



Race: The conversations we are "not"having in South Africa

24th February 2015

PRESENTERS		
Prof. Ben	Turok	New Agenda
Prof. Pierre	De Vos	University of Cape Town: Department of Public Law
FACILITATOR		
Judith	February	Institute for Security Studies
PARTICIPANTS		
Akona	Gwiliza	Roth Communications - Intern
Berenice	Paulse	Parliament of South Africa
Brenda	Vurgarellis	Independent
Charlotte	Imani	HSRC
Dayana	Dreke	Western Cape Network for Community Peace & Development
Ester	Sapitre	Parliament of South Africa
Ghalib	Galant	SynergyWORKS Consulting
Graham	Thomas	G T Consultancy
Johan	Kruger	FW de Klerk Foundation
Kathleen	Dey	Rape Crisis Cape Town Trust
Leon	Liedeman	GROWCOM
Lionel	Louw	Independent
Lisa	Madikane	Institute for Healing of Memories
Mandla	Klanisi	Institute for Healing of Memories
Maurice	Dyer	Institute for Healing of Memories
Michael	Graaf	Independent
Nick	Stickling	GROWCOM
Peter	Vurgarellis	Independent
Prof. Pedro	Tabensky	Rhodes University: Department of Philosophy
Roland	Langley	Walmer Estate Civic Association (WECA)
Siddeeq	Railoun	Independent
Sisanda	Sipamla	Parliament of South Africa
Venessa	Padyachee	NICRO
STAFF		
Felicity	Harrison	Goedgedacht Forum
Desire	Jackson	Goedgedacht Forum
RAPPOREUR		
Stuart	Rothgiesser	Roth Communications

INTRODUCTION

Felicity Harrison: We're concerned that race is an issue that has been glossed over. There is much 'woundedness' in South Africa around this issue and there is polarisation in public discourse, especially from politicians. There is a need to continue the discussion.

There is interest in further events around the country [on this issue]; clearly, these are the things that people want to discuss.

Judith February: The conversations are really important; we have seen how race has come to the fore in many debates, especially on social media. It is always simmering under the surface. But we also need to acknowledge the progress made since 1994.

PRESENTATIONS¹

PROFESSOR BEN TUROK

I'm rather tired of discussing race, since we have been doing it for so long; therefore, I'm going to speak from personal experience.

Race fatigue

I suffer from race fatigue – I am a bit bored from endless discussions on race. It is clear that race is still keen e.g. in today's *Cape Times*, a fight between white and black students in Stellenbosch is described. Daily, we have these discussions, so my race fatigue is probably not justified. I was born from Jewish parents in Latvia, which was the first fascist country in Europe. One of the first things my father did upon arrival in South Africa was fight fascism in the 1930s in Cape Town! My parents were liberal; they believed in the qualified franchise (i.e. Blacks were not yet ready for the vote). I developed a fascination for philosophy – I'm a follower of Plato, Aristotle and Marx. I began to look at my own values and beliefs and became a revolutionary politically and ideologically because I thought that SA would never change incrementally. I became involved in the SACP and ANC and in the long trajectory of the Struggle.

Race in the ANC in the 1950s

All congresses were separated by race – Indian, Coloured, White and Black. The ANC was determined to remain an African-only organisation, believing that was necessary to fulfil their mandate. In practice, we worked very closely. The Congress of Democrats worked together in the Alliance – there was integration at top and branch level. In the Cape, special effort was made to have multi-racial delegations in order to demonstrate the commitment to non-racialism. This was articulated in the *Freedom Charter*.

¹ Please note that this is a report on what presenters said and are not their verbatim presentations.

There were always groups of 'Africanists' who pushed very hard for African or Black identity (as opposed to multi-racialism). The PAC espoused a Black Consciousness/Africanist separatism which was actually anti-white and anti-Communist. The ANC, in a unique way, promoted non-racialism in practice (even though, organisationally, this broke down).

