

[Ismail Vadi Interview](#)

IV – Ismail Vadia

JS – Jonny Selemani

JS: Our first question, as I said, it's on the issue of non-racialism. The first question is what is your understanding of the historical root, pre-1994, of non-racialism, with regard to things such as the ANC in exile, ANC here and obviously the alliance by all the congress partners.

IV: There are multiple issues you're raising there. I think first of all one needs to understand what are the historical roots of non-racism. If you look at pre-colonial African society, that is before the white Europeans landed on our shores, what was society like then? You had the main African kingdoms or pre-colonial formations, lastly on the basis of a king. Depending on the nature of their sustenance, if they were pasture dwellers, or if they were permanently resident in an area, they would engage in subsistence farming. And in that context, identities would be created but those would be pre-colonial identities, linked to an ethnic condition, or social formation. With the coming of the white colonists, a completely new phenomenon entered South African political, economic and social history. White colonists came here in search of new economic opportunities, but in a very short while due to their military power, they began a quest of active conquest. And this conquest took two forms, one was obviously military battles in which they were able to defeat African kingdoms, and also an ideological conquest, where they introduced new languages, new culture, Christianity as religion, a Western notion of civilization. And with conquest, they came with preconceived ideas and norms of what African society was like, they saw it as uncivilized, as brutish, lacking in faith and belief in god, and they looked down upon that civilization. And yet there are many examples of very rich African civilizations, in all of Africa. Of course they didn't have the concept of a statehood, but there were significant civilizations based on kingship. So that shaped the nature of this relations. Colonial conquest created a master servant relationship, a colonized dominated people, which crystallized in 1910 as the Republic of South Africa, where the African people, all the kingdoms were smashed up and crushed by military force. Of course there were historic victories where African armies were able to defeat the colonialists, but over all the end game was the defeat of the African people militarily. And the formation of the Union of South Africa in 1910 represented that political defeat, and the start of white supremacy rule in this country. The Union of South Africa's government was established, which included both Dutch and English colonists, but they had excluded the indigenous majority of this country, the African people, and they also excluded people of Indian origin and those who were of mixed extraction as a result of inter-racial relationships, the so-called colored people. So that's the historical roots – you cannot understand this without understanding colonial domination and conquest. Subsequently, there has been a progressive stripping of socioeconomic and political rights for African, Indian and colored people. And that was based on race. A system set up for the national party's victory in 1948, an institutional system for direct racial segregation which was established with the group areas act, where Indian people lived in Indian areas, colored people in colored areas, and the pass system prevented African people, the mobility of African people in the country, they were restricted in the Bantustans, and were only allowed to come to the cities as workers, and limited numbers were allowed to settle down in African urban townships. So that

is at the level of race. So an institutional system, and a legal, political system, of white control, white domination. And of course when you start living in an Indian area, you go to an Indian school, your only friends are Indians, you swim at an Indian beach, you can only go to an Indian pool – a particular ethnic or racial consciousness is developed within succeeding generations, because that's how young people or children grow up. So you develop an exaggerated notion of your Indianness, or your coloredness, or your Zuluness. So an ethnic identity, ethnic come racial identities were constructed through the formal system of racial segregation and later apartheid. Now I mention to this, is what has been the impact of capitalism, because with colonial conquest came new economic relationships in forms of production. In pre-colonial African society we had basically subsistence economy, but colonialism led to the introduction of a new form of economy. Because with colonialism came land ownership, private ownership of manufacturing, of mining, massive new technological changes, and of course those who were holding economic power were white, and in the early years predominantly English, and then subsequently in the 1920s, 30s, the kind of capital began to invert, and those who were the working class were predominantly African, to some extent Indian and colored. So you have an intermixing between racial superiority and power relationships and economic or class relationships, and the common denominator is the racial categorization of these relationships. So the power was in the hands of the white ruling elite, and of course the majority were excluded from economic and political power. Now that creates a particular consciousness, so racial identities or class identities cannot be divorced from the material context in which people grow up, and because of the predominance of the racial factor in this country, we have an exaggerated notion of racial identity. Now what has been the countervailing force of the ANC? Shortly after the Union of South Africa, in 1912, the African political leadership, as well as intellectuals, teachers, priests, who accepted some of the norms of white colonial rule, the African educated elite, together with more progressive ethnic leaders, kingship leaders, said this is daylight robbery. I mean foreigners have come here and established a new power relationship and have excluded us. And the divisions within African society based on tribalism was not in the interest because that was now becoming a means of dividing and ruling the African people, and of course the idea of a South African native national congress was established, and the ANC was created. The very name, it said that this is a national movement, of course native means in that time it would have meant African, but the indigenous people of this land, and a political congress has been set up to begin to unify across racial and ethnic identities, as a countervailing force against white minority rule in this country. 1923, the ANC changes its name to the African National Congress, but pre-dating that already, in 1895 and 1896, when Mahatma Gandhi came and he took the lead in mobilizing people into a kind of passive resistance. But importantly, he took the initiative, he started a kind of political initiative in this country, that is the Natal Indian Congress in 1886, and then in 1904 he established the Transvaal Indian Congress. So in Natal you had the Natal Indian Congress, and then the forerunner to the Transvaal Indian Congress. So prior to the formation of the ANC, we had a political congress within the Indian community, actively mobilizing. Not for the overthrow of the regime, but basically saying that we are British subjects, and we want the same rights as those in the British commonwealth. Other developments in the Cape was the African People's Organisation, largely organizing colored people. For many many years, in spite of the forms of oppression in the Western Cape, colored people had some political rights. Of course the African people's organisation was mobilizing against overt forms of racism and discrimination against the colored people in the Western Cape. So these were all political

