

[Jeremy Cronin Interview](#)

JC: Jeremy Cronin

FW: Fiona White

FW: I guess the first question to ask you is what your understanding of non-racialism is? You can look at it any way, historically if you want, or contemporary understanding, or.. last time I asked you a history question you started in 1963, so I'm not sure if you can remember that far back!

JC: Well this one started in 1912 and I'm inclined to go to 1912, maybe not at one, but I would like to go to 1912. It means several things, I suppose in the South African context the core thing is the recognition of equality and of all South Africans, regardless of race. My friend Neville Alexander who is worth interviewing on this, he regards, and one can understand why we call it non-racialism, but he always says that it is a negative term rather than a positive term, that's another matter. So I suppose without, it's essentially that, a recognition, a commitment to South Africa in which, to fundamental and deep-seated equality in terms of rights and in terms of realities, structural and other realities. Hadn't thought about it more profoundly.

FW: No we aren't expecting people – it's just really your sense, when you think of the term, what do you think of.

JC: And obviously when one thinks of non-racialism now, one is tending to think, prior to 1994, the emphasis would have been somewhat different, I guess, it would have been a struggle to affirm the sort of humanity and everything that should go with that, of all South Africans in the face of a nasty white minority rule. I think currently now, I think part of what one needs to assert is the flip side, that all of the affirmative action and transformational measure that are absolutely critical to realize a non-racial South Africa, need to happen, but need to happen in the context in which white South Africans and their citizenship is also valued, part of the reality. In the face of populism, demagoguery and so on, which is, given the South African reality, its surprising there isn't more of it, given 300 years of racial oppression of one kind or another. The other dimension about non-racialism is that in the history, is that non-racialism has always been, within the broad ANC tradition, has always been not in denial about diversity. The tradition of non-racialism which has really been an ANC lead movement tradition, has never been in denial about diversity in South Africa, including ethnic diversity, linguistic diversity and so forth. So it's not a kind of abstract narrow kind of liberalism, it's always affirmed and recognized difference, but equality and the need to struggle for equality within the context of not denying diversity. So, 1912, you can't stop me going there. I think one of the really interesting questions to ask is why, in South Africa, has a national liberation movement in the context of centuries of racial oppression and so on, dispossession and so forth, why have there been a propensity towards accepting non-racialism. Always challenged, even within the ANC, there have always been narrow national tendencies, for obvious reasons. But I think it has a lot to do with the foundational challenge of the ANC in 1912, which was oops, 1910 has happened, a majority of South Africans have been removed from the post South African War settlement, and why? Because colonialism divided us and ruled us. And we need to embark on a project of united ourselves around a common identity. And at the beginning they always said that that

common identity is not about denying our diversity, that we are Zulu speakers or whatever, but it was a question of building a new identity and unity in, they didn't quite say it at first, but in struggle, through building a common movement. And that's very interesting because in a sense we now say academically, it was quite a post-modern version of identity, born of the reality of which they were grasping. The idea that identity is not given by what you are born into, you are born into something, and that doesn't disappear or evaporate, but identity is also a collective project which requires struggle, transformation, but also self-effort as well. And I think that is kind of a very rich thing, in the ANC, with all of its problems currently or in the past, or whatever. And so I think that that also meant that its ability to then, one of the key slogans which Mbeki is misquoted, decontextualised, is that very early on, the ANC talked about the demon of racialism, very interesting, it links directly. There was a slogan about fighting the demon of racism, and Mbeki of course evoked that, meaning that whites are a problem, which they are, but. If you look at the context, the demon of racism refers to the problem of tribalism, and how it undermines our efforts as the ANC to build this common sense, and as long as we have this demon – so they weren't in denial that many whites were racist, and oppressive and so on, but there was a sense of, you know, we are racist because we are thinking of Sothos, Zulus, Xhosas, and we are compromising ourselves. SO quite interesting that in the historical context of the ANC, racialism was founded around a different matter – related but different matter from what we would use now. And, I think all of that, I mean, the ANC was not a non-racial organisation in the sense that it didn't have white members when I joined the movement in the late 60s, I couldn't join the ANC because I was white, but it was always non-racial in its aspirations, and confirmed that in 1955 with the Freedom Charter, and with some difficulty because that and ironically the call for the nationalization of the mines and the banks, those were the grounds on which the narrow nationalists broke in 1959, to become the PAC. The idea that South Africa belonged to all who lived in it, black and white, which was rejected by a breakaway from the ANC. So it was the non-racialism issue, and a national communist interest. It is all kind of an irony now, considering the current reality. There were also economic clauses in the freedom charter, and they affected foreign Marxist communist feelings, and the PAC broke away, which indicates that there has always been that underlying current. But the acceptance of that principle that everyone belongs in South Africa was partly permitted and allowed by the foundation challenges that the ANC had, about building unity out of diversity among African people. And that's about the limit of my knowledge. I've always been intrigued by this.