In 1960, MK was formed as a non-racial wing of the ANC. The racial breakdown in the formal structures of the Alliance did not occur in the underground – for practical reasons. Branches in exile were also non-racial. In 1969, the ANC met in Morongo, for seminal discussions on race. The Black bourgeoisie seeking political and economic power would not represent freedom but set out very clearly that political emancipation for Blacks was not the goal of the ANC; the goal of the organisation was liberation. Prejudice stands at the top of the colonial structure of oppression. We thought that race is the product of a system, rather than the system itself, a system of power (economic, political and social), and the problem remains a struggle to remove that system of oppression that was – and still is – South Africa. This was difficult to explain to people: Europeans were mesmerised by stories of discrimination.

Present day – Redefining the system

What is the nature of the contradictions today? Is it race dislike or is it still a systemic issue? Clearly the manifestation of race prejudice is still very strong. "Colonialism of a special type" was adopted by the ANC to describe apartheid. SA is no longer a colonial system, defined as a "system of political, economic and military coercion". We do have manifestations of economic coercion but not the other forms. We need to redefine the system as it is because it is no longer colonialism of a special type. However, the ANC is reluctant to redefine the system.

Efforts of the ANC to break down the system have been unsuccessful and sporadic (e.g. BEE, Affirmative Action). Black millionaires are not committed to liberation in any sense. The ANC is going to have to do a lot of re-thinking, because the BEE millionaires are not part of the motor forces but actually are reactionary in many ways. Affirmative Action has been enforced in very unfair ways in many cases, especially in the Western Cape, and has nothing to do with liberation.

Big mistakes are being made in order to break the shackles of the system we have inherited. There is still much to do. We have to attack race prejudice at every opportunity, but the problems are more fundamental than the cases we see every day. We have to define the present system; this is the challenge.

PROFESSOR PIERRE DE VOS

Race and power

I would like to raise points regarding conversations we're *not* having. What can one say that is new about race? It feels often like we are re-inventing the wheel. I wonder if we think enough about race and power, and the way in which race shapes power relations in society, e.g. who is allowed to speak, who is listened to, who is given power in specific contexts...and how this intersects with other personal characteristics, e.g. gender, sexuality.

The old fashioned, wishy-washy liberalism that divorces race and power is an issue. Race is not about people being nice to each other. People often talk about race as if it is divorced from other aspects of our lives, floating above.

The second question is: how is it that we are still so invested in the apartheid categories? These are invented! Why is it that we invoke those categories without problematizing an architecture of race imposed by the apartheid ideology? An essentialist notion of race goes along with it, i.e. that race is not something invented but that race is something that tells a truth about one as a human being. All of us experience race in some way, e.g. the privilege of being white or the discrimination of being black, but why is it that we invoke these categories without questioning them and it seems that in doing so we serve to normalise them?

Third, given apartheid race categories, it is very difficult and uncomfortable to talk about inter-race prejudice (i.e. between people who under apartheid were classified differently). These are not easy things to talk about, because the idea of being 'Black' has a broad category in the ANC's definition. These kinds of tensions and prejudices that exist based on these old categories often go hand in hand with competition for jobs and other economic opportunities. People will invoke apartheid categories to advance their material interests. They have real effects on the material world. It is an elephant in the room and is difficult to speak about without being seen to be blaming the victims.

Fourth, [is] the issue of structural racism. The legacy of a world dominated by white-ness and knowledge is structured by the dominant group. This is a structuring of our thinking; we often internalise ways of being in the world that are very much based on the very ideas that legitimise colonialism e.g. the structural racism that permeates a university, for example, that says certain knowledge and ways of being in the world are valued, i.e. European and North American. We are all steeped in it so it is difficult to talk about. We often don't realize how infested our knowledge is with Western notions of knowledge production.

Another question that is important to think about is xenophobia, and its link to structural racism and prejudice. It is always striking that foreigners who bear the brunt of prejudice are not the white foreigners who buy property in Camps Bay. This may be due to class prejudice but it may also have to do with internalised prejudice on our continent. Why do South Africans have a different response to foreigners who come from Europe and North America? Have we internalised the prejudices that apartheid promoted? To what extent have we internalised the notion that South Africans are better than other Africans? I am told by Africans that South Africans are very arrogant, prejudiced and "behave like Americans"! It would be interesting to talk about this. What is happening here?

