

Spring 2014

# Cape Town on The Eve of The 2014 Elections: 12 Narratives on Political Efficacy and The Post-Apartheid Presidency From Langa and Stellenbosch

Richard Ahne

*SIT Study Abroad*, rahne15@cmc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp\\_collection](http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection)

 Part of the [Inequality and Stratification Commons](#), [Political Science Commons](#), [Politics and Social Change Commons](#), [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#), and the [Race, Ethnicity and Post-Colonial Studies Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Ahne, Richard, "Cape Town on The Eve of The 2014 Elections: 12 Narratives on Political Efficacy and The Post-Apartheid Presidency From Langa and Stellenbosch" (2014). *Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection*. Paper 1773.

[http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp\\_collection/1773](http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection/1773)

This Unpublished Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the SIT Study Abroad at SIT Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection by an authorized administrator of SIT Digital Collections. For more information, please contact [digitalcollections@sit.edu](mailto:digitalcollections@sit.edu).

CAPE TOWN ON THE EVE OF THE 2014 ELECTIONS: 12 NARRATIVES ON POLITICAL  
EFFICACY AND THE POST-APARTHEID PRESIDENCY FROM LANGA AND  
STELLENBOSCH

Richard G. Ahne

Project Advisor: Bastienne Klein, private academic tutor and consultant, info@

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for South Africa: Multiculturalism and Human Rights

SIT Study Abroad, A Program for World Learning

Cape Town, Western Cape, South Africa

Spring 2014

**Table of Contents**

Acknowledgements.....	3
Glossary.....	5
Abstract.....	6
Introduction.....	7
Literature Review.....	10
Methodology.....	21
Ethical Reflexivity.....	25
Limitations of Study.....	27
Findings and Analysis.....	29
Langa.....	29
Stellenbosch.....	37
Conclusion.....	47
Recommendations for Further Study.....	50
Bibliography.....	51
Appendices.....	52

### **Acknowledgements**

This project could not have been completed without the invaluable encouragement and support of so many wonderful people during my stay here in Cape Town. I leave with a heavy heart knowing that upon the completion of this project, it will be soon for me to depart and to leave the people who have become my family in this beautiful country.

I would first off like to thank all the staff and those affiliated with the SIT program for all of their support and guidance, as well as for putting together an amazing program in which I have experienced and learned so much. Sisi Tabisa, thank you always for your wonderful company, our wonderful discussions about South African politics and society and for planting the seeds of thoughts that eventually formed into this project. Stewart, thank you for being the best academic director and friend, and for helping me refine the scope of this project and for teaching me “shaap shaap”. Thank you so much to Bastienne Klein for being a helpful advisor and a willing advisor for my project when others were not so willing. Thank you so much to Martin and Andile, for not only driving around a bunch of kids in their vans, but for providing laughs and merriment along the way.

I would like give my warmest thanks and embraces to my host families. To my mama in Langa, thank you so much for opening up your humble home to me and accepting me as a son. I hope that your best moments are yet to come in your golden years. To my little Langa bhutis, I pray that you can grow up to be strong, good men, far more so than your father and even Fourarms from Ben 10. To my mama, little bhuti and little sisi in Tshabo, thanks for showing us the beauty of South Africa's countryside in the Eastern Cape. To the vivacious yet tough-as-nails Afrikaner lady in Stellenbosch that let me stay in her home not once but twice, thank you for not

only providing me with leads in Stellenbosch, but also for your wisdom, your encouragement and your strong will. And to my mama in Bo-Kaap, thank you for your making room in your large family for one more person. I don't think I can forget your smiling embraces that added so much color to the already colorful community of Bo-Kaap when I was there.

Finally, I would like to thank all of the students of the SIT program that trekked this beautiful country and city every step of the way. Jordan “my boy”, Steph, Lucy “Stocks”, Shanna, Hannah, Casey, Kathryn, Amy, Georgia, Niki, Mari AKA “the best roommate”, the always awesome Arielle, Lucy KK, Amiri “the queen”, “Typhani”, Lilli, Elizabeth, Karisa, Adina, Lydia “Lyds” and Stace, South Africa just wouldn't have been the same without each and every one of you. I wish you the best of luck in all of your future endeavors.