organisations. These were appropriate for their time because they attempted to mobilize a particular constituency. But given over time, by the 1940s, when a more left wing or Marxist orientated leadership began to emerge in these organisations, they say that there was no way they could fight this struggle alone. They realized that they needed to form alliances in order to foster the unity of the oppressed people, those who were racially discriminated. They needed to share a common platform, so that you can strengthen your fight against a white minority ruling this country. And of course in 1947 a very important agreement is reached between the Natal Indian Congress, the Transvaal Indian Congress and the African National Congress, signed by the 3 leaders in what was called the Doctor's Pact. Dr Khumar from the ANC, Dr Dadu from the Natal Indian Congress and Dr Naicker from the Transvaal Indian Congress. Basically it was to say that we share similar if not the same forms of oppression, we are socially and politically discriminated against in this society, and we must make a common cause for the struggle for non-racialism in our society, for change, a more multi-racial society. 1952 the defiance campaign was organised across racial areas, and then very importantly 1955 was the Congress of the People, where the Freedom Charter is adopted. And the opening lines of the Freedom Charter was very important, the declaration that South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white. So a very powerful and a very moving line, that captured the vision of a new, non-racial society. What was important about the Freedom Charter was that people were asked what were they against, so I was against the Group Areas Act, etc, but they were also asked what are you for, what is your vision for the new South Africa, and that was captured in one page, which was the Freedom Charter. And that crystallized the vision of a non-racial society, in which all people as individuals, irrespective of their racial background, origins, have a common form of citizenship, equal political, socioeconomic rights, freedom of expression, equality in schooling. So a new vision was crystallized through that campaign, lasted over 18 months, and captured the imagination of many people throughout this country, and it posed the question what do we want? We know what we are against, but what do we want? So it was a very historic and significant document. Shall I stop there or must I carry on?

JS: Carry on, I'm enjoying this! Because I was going to question you about the Freedom Charter, and I think you're heading towards the idea of the ANC in exile, as well. Currently we are looking at, you mentioned..

IV: I'll carry on then. What is important is that political decision at that stage was taken to constitute the Congress Alliance, an alliance between the African Indian Congress, and ANC, and Congress of Colored people and the Congress of Democrats. The congress alliance was important because it set the stage for greater multi-racial forms of collective struggle across communities, joint struggles and greater co-operation in the fight against apartheid. 2 significant developments, when the ANC was banned, the Indian Congresses were not banned, but they became dormant. But when the ANC launched its armed struggle, Umknoto we Sizwe, members across racial communities became combatants. So you are affiliated to MK, or you joined MK on a completely non-racial basis, although the political organisations remain in the form of African exclusive or Indian exclusive organisations, although ideologically they have already moved towards the ideal of a non-racial society. But very important to remember is the South African Communist Party, later when it was about to be banned, it remained one of the most important non-racial organisations. You joined the party as a member, and depending on your discipline