Lastly, I think we need to talk about these issues in a different way. We always talk about redress and affirmative action when we speak about race. The Con-Court has embraced the notion of transformation to think about these things broadly. What do we need to do to make society one that is transformed in terms of class and race? We often talk very narrowly about race, e.g. appointments to the judiciary. People will often count heads, and these things are important, but people do not ask what the values are of the 'Indian woman' or 'African man' who is appointed. Are they people invested in the status quo or in a deeper kind of transformation?

DISCUSSION

Judith February: Political language impacts on the way in which these things play themselves out in society.

Participant's personal story: With the advent of democracy, I was classified for the very first time as 'Coloured', as the 'Other'.

I've always believed that racism within itself is a symptom, not the disease. A new term for all the isms is 'syndromatic'. It is a syndrome because it is multifaceted. How does one deal with this at a systemic level, e.g. colonialism. The impact of the monetary system is not often looked at. Oppression, domination and exploitation are a very powerful triad, but it is driven by a particular nucleus – the creation of greed and fear through misuse of power, authority and deceit.

We need to look at the origins of all forms of exploitation and domination and we will find that the skills competences are all the same. Oppression, domination and exploitation bring about syndromatic isms, and one cannot take out the imagery of the colonial imperialism, of history, or the role of industrialisation within the resurgence of racism, particularly the *Breton-Woods Agreement*. In summary, the US Petrodollar started playing a significant role in world domination. This policy was designed by the World Bank and IMF and plays a major role in the world economy. The monetarist system is about the deceit of supply and demand to control. My heart still pains that the closure of the RDP Ministry was a major blow to transformation.

QUESTIONS:

I was struck by how atomized the bottom of the Struggle was but at the top we saw integration. Is that not the case today? There is much integration at higher levels but on the ground people are still locked into race-based differences? Due to town planning, people are still locked into racial divisions – geographically and in their heads.

BEN TUROK: There is very little integration at the top! The ANC today is very strongly African. It was much more multi-racial in the 1950, e.g. Dr Naicker, Dr Dadoo, Alex Latimer, Helen Joseph and Braam Fischer. The ANC made enormous efforts to profile people of

different races as leaders of the struggle. There is little visibility of non-Africans in the ANC since 1994. Jesse Duarte is the only non-African at the top of the current ANC.

Comment: Race is not really the issue. We wasted 50 years struggling over the issue of 'race'.

BEN TUROK: It was not a distraction; it was formulated in a different way – as national liberation, not as race freedom. The argument was that national liberation is different from Africanist liberation, e.g. the Black Power movement in United States, a pro-black struggle and not a non-racial struggle. The ANC did not agree with this as it isolated one aspect and not the whole Struggle.

What would SA look like if we let go of the notion of race as the defining feature of people? What would our institutions, rules, process and our relationships look like? Why do we fetishize this notion and hold onto it? Does holding onto them benefit the power relations?

PIERRE DE VOS: Identities are sites of struggle and resistance. Identities are very important to invoke in order to resist oppression. It's about trying to use a collective identity to resist what is being imposed. It means we will have to re-order global society, and this is currently not possible. Derrida says one must play with two hands: one must accept for the time being that we are stuck with identities around race, gender and sexuality. We cannot avoid being black or white or homosexual or whatever, but, with the other hand, we have to question the validity of these identities and accept that they are constructed. It is a struggle.

DISCUSSION

In the 1980s, the IMF and World Bank became very powerful in relation to the 'Third World' and they designed the Washington Consensus that imposed very severe financial control mechanisms on developing countries, especially Africa, that led to two decades of stagnation. These elements were adopted under coercion by SA in 1994.

South Africans classify people through the lens of race. A participant told a story about being a foreigner seen as white in 2003 (and therefore ignored by non-white South Africans). It makes one sad to see in 2015 all the stories of racist attacks.