## **Glossary**

ANC: African National Congress

DA: Democratic Alliance

EFF: Economic Freedom Fighters

### **Abstract**

This paper aims to examine the thoughts and opinions that citizens of Cape Town have regarding the political efficacy of the post-apartheid South African government and the post-apartheid South African presidency on the eve of the 2014 elections. As South Africa reaches its twentieth anniversary of the first democratic elections in 1994, the time is ripe and appropriate to examine the actions of the democratic government in improving or exacerbating the lives of Cape Town citizens, analyze the role of the post-apartheid presidency in this process and to measure people's faith in government and perception of presidential leadership. Through conversational interviews with voting age citizens in the Cape Town communities of Langa and Stellenbosch, this paper provides their narratives regarding their thoughts on their faiths in government, the current state of affairs and government performance, both in a local context and a national context. The interviews also convey their perceptions on presidential performance and leadership. The findings from the interviews demonstrate that political efficacy across the three neighborhoods has generally been low, with little or no excitement for the upcoming election, and disappointment and frustration with the current state of affairs, though there have been some relatively positive reactions. The findings from the interviews also suggest that although most of the interviewees valued the same things regarding traits of presidential leadership, they also emphasized different traits individually as well. This paper compares the findings of the interviews with a literature review, providing commentary on post-apartheid presidential leadership and electoral system, as well as governance in South Africa, twenty years into its democracy.

## Introduction

I had the great fortune to arrive in Cape Town, South Africa during three noteworthy events in the country's history: the celebration of the country's twentieth year of democracy, the 2014 general elections and the remembrance of the late Nelson Mandela, who passed away about a month prior to my arrival. Because of the upcoming elections and the country's 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of democracy, I constantly encountered appraisals, evaluations and reflections about the state of affairs in the country throughout traveling across the Cape Town area, living with home-stays with families in Langa, Stellenbosch and Bo-Kaap, reading South African newspapers and participating in seminars and discussions during class. As a result, I became enamored at how civically engaged and informed the South Africans I crossed paths with were and became intrigued over how ordinary Cape Townians viewed the state of the nation through a political lens, especially as the general elections were coming up. This led me to initiate this project, which attempts to analyze the political efficacy of Cape Townians, a very diverse community, within the context of the 2014 general elections.

My interest in the post-apartheid presidency's role in the current state of affairs in South Africa derived largely from the sharp contrast in portrayals regarding Nelson Mandela's democratic South Africa's inaugural president and the incumbent president Jacob Zuma. It became quickly clear to me that while Mandela was revered upon his recent passing as a national icon of international proportions, a Washington-like father of democratic South Africa with his beaming face strewed over t-shirts and banners overhanging from buildings all across Cape Town, it couldn't have been more different for Zuma. I saw that Zuma was constantly lampooned, ridiculed and criticized in South African newspapers, media and public discussion in



general. I felt that he commanded little, if any respect on the national stage and amongst the South African public. This was especially surprising from my American cultural perspective, in which the president of my country always held a level of respect, even among his fiercest detractors, due inherently to the office he held. Furthermore, I was perplexed and shocked at how, after learning about his long paper trail of scandals regarding rape, polygamy, and corruption, amid a sagging national economy, he could possibly stand favorably for reelection without being considered politically radioactive. As a result, I became curious about how South Africans residing in Cape Town perceived good governance and strong leadership qualities under the post-apartheid presidency.

In culmination, a priority objective of this paper to analyze the thoughts and opinions of Cape Town citizens regarding the post-apartheid presidency, as well as their overall political efficacy, their faith in government and government performance and responsiveness, on the eve of the 2014 elections. The paper examines data collected through conversational interviews with residents in the Cape Town communities of Langa and Stellenbosch. Furthermore, this paper aims to discuss the findings from the data and potential relationships between the political efficacy of Cape Town citizens and their perceptions of presidential leadership and qualities. This is in order to provide potential commentary on the post-apartheid presidential election system and the role of the presidency and national leadership in governing a post-apartheid South Africa twenty years after democracy and beyond.