The other reasons, I think, like Mandela symbolizes so many things, but he was a kind of, to use a skew word, there's a kind of race confidence that he has, so I think that the kind of more narrow, nationalistic currents in our history, but perhaps in other parts, are, and based on a narrow identity sometimes, are often characteristic of where oppressed people are minorities. If you look at the history of the European national liberation struggles, they were very ethnic, and we saw that again in the former Slavica for instance, whereas, so we've had a different national liberation struggle, it has not been narrowly ethnic, so the national project from its start, was about building a South African identity, rather than a, which is why our motto, the way in which, the way in which our national motto is a language that is foreign, I suppose we could have gone with Latin.

FW: What does it mean, our motto?

JC: Well, the one version is that we are all the same, so again it's the non-racial message, but some linguistics say that we have completely misunderstood, and that it actually means that we all kiss. Which means the same thing I guess! Another version of non-racialism and non-sexism as well, I guess!

FW: *Laughs* That's very interesting!

JC: well the thing is that you couldn't make it in Zulu, or English or Afrikaans, and Latin would be completely be inappropriate, which is really how Europeans could have got around the multi-linguistic issue. So we genocided the linguistic group and then we used what we think they would have said, interesting.

FW: Can I ask you how you think the sense of non-racialism in the ANC has travelled from 1994 to today, looking at the last 17 years?

JC: Maybe in the ANC, but also in the country, so I think a strong commitment obviously, in the early 90s and in 1994, in the settlements, in 1993, strongly embodying those freedom charter principles of the core foundation of South Africa's united, non-racial, democratic context. And there's not serious opposition to that inside the ANC, there's a strong sense of pride in that being our tradition in 1994. The hugely embraced and distorted, somewhat, the non-racial tradition by the kind of liberation reception, white liberal reception, the kind of rainbow nation notion of non-racialism, the canonization of Mandela as kind of the epitome of this. So I think, which was all probably positive, in the sense that it got us through a complicated transition quite well, and we managed symbolically, and in constitutional terms and in political terms quite well, better than most countries that have had the same kind of history to ours of bitter struggle, I mean compared to say Zimbabwe and other situations in Africa, it was quite an effective thing. But it went with readings and symbols and things like that, which I think tended to vulgarise, sentimentalise the non-racial traditions. And I think that bearing some of the costs now.

Maybe to give some examples, non-racialism doesn't mean a deal struck between whites and blacks, and I realize that prominent thinkers in the South African context tended to think of it like that, and if you read Archbishop Tutu's very interesting foreword to the interim report, of the TRC, it's a very interesting in all kinds of ways, preface that we wrote. And I think it was there, but certainly in the discourse around it, that the things he said around it, he says one of his great regrets is that although, from the side of the black majority, Mr Mandela came forward and conceded that there had been problems and weaknesses, but committed himself on behalf of the black majority to do this, and he regretted that there was no white leader who had the courage to do the same thing. Now as a white south African, I was offended by that because I didn't think that I could be represented by a white leader, I wanted to be represented by Mandela. Because for me, non-racialism is that I am a South Africa, and I don't need some white leader, yes I need to admit like every other white that I was an unwilling beneficiary of apartheid, of course I was and one should concede that and also one should commit oneself as a South African to overcome that legacy in all kinds of ways. But the way of thinking about non-racialism as a kind of deal is again present in Archbishop's call for a kind of white tax. Which I think, I mean, it's not like one doesn't, that there is a sentiment behind it that is right, but I think it is misconstruing many things, and one of them is that it's some kind of deal, or some kind of one of