Conferences on race are very diverse and differentiated; there are few spaces for different races to come together and speak. It is very important to create space for critical whiteness. There has been a loss of memory, i.e. white South Africans are refusing to take responsibility for their role in apartheid.

South African blacks have an inferiority complex. It is very sad to see that the apartheid system has had such a deep effect. There is much work to do.

Participant: We have always had racism, e.g. anti-Semitism in South Africa. Italians will discriminate by South or North [of the country]. I'm proud to be South African and our children have that pride. We need to stop arguing about the past in order to move forward.

I want to agree with the former speaker re being classified since 1994: I have felt more 'Coloured' than since 1994, in contrast to prior to liberation, when we were simply all Black. Employment equity speaks of Blackness but one must be African in order to be politically correct. The modelling as seen in government appointments to boards where there are opportunities to model non-racialism is not done. Government is concerned with appointing whites but not Indians and Coloureds.

Ben Turok: It is clear that Africans are pushing their way forward in all areas, including political and economic, rather than operating in an inclusive manner. There is pressure from one group in our country for a higher profile. A class that has been deprived and oppressed for so long is pushing for hegemony, and this is understandable. This is not race prejudice. It's not because they are 'anti-Coloured'; it's a more positive aspiration, a release of energy from African people because they were denied previously.

One word on this word 'so-called', e.g. 'so-called Coloured'. The reason people say 'so-called' is because the label 'Coloured' is embarrassing. Coloured people have a challenge to define themselves – and it is not enough to say one is 'South African'. It is inadequate that we allow someone to say 'so-called' and to call ourselves 'Coloured'.

Pierre de Vos: What I often do to signal my discomfort with the apartheid system is to say "a person who was classified under the apartheid system as ..."

Participant: There are certain contexts in which classifications are reserved and are integral to redress and transformation. Universities need to be challenged on economic exclusion.

Power

White privilege is perpetuated. One does not have access to power if one is not part of the elite. Economic inequality perpetuates the hold on power, and it is manifested in the educational system. Money buys good quality education, which gives you access to opportunities and privilege. Without money, one is doomed to a poor educational system.

Pierre de Vos: White privilege has been spoken much of in certain circles recently. Whenever I write about this, there is an avalanche of answers. There is a huge denial on the part of many white South Africans and on the unspoken ways that the world privileges us. People get very upset about this because it goes to the links between race, power and economic benefits, and whenever that is touched, there is an uproar: for example when I wrote that I agreed with Tutu to pay 5% as an apartheid tax I got hate mail and phone calls. It is almost as if to touch the economic structure one has to admit that you were on the wrong side. Unlike in Germany, the majority of white South Africans have not done that. How do we get the majority of white South Africans to say that they benefitted from

apartheid? Due to the nature of the transition we are expected to not touch this hornet's nest but rather focus on reconciliation.

Ben Turok: Difference is normal in South Africa. No other Africans ever call me a 'white' South African. It is only in SA that I am called 'white'. We have a problem that no-one else in Africa has. It is not done in Kenya to comment on one's white skin.

Participants: When I was called 'white woman' in Nigeria by kids, I did not take this as prejudice. We are over-sensitive to the race issue.

As soon as the ANC stands a chance of losing the vote, it will destroy democracy. This is all about the economy, but maybe racial incidents should happen more often to come to the fore. The Model C system was the biggest mistake: Model C principals have not transformed. An African or Coloured South African loses their identity in Stellenbosch. The gap between Coloured and Black students and white students is alarming. Because Coloured groups transcend both races, we understand both black and white issues. There is a perpetuation of economic control by the *Boere* mafia. We need entrepreneurs to grow the economy and people will start to talk less of race.