This paper is split up into five major components. After a review of the literature pertaining to the topic at hand in this study, the overall methodology that this project undertook in order to obtain data on political efficacy and perceptions on the presidency is outlined. This

section of the paper explains the reasoning behind using the format of conversational interviews for data collection as well as its conduct and procedure. Furthermore, it discusses the measures taken throughout the methodology to ensure ethical reflexivity and acknowledges limitations of the constructed methodology. After the methodology is presented, the paper details and analyzes the findings on the interviewed people's political efficacy and their thoughts on presidential qualities in Langa and Stellenbosch. Finally, the paper provides concluding commentary based on the findings and compare them to the arguments made in the literature review. The paper ends with a presentation of recommendations for further study.

This paper uses a combination of firsthand and secondary sources to develop its arguments and structure. Its secondary sources are incorporated in its literature review and offer both a constitutional perspective on the post-apartheid presidential system and a political science perspective on how the management of the office has played a role, through its principle occupants to date, Nelson Mandela, Thabo Mbeki and Jacob Zuma, in influencing good governance in post-apartheid South Africa. The latter type of secondary sources are also bolstered by publications that further outline the organization and internal dynamics within the Mbeki and Zuma presidencies. Firsthand sources and findings were based on conversational interviews held with voting-age residents in Langa and Stellenbosch that discussed their thoughts on the upcoming elections, government performance and presidential leadership.

## **Literature Review**

As South Africa celebrates its second decade of democracy, it is imperative to assess the impact and influence that the post-apartheid presidency has on good governance of the country. Furthermore, an examination of how the actions and perceptions of the post-apartheid office of the presidency are related to the overall faith in government, public approval or disapproval of the government and general political efficacy is similarly in order, especially as South Africa prepares to vote in its 2014 general elections. A review of the literature pertaining to these topics primarily focus on the structure and dynamics surrounding the post-apartheid presidency, along with how its principal occupants have acted under the auspices of the office, and how it has impacted good governance, both from constitutional and political science viewpoints. Surprisingly however, there is a dearth of research surrounding the post-apartheid presidency and its relationship to overall political public opinion and political efficacy in the country. The constitutional commentary provided by the literature highlights the constitutional mechanisms that the South African constitution possesses that strictly limit the powers of the presidency and promote good democratic governance. Political science commentary presented by the literature sheds light on how the unique governing styles of the major post-apartheid presidencies to date, Nelson Mandela, Thabo Mbeki and Jacob Zuma, promoted or undermined good governance in South Africa.

### **Constitutional Commentary**

The public and legal foundations of the post-apartheid presidency, its design and powers, have been delegated under Chapter 5 of the South African constitution (Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996). A general consensus among legal scholars is that the South

African constitution, regularly hailed as one of the most progressive constitutions in the world, constructed a post-apartheid office of the presidency that is stringently limited in power and yet equipped enough to govern democratically.

Legal scholar Muna Ndulo, writing for the *Vermont Law Review*, largely praises the South African constitution, writing that it is “one of the best models for a constitutional arrangement that provides important safeguards to ensure public accountability, responsiveness to the electorate and participation of the people in governance”, especially in regards to powers delegated to the presidency (Ndulo, 2002, 1). Ndulo particularly spotlights the presidential election system under the South African constitution and commends it as key constitutional arrangement that limits the power of the presidency and fosters good democratic governance. Ndulo asserts that because the president is elected from within the parliament, he or she owes his or her right to govern to the legislature, and does not have a legitimate claim to a mandate to govern because he is not popularly elected by the people, like parliament (Ndulo, 2002, 3). Ndulo argues that such a constitutional set up not only provides a check and balance against the presidency, it also sets the presidency up to be more conducive to power-sharing arrangements with the legislature. (Ndulo, 2002, 3-4). Another constitutional device that restrains the president and thus promotes good governance, argues Ndulo, is the constitution's explicit detailing of the use of presidential executive power, namely the power to veto legislation and exercise executive authority or, as Ndulo coins it, “presidentialism” (Ndulo, 2002, 4). Ndulo asserts that the South African constitution successfully prevents excessive presidential power by “providing the manner in which executive authority is to be exercised as a way of providing meaningful checks and balances in the exercise of that authority” (Ndulo, 2002, 5). The constitution does this by

