we need. I think government itself is creating an atmosphere of poignant public debate, instead government should be promoting an atmosphere of constructive public debate, where we say we have faults, you have faults, let's get together and work out way through this. And I have no doubt we can do it. The noise will continue, I mean the populace and the rhetoric will continue, that's fine, but we need to come together to say, this is a free country, say what you like, but we are knuckling down and dealing with the critical issues.

FW: That's interesting, so you say that as one of the key challenges – that's not happening.

CC: We don't have the common vision across the critical path in our country. We don't have common vision, so how are we going to work together? You know as an example, a friend of mine, came to see me and says him and his group are consulting to five major syndicates. And what they want to do is, they're saying that there is no way they are going to be able to raise money from rates and taxes and so on for the infrastructure needs of these five developments. And what they want to do is they want to test business, to say can barriers and additional claims be used for specific infrastructure. And myself and a colleague from the business leadership foundation, we said that we can convince the businesses to do this, on a couple of conditions. One SARS raises the funds and manages them, two there's a clear government structure overruling those funds, and that could be just quarterly audits by a audit company to show the the funds are being properly managed, and we have clear guidelines on what we're doing if those funds are not going to where they are supposed to be going. So it's not a question of whether we can raise the money, it s a question of the governance issue. So I think that we can work together, we can make things happen, but let's agree. From government side, we need to acknowledge that we just screwed up. Business needs to acknowledge that they have been part of abysmal practices, like collusion about the prices of bread. We can't tolerate that. Similarly, labour needs to come to the party and say that the way they are dealing with issues is not constructive. So we all need to give a bit. We all need to make class compromise, it's not race compromise, and until we do that, we're not going to have a sustainable country.

FW: What are your views on BEE and Affirmative action in terms of non-racialism?

CC: Look, I think BEE is necessary. Again, it sort of goes back to what I said, we've got to recognize that, again, just like politically, economically if we don't bring the majority of people into the economy, we don't have a system that is sustainable. The majority of people happen to be black Africans. And that's again out of history, part of our population make up. But I think that the way we've gone about this is wrong. Again, I think we should have sat down together and agreed why we need to do this, we should

have shown each other, that if we don't do this, what the impact on the economy and therefore on society is going to be. And that should have been the basis. And I'm convinced they would have been behind us for sound economic and social reasons. Instead, what have we got, we've got problems. For the last 4 years, we've done nothing under the financial charter. Because we've been bogged down on a debate about additional percentage of ownership in banks. Now, do I care who owns a bank? I don't care. Internationally, banks, 95% of ownership is through institutions, venture funds and so on, because if a bank goes belly up, our regulators can't come with money, so if you want to be a shareholder of a bank you better have deep pockets. It's not a phenomenon that's unique to South Africa. But what do we want to do? Give 15% ownership to individuals and stuff like that. And I keep telling community and labour representatives, why are you worried about this? You should be worried about how much money we put into low income housing, and agriculture, and those sorts of things. And I can't get a rational answer, because they are fighting over this. They told me a few years ago, let's cut through the crap. It's an extra 5 % for their people, that are what they are talking about. That's why they can't reach agreement. Now what's the upshot of that? That the GTI generic codes which is the law, all the banks are reporting against the codes, because they have to. While we're involved in this charter debate. The codes have nothing on low income housing, nothing on access to financial services, on agricultural investment, on infrastructure investment, on SME investment. It's a breeze for us. All the banks are scoring highly against those codes. Do my CEOs tell me we're happy with that? No, they say Cas we've got to get the sector code, we've got to do this. So now I'm pretty close to saying stuff the charter – I'm close to saying to the minister of finance, let's talk. And don't ask me to talk to the rest of the world. If you want change, then let's talk.

So, again I think that the implementation is being informed by this resource allocation stuff, and the sort of values or lack of values that is driving our country at the moment. If you don't change the values around it, if you don't develop a firm set of values that actually talks about real empowerment, then we will fail. And there's a debate on at the moment, where we should be forgetting BEE and looking at the broad-based, which is what we've been saying for the last 3 years. So I think it's absolutely necessary. I think where we had a situation where you had to have legislative intervention to actually stop people from participating in the economy, you can't then the next day in 94, well now everything is fine. There's got to be legislative intervention to bring the balance back, and that's got to be BEE. But we've got to do it in a way that puts, and this is the one thing that I think our government is failing at, is a total reluctance to actually empower people to take charge of their own lives, and that's what we should be doing. I should be providing the environment where people can access funds, use that finance to do things for themselves. I should be providing the environment where we are broadening access to finance for housing so that people can have an asset with which they can raise additional money and take charge of their own lives, and those are the sorts of things we should be looking at. Instead, we constantly want to have an organisation that tells people what to do here, and another one that tells people what to do there, and so on and so on.