your understanding of Marxism, you were recruited into the party irrespective of race. SO it played a very important role in practically demonstrating that you can have a non-racial formation in the country, even in a racial society. It created its own problems in the congress alliance, when the African contingent claimed that the whites and the Indians and the coloreds were leading them by the nose, which ultimately led to the break away of the Pan African Congress in 1958. But that was a critical moment for the organisation, because those who shared an Africanist vision left the ANC, and I think that demonstrated that the ANC was already significantly striding towards a non-racial outlook. The ANC only opened its membership in 1985, held in exile, a very important conference of the ANC. There it opened its membership to anyone, irrespective of race. But by that time, in 1983 the Natal Indian Congress was already resurrected and started mobilizing Indian Communities. Significantly, when the ANC was unbanned and came back, the decision was taken that it would open its ranks even up to the level of the leadership to anyone who could get elected. But that all happened before 1994. So we see two processes, colonial conquest and domination, establishment of the power of the white rule in the country, but a countervailing force developing progressively, as conditions are changing, and creating in practical terms a vision of non-racial society through its methods of mobilization. Of course what is significant is the decision of 1994 to have democratic elections. Remember in 1984 we have the tri-cabinet parliament where whites, Indians and coloreds were accommodated by PW Botha in parliament, but again parliament for whites, a parliament for Indians, a parliament for coloreds, and of course the homeland system for African people, no parliament for African people. Because the people who were trying to reform apartheid were saying but the Zulus must have their own parliament in KZN, the Xhosas must have those in the Eastern Cape. So they said that they don't have an African majority, we only have a conglomeration of minorities. And that is what we oppose very strongly. So if 1984 saw a divergence of a racist tripartite parliament, certainly 1994 10 years later, the vision of a non-racial democratic parliament stands as the highest form of the expression of the people for a non-racial society. Can we end this now?

JS: What I would like to hear a bit more about, is the role of the ANC in exile, because it is argued that their role was one of the key features of the movement of non-racialism, because those who were exposed to people out there were not exposed to racism like people down here.

IV: Well look, I don't know, I was not living in exile. But you must ask yourself why the pAC didn't become as non-racial, it also went into exile, and it had members all over the world, had established its own offices, but it never transformed itself ideologically. The ANC's non-racialism had a very good influence from the communist party in the early years, through joint struggles and working together. See the way in which you break down racial prejudices is through day to day social interaction, that you begin to realize that another person is just another human being like me, he has the same kind of weaknesses, frailties, you have bad Indian people, you have Indian criminals, so you have African criminals, you have white criminals, it is a weakness of human nature irrespective of race. But of course race has created a prejudiced filament through which we see society. And I think in a non-racial society, a post-apartheid society, we should be working towards stripping that filament, and seeing people for who they are and what they are. To really begin to see people with values. Either you share those values or you don't share those values.

JS: So would you say that, how would you interpret, what is your understanding of the idea of non-racialism today, post-1994.

IV: I think non-racialism is not an event. It is a process of construction. Apartheid constructed a racial identity, in exaggerated forms. Because even in societies where there is no racism, you still have racial identities. What apartheid did was give institutional form and character to it. Now, to wash that out, to clear that form from the psychology of the people, from their consciousness, world view, is going to be a process. It is not going to be a moment or an event. And in a situation where there is significant inequality in society, in a situation in which socioeconomic relations have not equalized, race will still remain a critical factor in the society. With the bets will in the world, a desperately poor African person will look at a rich Indian person, rich white person, in a different way. And in his or her mind, the thought might come, how come whites and Indians have so much that I don't have? He is asking a legitimate question on the basis of his economic deprivation. So in a society of inequality, in which the majority of people who are poor are black, and a minority of whites, coloreds, Indians are rich, race will remain a factor.

The question is, how can we transform that, how can we begin to tell people, to understand that the inequality is a historical legacy, we need to fight against that, but we don't have to disrupt the project of building a non-racial society. We don't need racial antagonism and conflict in society, what we need to do is to address the root cause of inequality in society. There state has to create a really critical role, business sector has to play a critical role to begin to reduce the levels of inequality in society, to empower people. So we've got affirmative action, BEE, land redistribution as a strategy.

Now the question is, are these strategies succeeding, or are they failing? Now of course, a view is beginning to emerge that they are not going far enough. They are not radical enough, and many people are tinkering with them and not addressing the fundamental challenges of society. So after 17 years of democracy, we have higher levels of inequality in society, when the official program and project of the government is to reduce inequality. So the questions are being raised, are your strategies appropriate? And it is in that context where the debates around nationalization are coming up, should we not look at more radical forms to deal with this problem? Because what we have experimented with does not yield significant result. But look, there has been change. You have a growing black middle class in this country, some of them have become extremely wealthy. So capitalism, let's call a non-racialism democratic capitalist system has benefitted them significantly. But for a black person who is down and out, who says but I vote every 5 years, and how does it change my situation?