relegating the implementation of executive authority under only specific statutes or the constitution itself (Ndulo, 2002, 4), and limiting the applicability of the veto power to only legislation that provokes constitutional questions, not questions of policy or politics (Ndulo, 2002, 5). Lastly, Ndulo stresses the accountability measures placed on the presidency by the South African constitution. A unique feature of the South African constitution is that it compels the parliament to establish mechanisms that ensure that all executive organs of state, including the office of the president, are held accountable to it and to properly ensure that it can conduct stringent oversight over the executive (Ndulo, 2002, 7). This is of utmost importance because it guarantees a powerful check and balance system against the president and promotes the independence of the legislature (Ndulo, 2002, 7).

Other legal scholars however, are not as positive about the constitutional order around the post-apartheid presidency. Legal scholar Charles Manga Fombad, writing for the Buffalo Law Review, argues that “in spite of the progress made towards promoting constitutionalism, democracy and good governance” on the African continent, the future prospects are not as bright as would have been expected” (Fombad, 2011, 2). Fombad also lionizes the South African constitution as an ideal model for strong constitutionalism, the idea that constitutions “provide a solid basis for the respect for the rule of law, democracy and good governance” (Fombad, 2011, 3). However, he warns that even ideal constitutions such as South Africa's could fall victim to opportunism and complacency (Fombad, 2011, 35). Fombad specifically points to African absolutism, the centralization and concentration of power in the presidency, and the abuse of power that follows, as the primary danger that even liberal constitutions such as South Africa's are under threat from (Fombad, 2011, 6). Fombad attributes African absolutism to weak checks

and balances, single-party hegemony under the control of the president, the absence of meaningful oversight and a superfluously wide range of presidential immunities (Fombad, 2011, 6-7). Fombad stresses the necessity for even liberal constitutions such as South Africa's to maintain powerful provisions that establish term limits for the presidency, dilute the concentration of power and decision-making authority in the office of the presidency and guarantee objectivity in presidential appointments in order to escape the scourge of authoritarianism so endemic on the African continent (Fombad, 2011, 16-17). Fombad also recommends retaining strong accountability measures over the president that promote constitutional democracy, such as South Africa's Chapter 9 institutions (Fombad, 2011, 14).

Constitutional scholars have obviously identified African absolutism and authoritarianism as primary threats that can corrupt the South African presidency and undermine its ability to foster good governance. Even Ndulo laments the presence of “charismatic authority” in southern African presidencies, in which “by virtue of being the leader who had successfully challenged the colonial power, these leaders had created executive dictatorships through the centralization of state power in their own hands” (Ndulo, 2002, 13). It is thus heavily implied that the writers of the post-apartheid South African constitution, by creating a parliamentary election system for the president, specifying the use of presidential authority, ensuring robust oversight and accountability institutions that check the presidency, and establishing term limits and an objective appointment process, valued a limited presidency and ensured that good governance could be fostered through checks and balances and the avoidance of authoritarianism.

### **Political Science Commentary**

Political science literature has also evaluated the post-apartheid South African presidency,

particularly how the individual governing styles of the major post-apartheid presidents, Nelson Mandela, Thabo Mbeki and Jacob Zuma, promoted or reversed good governance. Dealing with political realities instead of legal theories and principles, political scientists, such as Anthony Butler, reject two premises regarding the post-apartheid South African presidency: that it presides over an inherently unstable society and that it is vulnerable to unaccountable, authoritarian leadership (Butler, 2010, 192-193). Butler argues that “unsubstantiated notions of inherent instability and unconstrained [presidential] leadership have exacerbated an expectations trap that undermines the political and economic bases for democratic success” (Butler, 2010, 189). Butler elaborates upon his rejection of fears regarding an authoritarian post-apartheid presidency, believing that it governing more difficult:

“Leaders in any political system face multiple challenges. Theirs is in part problem-solving role, framing the challenges facing a society and advancing feasible solutions. They signal national commitments, and shape the expectations of activists, bureaucrats and mass publics, while confronting the overarching need to provide for economic success and territorial integrity...On one hand, it is widely held that states in transition require 'strong' leadership. Superhuman efforts, on this view, are required... On the other hand, strong personal leadership is taken to be a dangerous commodity in just these same states...these problems are magnified in Africa by a post-colonial history...” (Butler, 2010, 191).