things that whites, that a white leader apologises for us and that's the moral thing done, and there is a material thing and we pay a tax and whatever. It has many problems, but one of the notions is that non-racialism is some kind of deal, rather than a principle and also a commitment to transforming the material conditions that continue to reproduce huge regional, gender and racial and class of course, inequities of all kinds. And to be non-racial, I think, in South Africa and to be serious about your non-racialism is to be deeply committed to acknowledging that there are massive problems, and there are inequities in privilege and resources, and those don't get solved with one off acts. I think one off acts might serve a symbolic purpose, but the real issues are, why are we continuing to build apartheid spaces through RDP housing, why aren't we de-racialising towns and cities? It's just that the RDP housing is run by an ANC government, but the black and white South Africans need to appreciate the need to think profoundly about thorough transformation, and not symbolic change. Another symbolic change would be narrow BEE, which also doesn't de-racialise the country at all. So all of these things are all short-cuts, they are all pointing in vague ways towards structural problems, but they become – well, quotas in national teams and things like that, not really grappling with the deep-seated structural realities.

FW: How do you think one can get beyond the symbolism and deal with the deep seated structural challenges?

JC: not easily. It's the right question. Obviously it's a whole range of issues, spatial issues, there are two countrysides in south Africa, but also within towns and cities. It's very symptomatic that popular frustrations and anger are called township delivery protests, which means that we are failing as politicians to not mobilize those energies into the struggle for the transformation of the city, because typically those township protests happen not in the very poorest areas, but in areas where there has been some service delivery but it was thought that it went to this and this group of people because of their political associations or tenders and so forth. These pressure cooker situations, in which large numbers of working class and poor black people are crammed, and a lot of the fights are factional fights, taxi associations, small shop keepers against foreign shopkeepers, housing queue people fighting each other and so on. But the crisis is a spatial one, they are crammed into these horrible dormitory townships where black people are still treated as if they are migrants, they are here in the city to sleep and work, and we provide them with rows and rows of sleeping accommodation called RDP houses, far away from everything. Transport is our big problem, with the spatial realities. So that's one dimension.

Obviously the whole education side of things is a massive other reproducer of racialised inequality. So, but then it intersects strongly with class realities, so some black people are able to escape the reality of the township, but the majority aren't, they are locked into those places and their kids are locked into those places, and their education is dreadful. And all the indices are strongly marked, whether it's vulnerability to disease, bad education, chances of getting employment, cost of basic things like transport, all of those are strongly marked by class and race, and often gender. So if we really value non-racialism, we shouldn't be surprised if there are emerging spaces for demagogic anti-whitism, which is not too applauded, it's to be condemned. But condemned because it's another illusion, it's not a way out of the predicament, of the 72% unemployed African youth.

FW: I was going to ask you next about ideas of features and challenges, but you've touched on both. So let me go, I mean it's two sides of the same coin, but are there any particular features you say as being key of a non-racial society, apart from what you've already spoken about? Anything else you would see as key?

JC: I suppose the key word is solidarity, that we can't, the notion of an injury to one is an injury to all. We can't build, given our reality, our history, given the systemic and reproduced realities in South Africa, not withstanding genuine commitments to helping the poor, through BEE, through social grants, land reform and so on. That you know, we have to build a society in which there's non-racialism, that is deeply linked to the notion of equality and solidarity. Not easy things to build in the 21st century necessarily. So healthcare, so I think something like the NHI is another very important, with many challenges to get it right, but it's a really important solidaristic intervention.