FW: So in a sense, creating opportunities.

CC: Absolutely, opening doors, creating opportunities. Leveling the playing field.



FW: is there anything you want to say about affirmative action?

CC: I think that affirmative action is part of the overall BEE strategy, so you know again, I don't believe affirmative action is giving a job to a black person to fill numbers, because that person is black. That's the easy way to affirmative action. What we should have done, and what we should be doing is, if you look at municipalities, what happened? They got rid of all their white experienced people, they found a big gap, and so they brought them back as highly paid consultants. What I would have done, is ok, you're Joe Soap, white person, 55 years old, tremendous amount of experience. Say right, your job guaranteed for the next 5 years, but part of that is that you are going to train the next 5 people. You are going to let them shadow you, train them, pass on your skills. At the end of those 5 years you've got 5 qualified black people, and it's a win-win situation. Instead, we just felt white people are bad, get rid of them. Suddenly we realize, not that it was rocket science, that hell we don't have the skills to replace this, so we hire them as consultants. And I'm not blaming those people. At the end of the day, who bears the brunt of this? Ordinary people who need services. So I can have a security guard at my house if I need to, or I can have a gas stove. Ordinary folk who are living hand to mouth are the ones who bear the brunt of this. To me, affirmative action is more about utilizing the capacity and the experience we have, but utilizing that in a way that delivers services and also mentors people and tradesmen. So that again, over a period of time, the numbers will reflect that the majority of the trained, skilled people will be black people. But let's accept that we don't have those people yet and we can train them. And the skills and the experience that white and other folk, youth have. I mean I have a guy who is responsible for my low income housing, he's white. I've had people say how can you have a white guy running your low income housing? Well, a couple of reasons. One, this white guy has a better understanding of transformation and is more transformed than you, as a black man, will ever be – speak to him. And you'll understand, he knows exactly what transformation is. And secondly, he's the key expert on low income housing in this country, and thirdly my responsibility is not whether I have a black person or a white person running this thing, my responsibility is to get finance to people who need low income housing. So I just think we need to get those sorts of things right.

FW: That's great –that's a very interesting and a very helpful perspective. Is there anything else you want to add about the role of any other sectors of society?

CC: I just think that we need to encourage growth of community based structures, you know, and not be political and civic structures as we understand it. Understand growth of structures around what is important to people in that area of their lives, and through those structures I think non-racism will manifest itself as people interact with them. And those structures should be talking more and more about governance policies, how leadership is being conducted, what is having a negative impact on their lives. So I just think we need to do more of that. Institutions like Committee for the Protection of the Constitution, those sorts of institutions are important. I mean we had a reunion of our old varsity, I did my degree in a place called Salisbury Island, off the coast of Durban, and we had a reunion, we had about 500 people spending the weekend together in Durban, and going to the island and so on, and the Gauteng group felt that we need to come out of this and launch something that actually begins to reaffirm and protect the values that we grew up with, and I think more such initiatives are necessary. And to me it's all about that, it's about values and principles. And if we don't reclaim the values and use

that as a foundation to build on, we're not at a crossroads as far as I'm concerned, we're at a T junction. And the turn we take is going to be critical.

FW: I mean I'm pregnant, 5 months pregnant, so I'm hoping it's the right direction!