Political science literature that deal with the post-apartheid presidency's involvement in fostering good democratic governance and raising good prospects for a post-apartheid South Africa revolves around comparing the actions and *modi operandi* of major post-apartheid presidencies. Most of the literature reviewed argue that the Mandela presidency best promoted good democratic governance and governmental responsiveness through its consensus-building style that resonated with the values of South African constitution. However, the political science literature is not as friendly in appraising the Mbeki and Zuma presidencies, and does not credit their own distinct governing styles with much success.

### **The Consensus-Building Mandela Presidency**

Butler notes that President Mandela escaped the expectations trap of post-apartheid South African presidencies by demonstrating consensus-building leadership and governing. Rather than implementing heavy-handed administrative and political apparatuses, Mandela utilized his moral influence into strong persuasive powers to forge consensus among different interest groups and stakeholders, while simultaneously placing himself above sectional squabbles (Butler, 2010, 195). Mandela also quelled concerns of possible dictatorship by serving only a single presidential term and overseeing a peaceful transfer of power to his Deputy President, Thabo Mbeki (Butler, 2010, 195). Butler credits Mandela's consensus-driven governance and leadership with the successful winding down of Afrikaner and Zulu nationalism and dispelling radicalism within the ANC (Butler, 2010, 195). Butler argues that Mandela's style of governance was that of a “public leader”, ushering in a post-apartheid South African government that prioritized consensus-building and promoting a stable democracy.

James Hamill, writing for *The World Today*, also attributes similar traits in Mandela's presidential operating style for advancing good democratic governance. Hamill particularly places significance in Mandela's rejection of absolute power in the presidency by retiring after only a single term, setting an unbelievably humble precedent and demonstrating the need to limit a president's tenure and to contain the office's power within constitutional parameters (Hamill, 2010, 24). Hamill asserts that this rejection of authoritarian power through displays of humility enhanced Mandela's disposition of being above the fray, and set the tone for the successful foundational placement of the ideals of a democratic society, such a vigorous civil society, political pluralism, and a commitment towards national reconciliation (Hamill, 2010, 24).

W. J. Breytenbach of the University of Stellenbosch concurs in attributing the successes



of Mandela's presidency's to its consensus-building style of governance. Breytenbach argues that Mandela embodied the Freedom Charter's commitment to non-racialism in his leadership, creating a new narrative of a "Rainbow Nation" that rejected extremist thinking (Breytenbach, 2006, 177). Mandela also "idealised the...character of the tribal model, which emphasises consensus and in which citizens enjoy optimal participation" (Breytenbach, 2006, 177). Breytenbach argues that Mandela's fusion of an inclusive national narrative and a tribal-style leadership model that emphasizes public participation and consensus allowed him to stand "in good stead while dealing with divisive issues at the time of the transition" and allowed him lay the foundations for strong nation building (Breytenbach, 2006, 177). Breytenach further asserts that Mandela's inclusivity and embrace of market-based economic policies, which he believes is attributable in part to Mandela's desire to have consensus-driven decision-making (Breytenbach, 2006, 179), allowed him to accomplish national reconciliation during his presidency (Breytenbach, 2006, 179).

Mandela's presidency demonstrates that not only did his consensus-driven style and traits result in good democratic governance in practice when establishing an effective and democratic policymaking atmosphere, it also resonated on a more theoretical level. He governed closely in accordance to the presidency the South African constitution created and envisioned it would promote good governance. Mandela positioned himself as above the fray in order to mold a consensus among different interest groups, rejecting extreme elements. This allowed him to make national commitments such as reconciliation that would strengthen the civil society of a newly democratic South Africa and lay the foundations for strong nation building. At the same time, by choosing to serve only one term, he not only imbibed the values of term limits behind

the constitution, he set a precedent of defining the presidency as, not the authoritarian body that Fombad warned against, but an office of humble public service for the will of the people.