Perhaps agencies are another important thing, I think, I'm really just repeating a point that many have made before, that to overcome and build a non-racial South Africa, we also need to move away from the dangers of a kind of delivery. A non-racial South Africa is not going to be delivered bureaucratically, top down, by the government. Because hand in hand with the populist demagogy, anti-white demagogy, and of course that reinforces a white demagogy on the other side, is this kind of victim type discourse. Which again is somewhat foreign to historic ANC culture. That was always said, by for instance the ANC and the liberation movement, but the stronger message was always Amandla, which I suppose was another version of collectively, Power is Ours, collectively, if we collectivise and unite ourselves across our differences. And I think in all kinds of ways that that message of popular protagonism and non-racial protagonism and African protagonism is absolutely critical to de-racialise our society. So it's not only delivered by whites, primarily, but whites have a role to play and should be active in de-racialising our society, transforming our society. It's the energies and aspirations that a great majority of South Africans have to tap into, and so forth, but for all kinds of reasons and it has to do with state power, the discourse has been very much on delivery and so on. So again, township delivery protests, rather than township people raising questions about their unequal distribution of resources across a town or a city, for instance. Fighting over the scraps of what's coming, into the township, assuming that the structure can't be changed, but we just want more. So Malema's discourse is not, it's all about they've got it, we want it. So I think it is the protagonism issue, proper protagonism is really important.

So we tried to measure the success of land reform about how close we've got to 30% redistribution, without asking what has become of the 8-9% that has been redistributed, and the answer is disaster. Not because of any fault of the people but because we haven't thought of, we thought of them as deserving people who must get their land back, right's based discussion rather than a discussion based on the agency of people and the need for their productive activity. The same with narrow BEE, it's about who gets shares in this or that company and the percentage shares they should get and so forth. How do they contribute productively to creating jobs or whatever? So the delivery thing is often related to a narrow rights based discourse in my view, who's entitled to what. And the biggest victim you are, the more you can claim, so you plead victimhood. And we've seen a lot of that in recent period, beginning in the pre-Polokwane period in the ANC, for instance. He's the victim, he's the target. Also the way in

which we remember Chris Hani as this victim of assassination and so on. So counter to what Hani was, he was not a victim at all.

FW: Just briefly touching on issues, we spoke about Malema, but elements of the ANC, different branches, youth league for example. It's not obviously one of the questions that we have,

JC: But everyone ends up talking about Malema?

FW: Well it's just very topical. But before, when I was interviewing people a few weeks ago, within the ANC, very very divisive, particularly on the issue of non-racialism. I'm asking the question because it comes up a lot as something which is fostering racism, rather than building towards a non-racial state. So I just wanted to ask if you have any other thoughts?

JC: Lots. Without overdwelling on it, where to begin. Certainly it is very divisive, this stuff, and it's certainly out of character with the strong conditions of the ANC, it's not that there hasn't often been this kind of minority view. Often in denial, it would be surprising if the great majority of blacks, including the most sophisticated, didn't have an outburst of anti-white anger. I mean, my wife who was an active anti-trade unionist in the 1980s, she was in the textile worker's union, and they were in Bellville South in Cape Town, and that became a sort of war zone at one point, and a lot of the youth were coming off barricades, injured and so forth, and then coming into the office to shelter or make a phone call. Or to look for legal help, etc. And at one point there was some nasty shooting, and some kinds were badly hurt with buckshot and rubber bullets. And one person turned to my wife who's white, and said the 'next white person I see I'm going to kill.' Didn't realize, didn't see.. And I think that's also something we should understand. It's, ya. It's a bit of a sentimental, but it's a true story. That it would be very surprising if people don't say things like that from time to time, out of frustration or anger, or if they've lost an argument, I've had that experience before in the ANC. When I think I don't always win my arguments with comrades, because they are smarter or brighter than me, but when I do there are one or two occasions when they say 'you white's,' or something. So we shouldn't be touchy feely about these things, especially as whites.