CC: But look, in the midst of all of this, but I keep on repeating this, a couple of months ago, I was invited by a security group with a black fund manager, they have a power breakfast every month, and they asked me to speak on transformation. And they did this very well; they just limited it to about 12 people, all young black fund managers, some from Eskom, Sasol, private companies. And breakfast was served from 7.30 to 9.30. And then we sat down and I gave my spiel and then we talked. And when I looked at my watch it was ten to 10, and we hadn't eaten yet, so I had to interrupt. But when I looked at the caliber of the people around the table, the conversation, I said you guys are going to take us far. Because one guy had said during the conversation, But Cas at the end of the day, it's about poor and corrupt leadership. And I said, well of course it is. But that's a long term project. But in the short term, we need to make this work. And I come across this time and time again –these young people, they are looking at a structure through which they can actually make a difference, a structure that is unfortunately not the ANC structure. So we need to provide those structures, you know. My daughter, three years ago, we went to New York, the first four days I was working and they were walking around. On the third day at breakfast, she says you know it's so great walking around, you can't do that in our country, the crime etc. And I started by saying, look sweetheart, it's minimal people who do crime, the majority of our people are fine. I said here's the deal. I'll try get a job here for three years, you come live here for three years and enjoy this place. And she said 'you haven't been listening. I've been complaining but did I once say I want to leave my country? You're cuckoo. I don't want to leave my country.' So that gives me hope, you know. I think the young folk will get us there, but we are going to have to create the environment to get us there.

FW: Well good, so a positive turn at the T-junction. Anything else that you want to add on challenges? Anything you haven't touched on?

CC: Let's see. Look, I mean you know in all of this, some of the issues that come up, like crime for instance, you know my intelligence people, we have an organization that deals with bank related crime issues, they tell me that the 3 years since 2009, there were more cash in transit heists in the UK than there were here. But not one person got hurt in the UK. Now to me, it's not the crime, it's the nature of the crime. And there one of the things is, I mean I'm not one of supporting or blaming everything on apartheid, but the one thing we haven't got to the bottom of is that young people, it's done something to their psyche. I don't think we've gotten to the bottom of the impact to young people of growing up in an environment where when they open their doors, there's the military outside or the police outside or so on and so on. So I think that's a challenge.

FW: That's interesting; you've just made me think of something very much from my childhood. I went to a government primary school, and you know from my perspective the number of days we had to practice drills of hiding under our desks because of alleged threats, and of course that does reinforce stereotypes on an 8-year olds mind, you know, what am I hiding from?

CC: yes, there was a school here in town; we used to bring kids from the townships in the afternoons for art. And the school used to have an annual calendar made up of the drawings by these kids. And I remember every picture had a depiction of violence. Either the police kicking in the door, or something. And that has got to have an impact on you, you know. So I think we need to get to the bottom of that. Values, cultural leadership and so on I've spoken to, the T junction I've spoken to. Public debate, rebuilding schools in society. I think part of that we need to protect our institutions, and the sort of stuff that Thuli has gone through, we've got to come out in public support of her.

FW: Yes, I actually know her, and I was horrified. Anyway...

CC: we've got to make noise about that, she got her public protection in a real way. And institutions like that. So I think I've covered it, from my side.

FW: Ok, well very helpful. Well, one of the things, just to kind of round off with, is that we have been asking all the prominent people that we've been interviewing if there's anything that they would like to share on what you do in your own day to day life or on a recurrent basis to break down either racial stereotypes or build non-racialism, if there's anything in particular.

CC: Ya, well look one is that I try to be out in the public space as much as I can, truly supporting foundations to the extent that I can, to promote non-racism, three is, you know I try to get involved in community based structures, so I'm very involved in the community policing and stuff like that, four is just in my constituents, I'm quite involved in organizing business and so on, and through those structures to constantly, and on platforms and so on, where I debate issues, to promote what I think is non-racism. And how not to be racist, when to continue to do it and when not to do it. So I guess I'm fortunate in that I am in a reasonably influential position, and I use that to talk about this all the time.

FW: And you spoke a lot about what the foundation can do, but as a last question is there anything that you would like the foundation to focus its work on, and is there anything you would like to add? I know you spoke about debates, but is there anything else to take back to the foundation?

CC: no, I think it's done some good stuff. It's had some good for a where we have talked about these issues and so on. I just think it needs to develop a more public image, and I think it needs to talk about these things in public, I think we need to challenge people in public. I know Kathy would be very reticent about anything like that, but I mean it doesn't have to be in his name, or the name of the foundation, but can be brought about by Cyril and others. But I think that it's important that foundations like these are out in the public space talking about these things. I remember one session we had at Lilliesleaf, Haleema spoke and Haleema said that these things have got to get beyond these four walls. Media, and so on. So you know, two years ago I asked Kathy to come and speak at the banking association AGM, we got to afford the foundation an opportunity to talk about these things to decision makers, to influential people out in the public. I think its doing good stuff, but it needs to I think develop a public profile.

FW: ok, that's great. Thank you very much for your time.