And that's what we need to address. The root causes of inequality. Unless you address that, racism is going to remain a factor. There are people in society, across all communities, who still have a racist mentality, a racist view. Some in the far right Afrikaner society, but you also have very sharp ethnic consciousness. You have some people who are serious about their Zulu identity, say they want to rule this country as Zulus. But those are in a minority. Certainly the mainstream project is still for a non-racial democratic society, but there are stresses and strains that are starting to emerge. So I think what the foundation is trying to do is to say that we have to talk about this openly, we have to accept that there are stresses and strains, they assume both racial and class identities, are interplaying with each other,

and if you don't manage this carefully, you can actually lead to heightened social conflict in society assuming racial forms. So we consciously and day to day have to push on the non-racial project.

Now schooling plays a very important role, because all of us get socialised through a mass school system. Your values are developed in your home, through your parents views, and then through the education system. That is what can be a major platform to propagate the concept of non-racialism, and to fight against forms of racism. They need to be constantly challenged. So it is both a positive form of mobilization, but at the same time we also have to react to things that are negative and to deal with overt forms of racism in society.

JS: You've answered a lot of my questions all in one, which is wonderful. I wanted to ask you what, things like, its been argued we have moved away from the struggle of political freedom, now its more about an economic freedom, where we are dealing with the issues of non-racialism. You mentioned that we are seeing a dual agenda of both social equality, which can also assist in the role of heading towards a non-racialist state.

IV: See, you must not take.. Many people say that we've got political freedom, now the fight is economic freedom. You must not take political freedom for granted. 50 years of post colonial rule in Africa, shows that democracy, political freedom can be short lived. When you cannot address inequalities in society, when you don't have good governance in society, in a short period of time, populist demagogues can emerge, dictatorships can emerge, and subvert the democratic project itself. And there are now more than 10 examples on the African continent of military dictatorships that are taking place. SO it is not one or the other. It is consolidating political freedom in this country, consolidating human rights and human dignity, at the same time accelerating the pace of economic development. Don't take political freedom for granted. Society can take a wrong turn very easily, and tomorrow you suddenly realize that new leadership demagogues emerge, and then society becomes totally corrupt and then there is a military coup. A military coup is supposedly to remove corrupt leaders, and then the military leaders themselves become corrupt. So you have a coup within a coup thereafter, and you have basically a military dictatorship, ruling by force over a very long period of time. So we must not take this project, we must build strong democratic institutions, we must defend the constitution, the human rights commission, a free and independent media, an active civil society, an active and politicized citizenship, so that they can defend their political rights and the gains we have made. It is very quick to narrow those democratic spaces that we have. We must consolidate and strengthen them. But at the same time we must recognize that if we don't address the issues of inequality very quickly in this society, there are going to be other forms of oppression and anger developing. So the two processes are twon components of a single process that we must attend to.

JS: In today's society, heading towards a non-racialist society, how do you think things like religion and the media can contribute towards creating an ideal non-racial society?

IV: Well, I think that religion can play a progressive role in society or even globally, but religion itself can become a source of conflict in society. Increasingly, I mean you hear a discourse, a chap called Samuel Huntington had introduced this 20 30 years ago, and he is talking about massive conflict based on lines

of religion. So we must not discount, if you look at event sin Nigeria now, Somalia, even in North Africa, religion is an underlying political factor. So it can become a source of instability and conflict in society. But it can play a progressive role. I think in our democracy the principle of democratic society has been accepted, the state has made a conscious choice to remain a secularist state, recognizing that there are multiple groups in our society, those who drafted the constitution has said that we will respect all religions, but we will not identify with a particular religion. And that wherever it is possible, the state accommodates a platform for freedom of religion. Those are very important values, if we can defend and affirm them, I don't foresee possibilities of religious conflict.