But obviously with someone like Malema and the circle around him, there's a consistency and a loudness about it, and as he gets into more trouble with his organisation and the law, the rhetoric increases. So the, it's basically in his case, the refuge of a scoundrel really. And it's not about, all the things he says are about, primitive accumulation for a small group of people, but selling the belief that some are going to change life for a large number of alienated, bitter, marginalized, very unemployed youth in our country, so it strikes a cord and offers some kind of magical solution to a problem, being anti-white and so forth. Taking away their property and whatever.

FW: And your sense is that it's not a part of the mainstream ANC thinking, that kind of perspective?

JC: No, no it's not but could become. There's that discourse is always around, it trickles around at any national movement and it was surprisingly minimal throughout the history of the ANC, but it was always there. I mean Mandela will talk about his late 1940s, he was a bit of a narrow nationalist when he was in the youth league, he was anti-communist, he would overturn communist party tables and so forth, and

he admits that. And so, ya, but it's definitely not been historically the mainstream at all of the ANC. But it could become that, if there's sufficient steam built up around frustrations for real objective reasons, and if we refuse to address these material realities that are reproducing acute racial marginalization, unemployment, poverty and so forth.

FW: On the other side of the spectrum, I just want to get your perspectives, particularly after listening to Tutu's presentation at Stellenbosch last week, I thought he made some valid points around, first of all, his sense of black self, that sense of not having a strong self belief. And then also the perspective of everybody being damaged from apartheid, whites as well as blacks. So on the flip side, to get your perspective, how do you think the white community could respond differently, those who affirm to be the haves, the benefactors of apartheid, the ones that Malema polarizes against?

JC: I think you're correct to be raising those things. I suppose I'm just going to be repetitive, but I do think that white South Africans need to, one conceive that they have been beneficiaries, even post-1994 generations. I have heard a young communist league comrade say that you want to abolish affirmative action, why should there still be affirmative action because you were born after 1994, how can you blame people born after that for apartheid. And he said ok, if you abolish the passing of wealth from one generation to another, then I am prepared to abolish affirmative action, but that's the trade off. That makes the point that a lot of wealth, but also property and also just access to books, access to all kinds of advantages, you know that's still profoundly marked by race. And white South Africans need to be much more sensitive, and much more committed to changing the things that are perpetuating that reality. So I mean you and I, and how old is your daughter now? 3? I mean I didn't ever put my kids into private school, but they were in model C schools, and didn't necessarily go to exactly the nearest school and so on, and we all wanted to pass on the advantage, and it would be surprising if anybody wasn't like that.

But there are many many things, so let me get political. I think the DA is also not helping the thing, and I think they do some reasonable thing and they run a cleaner show generally than we do, there might be more on this, Zille is obviously very confident. She's not a corrupt person, I'm not so sure about her political advisor, Ryan, who I don't think is corrupt but he's a shaker and mover, but we're gossiping. But you know, in effect I think thanks to Malema, was one of several factors, but it was a factor, they certainly did very well in the Western Cape, and they certainly won over minorities. So let's talk about minorities. And it's a big discussion we've been having in the ANC, you should have a look at something I wrote because I'm really repeating myself, for this sort of online thing, the ANC's online publication, this kind of reflection that came out of the MEC discussion, and I made some points that colleagues on the online publication said write that up. So quite a lot of what I'm saying will be there. But one of the points I was making was that because of Malema's strident anti-whitism, he'd given huge space, and Zille said that, he's our best election campaigner, huge space in the Western Cape and within minority communities. So there were huge advances for the DA in the Western Cape and even in Gauteng. And they framed their discourse as a non-racial discourse, but really it was, then, it was about mobilizing minorities against the threat of majoritarianism, and portraying majoritarianism, the Mugabe idiom, and all of those fears that minorities have about post-colonial African societies, for many good reasons of course.