It seems that there is ambivalence between how we experience things in our inner world (psychologically) and the structurally imposed outer world, and in how we relate to each other. Where do we see degrees of integration because that is surely a model for transformation? I'm very concerned about institutions of democracy, all of which are microcosms of what goes on around us at every level. In our organisations, we created platforms and other spaces where we could talk about internal conflicts and interests where we could talk about inevitable issues, e.g. kitchen table conversations. We have built organisations as a home with the kitchen table as the centre that is continually revolving. There are very interesting conversations by diverse parties at the kitchen table – humorous, questioning, and passionate. We need to create more of these platforms and places where these kinds of conversations can happen.

Comment: There are also physical spaces, e.g. the Sea Point Promenade, that need to be built that allow for these kinds of different opinions

Pierre de Vos: How to deal with difference and diversity is to understand that one's perspective is not the dominant perspective and also to understand where one has to bend to it; for example, at UCT where, structurally, some people are not going to feel that they belong. How do we break down the norm where to people in the dominant group it is often invisible? We won't do it unless we acknowledge at least that there are dominant narratives.

Ben Turok: It can be done by affirming that difference is normal. UCT does not put sufficient emphasis on that. It was done in the ANC; one did not feel race in the ANC for decades. Today one is beginning to feel an element of discrimination against non-Africans. It can be done if discrimination against non-Africans is consciously overcome. This is not happening to the degree it ought to whether in white-dominated institutions such as Stellenbosch University or black-dominated ones such as parliament.

There is much internalised oppression playing itself out. The behaviour of people in rural areas is as if 1994 didn't happen!

Participant: Ben Turok said that power shapes race and Pierre de Vos said that race shapes power, and if both are right, we have mutual constitution. Both have independent sources. We need to speak about how power shapes the mind, and for that we have to understand the mind. I worked at a place where I could not speak the language, i.e. Afrikaans. Pretoria is freaky: the white supremacy there is totally bizarre. There is a story of a black beggar saying "master". I couldn't believe that someone could do this and I got really angry; I felt insulted. That for me was a key that is at the heart here – not race but racism. This is a very complex issue. The critical issue is that the beggar could not help himself. People at the right of the Freedom Front, e.g. the Afrikaans Student Bond could not be understood except by a psychologist who has Fanonian leanings. Much of the debate in South Africa on race cannot be understood unless we take critical race theory on board. There is much insight to be taken from race theory, i.e. the intimate space between micro and macro. I'm also tired of being profiled as a 'white guy'. I know exactly who you are without talking. I've sussed you out, profiled you, know your algorithm. We need to understand that race and power are mutually constituted, and that one does not exist without the other.

Let's say there are three lobbies: the structural conditions lobby leaves it entirely mysterious as to how these structures exist but it's clear that they are also demeaning to human beings. Just change the structures and we as puppets will be free. We have no agency.

The psychology without structure lobby says South Africans need therapy. So we take a homeless person to Freud and we cure him of his condition.

The right position is that structures exist and they affect human beings and they are alive because they exist in us on an individual level. So we cannot ignore either one.

Going back in time is critical to addressing any critical issue – one issue that is linked to many other issues. One cannot disconnect racism from colonialism. In South Africa, we are faced with a particular dilemma: we cannot access the real negotiated settlements. Part of this agreement favoured many of the corporates. The 337 sunset clauses cannot come into the public domain. That deceit immobilises us because we are prevented from knowing what was really agreed on. The \$25-billion taken from the IMF had serious repercussions for the country. Nelson Mandela had to follow the party line. The ANC needs to come clean as to what the settlement was and what privileges they agreed need to remain. Our Constitution is inaccessible because it does not apply to my real life; it only applies to my imagined live.

Ben Turok: There is an interaction between the two, which is correct. 'Which one is the solution?' is the question. It seems to me that the discourse about race has certain limits because the solution does not lie in psychology, in identifying prejudice. It can't be solved only by discussing race prejudice; it is far more fundamental.

Pierre de Vos: One can say that race prejudice is constituted by the whole experience, the whole structure. The reason why I emphasise the race part is because I think that to effect change one must understand how things are made normal, how prejudice is normalised. If

we start accepting racism and prejudice and structures that create those prejudices and racism, we cannot change anything. One is not more important than the other. I have a tendency to write and speak against that which I experience, and I experience all the attempts to make that prejudice invisible – to ignore it and deny it.