The media can play, the media has a very important role. In propagating the values of a non-racial society. It has a critical role, one of its responsibilities in society. But of course the media will always be critical, and will represent, good media will reflect the stresses and strains in society. It has to reveal the conflicts in society and interpret those conflicts. And sometimes it can contribute to further conflicts in society, and further misconceptions for what is happening in society. Because media is not devoid of ideological control. And those who own the media, also shape, have certain values they want to propagate, and they also want to propagate a particular socioeconomic system. But I think we do have a free media, they are quite combative, they fight for their space which is good. Whether they do enough to promote non-racialism, I don't think so. Excessively, negatives, weaknesses or failures of government, it is important to expose corruption, but I mean there isn't an important positive reporting on some of the positive processes of change in this society. I don't see the media as a flagship of a non-racial society in this country, I think they can play a bigger role in promoting the principle of a non-racial society.

JS: Just one or two more questions. The idea that economic justice is central in the fight towards a non-racialist state. What do you think our youth, the leadership of the youth league for example, what do you think, do you think they are currently advancing this idea for a non-racialist state? And if not, how much more do you think they can do to educate the future of tomorrow?

IV: There is nothing wrong with the youth asking awkward questions. Young people in their nature are like that. They will ask questions you don't expect, they will push forward the frontiers, they will challenge the established prescripts, there is nothing wrong with that. But the youth league, my concern is that they must spend more time in mobilizing young people around the issues of young people. Now here if you have a situation where roughly 35% of young people in this country, up to 40% of young people are unemployed, don't have access to the means of production, to productive labour, then you've got a large constituency out there in society that is restless, that feels a sense of hopelessness, that's not sharing in the fruit of a new society. And that is a major issue of concern. Now so there's nothing wrong with the youth league raising issues of economic empowerment much more strongly, but sometimes they are really encroaching on the turf of the parent organisation. Its fine, their focus must be to mobilize young people around the interests of young people. What are the interests of young people? It's education. Its sports, its culture. Its about personal development, and it's about economic opportunities and empowerment. So the roundedness is what I don't see, the sophistication and strategies are not coming out, and perhaps its leaderships in the way in which it is raising things is adversarial rather than constructive. So I would have it that we would have a more positive mobilization ethos to the organisation, rather than an adversarial, combative, negative kind of approach. It is more

the style of the league, not the issues that they are bringing up – it's more the style and the manner in which the leadership is taking up the issue, that I feel much more can be done there.

JS: Before I ask you the question of the foundation's role, I wanted just to ask one more question about key features of a non-racial society, what do you think they would be?

IV: You see it's, because of our racial past, we are also locked into the idea that we have to build a non-racial society. But let's say if you were in a society in which race was not a factor, how do you deal with racial tensions? There is fighting prejudice, it's fighting stereotyping, it's asserting the positive identities of people. Now in this society, it's more complex. So will we have an ideal non-racial society? I don't know. Can we do it in 20 years, 30 years, I don't know. It's a moving target. It's not something that you can say, we will achieve this in so many years. Because it also deals with people's own consciousness, and their own perceptions and attitudes about other people. So it's a process of constant engagement, changing that consciousness. See I subscribe strongly to the idea of multiple identities. I am a South African but I am also an Indian, I cannot discard my heritage. I mean I love my Indian food. I love my Indian curry, and Indian music, Indian languages, but I'm also a Muslim. So I have a religious identity. Gender is becoming a very big issue, some people think to be feminine, feminist is a part of their identity. So you will be a male, an Indian, a Muslim, a South African, somebody might be gay also. All those things contribute to the construction of that identity. You live in a society, I choose to live still in this old group areas, because the families are here, you have come to adjust to the numbers, the cultural institutions are here. Some people want to break out of this and have gone to live in the suburbs. I'm quite comfortable here. So it's context, but ultimately let's accept that we all have multiple identities. So if Bafana wins the world cup, I will be South African. But if the Indian cricket team is playing the Pakistan cricket team, I might not even support the South African cricket team, so then the Indianness might come out. And sometimes if there's a gender issue, maybe gender comes out. And sometimes when there's an issue close to the Muslim community then my Islamic identity is more pronounced. So what is important is for us to have a shared loyalty to a South African identity, one, and that is to a single nationhood, and to a single political system, because part of the problem we have is the moment you have a racialised political system you fragment society, so we must commit ourselves to a single political system, based on our constitutional principles. I think we've done a very good job there.

Then you have other identities, but you must remember that we are going to have to consciously challenge racism in this society, and how effective we are depends on not just on the foundation, but on all organisations, movements in society to consciously address this issue. It's the responsibility of the churches, the mosques, the schooling system, and I don't think our schools are doing enough about non-racialism. The workplace, we are not challenging racism still, we are not doing enough to transform the relationships in the workplace.