So the media response was, you know, a fresh breath of air, the different non-racial prospect and so forth that the DA is building on. And I think, I do genuinely think that Zille's intention, I think she would like to build a non-racial thing. The DA's dilemma is that her strong, reliable support is the white base, so she is focusing on white community privilege. Not in a race-based way, I mean she doesn't mind Cyril Ramaphosa living next door to them or anything, so it's not like that, but they don't want lots of poor people too close by. For the understandable reasons about crime, and whatever. But, so the success of the DA, and it was a success, was partly because we gave it to them in all kinds of ways, but mobilizing minorities as minorities, is itself problematic. So that's really the same point I was making about whites, that, because we're still then stuck in apartheid categories. And this is very much Neville Alexander's big thing, again you can understand why. Because I mean what is it to be white, what is it to be black, and all of those obvious things. So, but I think the DA has very successfully mobilized people as coloreds and people as Indians, feeling safe with whites, now actually, as a guarantee that standards will be maintained in their, and as I say it's not necessarily the intention of Zille, or someone like Patricia De Lille or whatever, but I'm not sure that we're escaping either from our side with Malema's rubbish, or from the DA project, and that has to do with the objective, the support base, the reliable support group, who turned out massively. And their machinery and so on. And they are very successful in my view, they have erected a tri-racial kind of poster image, but the machinery is white male, Ryan Coetzee and the boys. But very disciplined, so unlike the ANC who had such an undisciplined election campaign about who is going to succeed next year, and nationalization and everything else, the white boys kept very much in the background. So it was a well-run campaign, which you've got to respect. But in terms of contribution to building a non-racial thing... hmmm.

FW: Do you see there being any strong leadership towards building a non-racial society in any sector of society?

JC: I think that, so where are we seeing? The answer is that strong leadership, no. Strong, non-racial leadership, not really. Strong leadership, yes, I mean Zille, strong, politically effective leadership for instance. With, but I think a sincere commitment to non-racialism, I've never doubted that, but in terms of objective positioning and the momentum of the machinery and of the electorate and so forth is not necessarily carrying us in the right direction. From the ANC side, I would have like to have seen, I think genuinely the core leadership of the ANC is non-racial and committed to that, and I think genuine anger at Malema and his statements. And obviously people have come out strongly, strong non-racialism in the Ruth First memorial lecture, on SAFM. So very strong anti-corruption and non-racial theme there, and it's quoted a little bit in this morning's newspapers, you know Braam Fischer and Joe Slovo, and whites must speak out, don't feel shy and abashed. Which I think also happens quite a bit, whites do feel intimidated, and then you get Steve whatever his name is, the Afrikaans singer, who's racist. They have no bones about speaking out in all kinds of speaking out. And that's obviously what the black racialism is about, intimidating you into feeling guilty, and what can you do and so on. So your pay attacks, and then they say ok but that's peanuts, we want more and more and more.

FW: I've read a lot of comments about the white tax idea, and a lot of whites are saying you know that would be great, if we could get a clean conscience by paying, then let's go. My objection is that you can't buy forgiveness.

JC: That's where the TRC also tried to drive the, they were looking at compensation for victims and so on. The compensation for victims needs to be, the idea that there is some kind of penance, one-off penance is, it treats people as victims, and some people are real, in a sense everybody is a victim. The, you know, Craig Willemse was a victim, he got bullied because he was fat, but I agree, there's a one off thing that has a monetary value and they are all victims, and they will forgive us if we do this. I mean, you've got to transform South Africa, and you'll never transform it like that, it's a process. It's a collective effort, and organised effort, it's a struggle, and it's a struggle to change ourselves, in order to change South Africa. It's symbiotic.

FW: Is there any particular sector of society that you think should be playing a lead role in building non-racialism?

JC: I think you know it's a task across society, but lead role, well I would guess the ruling party probably has a responsibility and a potential capacity to really play the lead role, that's what I would like, that's where I would rest my hopes and frustrations when it's not doing what it should be doing.

FW: Do you have anything personal you want to share about how you personally feel you contribute towards building a non-racial society, obviously through your work, but if you have anything you feel others can learn from or be beneficial?