### **The Centralizing Mbeki Presidency**

President Mbeki did not approach the presidency with the consensus-driven approach that his predecessor did. Instead, Mbeki's presidency was marked with a sharp turn towards centralization of power and policymaking in the presidency. Although this turn resulted in a modern presidential bureaucracy and administrative system, this excessive concentration of power and decision-making in a single body, something warned against and constitutionally devised to prevent, led to problems for Mbeki that was detrimental to good governance and public faith in government.

Mbeki was not as successful in evading the expectations gap as Mandela was. Butler argues that Mbeki fit the ideal of an administrative or managerial leader (Butler, 2010, 196), and subscribed to aspects of public policy science that encourages centralization (Butler, 2010, 197). Mbeki effectively became the master of virtually all aspects of governance, appointing senior civil servants and ministers, overseeing policymaking and implementation throughout all levels of government and controlling government communications and intelligence services (Butler, 2010, 197). Butler credits this consolidation of power in the Office of the President to the findings of the Presidential Reform Commission (PRC), which recommended bureaucratic reorganization, the creation of a new cabinet secretariat and reforms regarding internal human resource and financial management, which Mbeki happily complied with (Butler, 2010, 196-197). However, Butler asserts that Mbeki's institutionalization did nothing to solve the government's inherent capacity to solve problems and resolve issues (Butler, 2010, 198). He

writes,

“A tight and hierarchical administration, with... sound rules for...management and a centralized implementation structure, in it of itself does nothing to address the state's lack of reach or infra-structural capacity – its inability to control the territory through reliable logistical command over its resources...it is almost entirely irrelevant to the delivery of public services” (Butler, 2010, 198).

This over-centralization under Mbeki not only hampered good public policy, it stifled the chances of a consensus being reached and hampered wider participation of local governments and interest groups (Butler, 2010, 200). Butler further argues that Mbeki underwent this large presidential centralization project of in part due to political reasons, in the hopes of appealing to more western, capitalist sensibilities (Butler, 2006, 198, 201).

Breytenbach also views Mbeki as a centralizing manager while president. Breytenbach writes that, “[f]or Mbeki, nation-building meant further centralisation, transforming society , and consolidating the power of the black bourgeoisie in not only the state and parastate sectors, but also and especially, black empowerment in the private sector” (Breytenbach, 2006, 177).

Breytenbach also argues that this tendency to centralize was also reflected in Mbeki's personal Africanist ideology (Breytenbach, 2006, 177-178). He expresses that Mbeki's consolidating approach and vision led to a intensified fracturing and polarization in the South African body politic. Breytenbach writes that,

“This [approach] compel[led] [Mbeki] to consolidate black politics. Mandela's 'rainbow nation' now seems to have reverted into a 'zebra nation', where black and white are more polarised and mutually suspicious. For non-blacks, this had the potential to erode trust in the government. However, this lack of trust also had the potential to affect black politics, as Mbeki...hardly championed the black working class. Instead, his policies promote[d] black bourgeoisie development, which suggested a link between Africanism and capitalism” (Breytenbach, 2006, 178).

Mbeki's presidential style and characteristics reflect a very overbearing, centralizing approach, combined with an egocentric sense of agency in himself and his ideology. Although centralization was a commendable effort, by large it was a failure, stained with heavy top-down

policymaking with poor results, inadequate consultation with stakeholders, denialism regarding the HIV/AIDS pandemic, and an intensified polarization of the body politic.