I accept myself as being called 'Coloured'. In our family, we have darker and fairer persons. We have grown up with this...the darker skinned Coloureds are usually the poorer and Afrikaans speaking; the fairer ones live in affluent areas and have straight hair. That was the class distinction we had within same racial group. Discrimination is based on class and economic circumstances, e.g. domestic workers ignored by BEE, designer-clothed black people. We know in Sandton of black people being sent around the back (by black people). This discrimination (where you are on the economic and social ladder) is strong; it is fine if you are in the elite.

We can be diplomatic, analyse, talk, but in the context of South Africa, it is not about colour, there is a stigma attached to crime due to the apartheid regime. Until restorative justice is applied, which is the engine of transformation, the issue of race will prevail. To talk about what you did is not good enough; what are you going to do? It is not about running a soup kitchen or giving food to beggars.

What do we do about the way the world is structured, the Camps Bays and the Khayelitshas that does not give it to another elite? How do we do economic redress that changes the structures? It is important to talk about this and to acknowledge that we have a problem in our society – economic inequality that is structured. I do not have an answer to this.

Creating spaces to speak about race

The main question is why are we still so invested in apartheid race categories; from this flows all the other questions. The one thing we cannot take away from apartheid was to divide and rule. Contrary to individuals taking opportunities, the issue is systemic, and manifests in many areas of life, e.g. work where one can only be non-racist if one is African, to shops where I am treated with disdain because I'm Coloured, to church where I'm treated with respect because I'm educated (as opposed to being White where it would be normal). My child is very good with colour – he does not see race. We can see that we can successfully engineer policies to try to reverse the inequalities of the past. I'm steadily becoming disillusioned because not enough of these places to speak about race.

Creating spaces where the mind can influence the macro – to speak about race issues – is necessary.

These meetings are not going to help the people in the townships who all work in white communities. There are more African brothers than Eastern Cape people in our areas; we are losing jobs to those foreigners. There are no black-owned businesses in our communities (except alcohol and drugs); foreigners run the shops. People tolerate each other, not embrace each other. It is a trigger when a single foreigner does something. It is important to go to communities and speak to them about race issues.

The race issue is distressing: I have to ask a white woman to ask for placement for my child because if I ask they tell me the school is full.

The Berlin Wall fell 25 years ago. We are all white and speak the same language, but after all this time we still have prejudices and economic differences. Perhaps this puts into perspective the South African situation: all the baggage of apartheid and colonialism. The multicultural society and diversity is very exciting. People live in poverty every day and want immediate change. It takes time and we need to check our expectations.

Speaking as someone who comes from mixed descent, the issue of race is linked to economic opportunities – and being excluded from them. Africans pushing their way forward in a natural, organic sort of process is not the whole story; this is state backed to change the system with policies in place that seek a deliberate outcome, e.g. BEE, quotas, AA. We need to talk about these policies and whether we are achieving the intended outcomes and the people that we have unintentionally left behind.

Ben Turok: The state and the ANC itself is an instrument of affirmation; there is no doubt this is happening. The outcome could be a bad one; that is why the public and the ANC need to discuss what the outcomes are if Africans are given the priority in all levels. Whether there is a limit should be discussed too. Whether we are reversing history also needs to be discussed.

Having a platform to speak of racial issues is important. We need more of these discussions but at different levels so that people can speak out and do not resort to violence. Having a place to speak with intellectuals is very important. Everyone has been affected by history and it will be a long time before race goes away. People who deny race progress do not have a place in our discussions. Having black entrepreneurs and new political parties, e.g. the EFF is important. I have experienced black entrepreneurs who are not invested in transformation, e.g. the Chief Justice who spoke about SA being a more Christian country. Many people were opposed to this statement but persons in positions of power have their prejudices and bring these to these positions. The University of Pretoria is a big Stellenbosch University; they are identical in culture. Fact in point: The classes at SU were conducted in Afrikaans although they had English language textbooks.