JC: It's a little bit awkward because it sounds very vain and glorifying but a couple of things. I mean obviously the one thing is historically, some of the most, well first of all, what meant a huge amount to me when I was a first year student and got drawn into the underground movement and so on, was to discover that there was a non-racial, I was guilty like most whites becoming vaguely conscious about South Africa, it was a huge relief to discover against expectations, to discover that there were deep traditions of non-racialism, that was news to me, there was a Freedom Charter, and that there had also been whites in the struggle, like Braam Fischer and Joe Slovo. So just at a personal level, I was able to move from feeling guilty but hopeless to that I could do something, and it was the two things. The kind of non-racial traditions of the ANC, and of the communist party, but in our view the party that really brought non-racialism to South Africa was the communist party, which from its foundations in 1921, its founder members, but you know throughout most of the decades was, in terms of membership, the CP was non-racial in its active membership, and Mandela and others talk about that. So that it was not just the ANC's non-racial beliefs but the communist party, The second thing was I was arrested in 1976, I went into underground propaganda work for the SACP and on behalf of the ANC, and was on trial in September of 1976, and the apartheid regime called for the death penalty against us 3 whites, and blamed the 76 uprising on us. So we weren't sure to be whether to be rather proud of this achievement, or rather nervous as to the outcomes. But what was, the feedback I got even when I was in prison, was that quite a lot of black youth, numbers of key ones that made their way into the ANC, had followed the trial and had appreciated, for them it was like ok, whites are also in the struggle and are prepared to go to jail and so on. And I hope I broke down stereotypes. Its quite interesting because every now and again I read poetry and things like that in schools, and partly because some of the poetry is set for matric, so the poor kids have to read the poetry, but the prison poems, and quite a lot of kids still say, oh, were whites in the struggle and so on. So it's a nice way to also talk about that.

But in my current situation, my passions are the whole spatial thing, and the whole creating public spaces, and I see public transport, and really getting public transport moving, and effective, as part of transforming and de-racialising geography, as a really big and important, lovely task. So there's a lovely thing in the Cape Times today from some elderly white woman who lives in one of those retirement flats in Gardens, and yesterday or something she said she caught the myCiti bus, from Gardens to the waterfront and back again, and she said it was such a lovely experience, it was black and white people together, and we all talked, and that's the thing about public transport as opposed to cars, each of us lugging a ton of metal on our own, in our isolated boxes on freeways shouting at each other. And public transport, if its not the current public transport which is dreadful, in a minibus or a train, but if its decent, affordable, effective public transport, it deracialises mobility, transport, access, and creates an opportunity for south Africans to rub shoulders. They did during the world cup using public transport to get there and back, and there was that lovely semi-final, Currie Cup semi-final in Soweto, the rugby teams, the Stormers, it's very interesting. So all these groups of fans went into Soweto, and they caught, they used Metrorail to get there, one of them I even heard has bought property in Soweto. So these are symbolic, but it gives you a glimpse of what's possible.

So in my current life, ya, that's what I'm doing, changing the city, which we have to do in any case, because the average public transport trip in London is around 8km, and in Pretoria the average public transport trip length is 25km, one trip. So it's just telling you, so we can't get it right unless we also change these sprawling, particularly Gauteng, low density, and you know in all cities there are richer areas and poorer areas, but the geographical separations are just important. I mean rail lines are built to typically divide people, a thousand things like that. So the democratizing space and de-racialising space, public transport is part of that.

JC: And then you've got to tighten up on cars, but you can't do it until you've got the public transport, but if you start to be tougher on parking laws, like this building here, I get driven and dropped off in my fancy government car, and I mean I get subsidized in terms of parking and so on, but I mean the clerks, they need to find another way to get here and they are not subsidized and so on. There's a big fight, post office has just built a new building, and there's a big fight around corruption and so on, but part of what the unions are taking up is that its located in a swanky, inaccessible place, and I mean we don't think about access and mobility for people. So public transport.

FW: That's great, it's an interesting perspective. Thank you very much.