### **The Ambiguous Zuma Presidency**

The initial signs of Zuma's first term as president do not convey a very bright picture. There have been countless instances that, under his watch, reflect a South African society that is rapidly losing faith in his leadership and in their overall faith in government. Writing for the *Globe & Mail*, journalist Robert Rothberg diagnoses a South Africa profoundly adrift and suffering from a leadership vacuum, lacking a moral compass and under a widespread sense of malaise and underwhelming accomplishments (Rothberg, 2014). Rothberg blames this sorry state of affairs largely on Zuma's poor, almost absent political direction, integrity and statesmanship. He notes that Zuma's polygamy and lavish use of public funds for his private residence amid massive unemployment, crumbling schools, corruption, crime and rising discontent over service delivery only exacerbates public distrust and crushes public confidence (Rothberg, 2014). Polls show Zuma with a disapproval rating of over 50 percent (Sapa, 2014). Furthermore, only about 30 percent of South Africans believe that the country is on the right track and about 50 percent believe the opposite (Sapa, 2014). As the 2014 general elections draws nearer, it can be said that South Africa is in a depressing state of state of affairs and Zuma's fingerprints are all over it.

Richard Calland provides a compelling depiction of the Zuma presidential operation in his book, *The Zuma Years*. Calland argues that the Zuma presidency is presiding over the crumbling of the social compact established in the 1990s, with its governing style only adding petrol to the flames of decay (Calland, 2013, 8). Calland writes that while Zuma encourages a “big-tent approach” when it comes to governing and attempts to govern through coalitions

(Calland, 2013, 5), he is too weak and prone to mistakes, therefore lacking the political cunning and fortitude necessary to govern as such (Calland, 2013, 6). Furthermore, Calland insinuates that Zuma is surrounded by inept, sycophantic advisers that not only insulate him, but exacerbate his sense of entitlement to the benefits of the presidency, his lack of accountability and awareness to conflicts of interest, and overall mediocre presidency (Calland, 2013, 28, 29, 32, 35, 36, 38). According to Calland, this creates an inconsistent approach to governing, concerned only with narrow interests at mind, “essentially about retaining power...in both ideological and policy terms, a vacant space...in which various interest groups, organisations and factions jostle for space and domination” (Calland, 2013, 33). In other words, Zuma's presidency conveys traits of ambiguity, an appalling void of leadership in increasingly desperate times.

Although the future of Zuma's presidency still lies ahead, the literature makes it clear why there is such a discrepancy in how Zuma and Mandela are viewed in the eyes of the South African people. Zuma's ambiguous, weak, and corrupt leadership style in his presidency so far holds frightening, even despairing ramifications for the future of South Africa.

## Methodology

To conduct the primary research for this paper, social analysis interviews were done in three different Cape Town communities, Langa, Stellenbosch and Bo-Kaap. The interviews were conversational in nature, conducted in a manner that combined an open interview format with a depth-probing interview format in lieu of a structured one. This was because I believed that such a format would not only relax the interviewee, thus enabling him or her to be more open with me when expressing their thoughts and opinions, but also because such a format would facilitate “a broad-scale approach...directed to understanding phenomena in their fullest possible complexity” (Glense, 2006, 105). Furthermore, an more open interview setting would allow for new questions to be developed to follow unexpected leads that may arise in the course of the interviews (Glense, 2006, 104), which did occur throughout the course of the interviews.

Six individuals were interviewed in each community, Langa, Stellenbosch and Bo-Kaap, leading to a total of eighteen people that were interviewed for this study. However, only the twelve interviewed from Langa and Stellenbosch were incorporated in the final study due to time constraints. An equal number of men and women were interviewed, leading to three men and three women being interviewed in each of the three field sites. The age distribution among those interviewed will be all across the voting age spectrum: eighteen years of age to sixty-five years of age. There was no precondition to who was interviewed, except that the individual was eligible to vote and willing to be interviewed.

Although the interview was primarily conducted in an open, depth-probing format, a small set of questions were developed to be asked by the interviewer in order to provide a general linear direction for the data collection and to prevent scattered and aimless digressions

from occurring. These questions by nature sought to do two things: to collect accurate information of the interviewee's thoughts on political efficacy and to capture their thoughts on presidential leadership. First and foremost, the term “political efficacy” had to be defined. American political scientists Campbell, Gurin and Miller defined political efficacy as “the feeling that individual political action does have, or can have, an impact upon the political process ie., that it is worthwhile to perform one's civic duties. It is the feeling that the individual citizen can play a part in bringing about this change” (Campbell, et al., 1954, 187). American political scientists Converse and Balch elaborated on this definition. Internal political efficacy could be defined as the confidence an individual has on his or her own abilities to understand public affairs and to act politically, while external political efficacy could be defined as an individual's belief in the responsiveness of government and the political system (Converse, 1972, 263-337) (Balch, 1974, 1-43). Essentially, political efficacy is simply the level of faith and trust a citizen in the government. Therefore, open-ended opening questions were asked to initiate the conversational interview and simultaneously record political efficacy. Questions that asked how the interviewee felt about the elections coming up, how they felt the government was doing in addressing issues important to them, both on a local and national level, and what they wished the government would do effectively captured the both the interviewee's sense of internal and external political efficacy.