JS: If you say in the schools, what would you like to see happening?

IV: Values, I mean promoting non-racial values. Schools have doors that have opened up, they have become significantly deracialised, but you for example in Lenasia, majority of the kids in the schools are

African, but the majority of the school management is predominantly Indian, and I know African teachers are saying but when will the day come when I get promoted, and become the principal of a top school in Lenasia? So there is competition among the governing bodies, if there is a predominantly Indian governing body, they tend to give jobs to Indian teachers, because in their minds they think Indian teachers will give the best education to our children. But who are our children? The children are now predominantly African. So those contests take place, side by side. I mean those struggles take place, and that needs to really begin to look at the values of non-racialism, and then really look at the competence principles, is the person competent, irrespective of race, and don't just make the assumption that an Indian is more competent than an African. Look at the criteria objectively, look at the competencies of people, and sometimes you've got to give people the benefit of the doubt to affirm them. I think affirmative action has been vulgarised, it is becoming token, where the top leadership has a few token black Indian and colored faces, but in real terms in many businesses actual racial change has not taken place. So we need to have the affirmative action taken more strongly and more in a more nuanced way it needs to be affirmed. I mean some people are saying so for how long must we have affirmative action, it's already 17 years, how long must I wait to be affirmed? I also want a job, I live in this country, I've got the skills, how long must I wait? So those are all legitimate questions. But there is an overt form of racism, we have to challenge it.

JS: You mentioned the core values of non-racialism?

IV: As a principle, it must be a central principle in all forms of organisation in this society, business, social, sporting clubs. And that's where I was coming to with the youth league. If you look at the youth league today, what is its membership? It is almost exclusively African. You go to a youth league conference, if you can find out of the 5000 who were there of the conference, just how many Indian, colored and white youth were there, if you look on the campuses, when do we call ourselves the black student's society, but we were strong on non-racism. If you look at the leadership of the youth league, it doesn't reflect a non-racial character, it's almost exclusively African. Ok I see they have appointed an Indian person as a spokesperson, she is a young girl, she does very well. But if you look at its leadership, it's almost wholly African. Here the ANC has put out this strong call for the non-racial character of its leadership, it must be visible. In the earlier years it was much more strong, I must say even in the ANC now, fewer and fewer white Indian and colored leaders are beginning to emerge. But nationally you still see a strong influence, I mean of the 4000 people who come to the ANC conferences every 5 years, yes a large majority are African, but there is a significant proportion, at least a few hundred whites, Indians and coloreds. But it is the African delegates who vote minorities into the leadership. So there is still a strong belief in the principles of non-racialism in the ANC but I don't see it in the woman's league, and I don't see it in the youth league. What that tells me is that the youth league is failing to organise and mobilize young people from different communities, and it is failing to develop a leadership in these communities who would be able to become full leaders of the ANC youth league. I don't see it happening, and that's a concern.

JS: And finally, if you had to say, obviously being on the board of the foundation it's quite an insider question, but what else do you think the foundation can do to advance the cause of non-racialism?

IV: Well, the foundation can do many more things. We've had long debates. I think we've made a lot of progress since we started, and wheels turn very slowly, but we are beginning to make an impact, and it's not fast enough, its not significant enough. I would like to say a bolder approach on behalf of the board, on tackling the issues head on. And I think the difficulty is that most of the board members are also important figures in the ANC, and if they make a statement on the board platform, it gets misinterpreted as if it is an attack on the ANC. So leaders might be a bit more cautious in the way they approach things. So I think leaders need to be much bolder, and it should not be afraid to pronounce on key racial issues. It's not swift enough, that's my view. Important racist incidents occur, a big time news on TV and media, etc, but the board is very slow to react, and by the time it reacts, it's no longer an issue. Of course it's an issue in society, but it's no longer a media issue. So I would like to see it be more agile on that front, it needs to be more proactive in it's commenting. I certainly can do much more work on the schools front, but we are starting to get there. Research is a very critical area, a very powerful instrument to begin to shape public opinion, I am happy we are starting on that level and doing more systematic research, and not just talking about my gut feelings or someone else's gut feeling, but it is based on solid data that we can put out into society, and begin to raise the issues. And sometimes the foundation has to put racism in front of the nation's nose, and say things are rotting here, when do we confront these things. So I would want to see a bit more of that boldness coming out. Time is up.

JS: Thank you very much.