Stellenbosch University has been a ticking time bomb. There was also the Gauteng headmaster issue.

Privilege

We never want to give up our privilege as a human being. Whites create white, heterosexual, and male as a norm. Everything else is the other, and human beings have a fear of the other. We need to create space for integration – not tokenism. Are you connecting any prejudices, stereotypes, judgments to colours? Every white person is internally racist – consciously or not – because of the structures. We need to address the issues of privilege and critical whiteness. How many whites understand what it is to wake up

at 4am and travel from Khayelitsha to make tea and care for the children? They only care about the fact the person is late!

The Former President said: "I am an African." But I'm not sure South Africans know what it is like to be an African. Other Africans and Afrikaners are said to not be African. Black South Africans are abrogating that term, so now no-one else can take on that issue. The Holocaust is another example. This is part of the issue; it is not just structural. We have a legal code and some institutions that work well, but then we get into processes in those institutions that do not work so well. In the labour field, we moved into powerful processes, e.g. arbitration by third parties, rules, institutions, processes and relationships. It really is people who enforce rules, institutions, etc. Can anyone name the previous Public Protectors? Can anyone name the head of the HRC? The institutions are only as strong as the people in them. A transformed leadership is necessary to not weaken the system. And there is one more element: "Foreigners taking my job, my land" was the political cry in 2008. Tinkering with the structural stuff keeps us in the loop. Apartheid was both structural and intensely personal. Both need changing. The personal transformation needs space in the structures.

Concept of 'Creolisation'

Technically, Afrikaans is a Creole language, meaning it has a mixed colonial and imperial background. People also self-identity as 'Creole'. Within Afrikaans academia, there are some who are trying to be progressive, talking about the language as a Creole language and the people as Creole, and pointing out that apartheid was a traumatic tearing apart. It might be that we are not all the same, but the Creole category offers a more neutral way forward.

Restorative Justice

Mandela's 67 minutes was an idea of what restorative justice could be. Mandela had an idea but people were running around in a ridiculous way to send soaps, etc. We think so broadly; we do not take it in our selves. As a result, we do not do anything. What are you doing personally that is sustainable to transform this country? Are you willing to be transformed, or are you comfortable enough in your comfort zone?

We have to be the change we want to be in the world. I find myself in different spaces, e.g. places where everyone is treated equally and in places where we are not treated equally. There are many places where we are treated equally and we should tell those stories. Children do not do as we say but as we do. We have to be the change ourselves, to act.

The power of restorative justice lies in repairing people's relationships. Everyone is of equal value. It allows for listening to each other beyond the frame and the lens of how we see each other (race). It would shift it people could learn to respect and see dignity in each other. It is called a 'sacred space' because it gives people back their dignity.

There are two answers to restorative justice. First, the whole question of white South Africans being prepared to step back, the Samantha Heist argument. It is about speaking and making mistakes where one becomes human. Whites should not be quiet. Stepping back and not being in a leadership position (where others can be leaders) is the easy solution.

How can an organisation like AfriForum fight for land restoration? Afrikaners have not become part of the new South Africa. Civil society organisations need to be rebuilt, and money needs to be found independent of government and companies. Reaching people will go a long way to rebuilding society socially and economically. We need to find funds and identify civil society organs that stand for justice.

Every 67 years the world economy collapses. In 2015 the Third World War will occur. It is not a war between nations, and happens within nations. It has to happen to bring issues to the fore.

Conclusion: As civil society, we need to stop thinking that laws and government will solve things. Some of the interesting questions I have are what are the intersections between race and class post 1994? How do we transform race and communities, and ourselves?

The process of the transition was a compromise, and sometimes we forget this compromise.

We also need to look at the experiences of other countries, and look at the attitude of exceptionalism (i.e. that South Africa and South Africans are unique in overcoming and dealing with race).

The role of leadership in South Africa is telling.

I urge you to continue to have these conversations in your workplaces, homes, etc.

END