Questions regarding the interviewee's thoughts about the post-apartheid presidency were orienteered in a similar reign to how the reviewed political science literature approached it, through comparison evaluations. Interviewees were asked a broad, open-ended question about which leadership qualities they valued in a potential president. They were then asked how they

felt about the individual post-apartheid presidencies in comparison to each other and asked how they felt about prospective presidential candidates on the national and local stages in comparison to one another, to the extent of their opinion and or personal knowledge.

The interviewees' responses were analyzed through qualitative data analysis coding once the recorded interviews were fully transcribed. Answers to open-ended questions regarding political efficacy, as well as general statements that reflected thoughts on political efficacy, were coded as either “low political efficacy” or “high political efficacy”, with the reasoning that was provided noted on field notes for analysis. “Neutral political efficacy” were answers that expressed sympathy for the government, but general dissatisfaction. Commonly raised issues were also classified and coded, including issues of corruption and accountability, youth involvement, expertise and competency, and the presidential election system. Answers to open-ended questions regarding presidential leadership were coded and classified based on the salient traits that were reflected. The codes that were used include:

- ✦ **Competency/Experience:** This code classified salient presidential traits expressed by interviewees regarding the ability to deliver on promises and getting things done, being qualified to be a national leader, in terms of education, work ethic, expertise, etc.
- ✦ **Charisma:** This code classified salient presidential traits expressed by interviewees regarding personality, likability, their public image and general charisma.
- ✦ **Trust:** This code classified salient presidential traits expressed by interviewees regarding whether or not they could trust the president or potential president.
- ✦ **Unity/Consensus:** This code classified salient presidential traits expressed by interviewees regarding the ability to bring people together, build a consensus, quell



extremism and radicalism, etc.

- ✧ **Statesmanship:** This code classified salient presidential traits expressed by interviewees regarding putting the country's interest over self or a particular interest, embodying the ideal of public service, willingness to sacrifice for the greater good and welfare of the country, ability to inspire, etc.
- ✧ **Responsiveness:** This code classified salient presidential traits expressed by interviewees regarding the ability to listen to people's specific needs, knowing the people's specific needs and the ability to act on them accordingly.

### **Ethical Reflexivity**

Ethical considerations were fully taken into account during this study. The open and depth-probing conversational interview format presented ethical advantages in regards to power relations between myself, the interviewer, and the interviewee. Because the interview was less structured and more conversational, the interviewee was more likely to be comfortable and less likely to be vulnerable to the unbalanced power relationship that often favors the interviewer. The interviewer-interviewee relationship, over the course of conversation, placed the interviewer and the interviewee on a more equal footing, and also allow the interviewer to take more a “learner” role as well (Glense, 2006, 94). This held the advantage of deterring any potential misrepresentation of the interviewee that may involuntarily develop. As the interviewer, I repeatedly emphasized the openness and casual format of the conversational interview in order to maintain this equal power relationship. The rise of follow-up questions that formed throughout the course of the interviews also strengthened the “learner” aspect of the interviewer's role. Furthermore, reciprocity was also undertaken through food, in which the interviews were conducted over a meal, further accentuating the open-ended format.

The privacy, anonymity and confidentiality of all of the interviewees were fully respected. All interviewees signed a consent form (see Appendices) and were informed by the interviewer, line by line, that all information was to be held in confidence, that they have the right to withdraw any information given over the interviews at any time. No names, gender identification, ethnic or racial identification, age, unique physical features, professional information or any other information that could have possibly jeopardized the interviewee's anonymity, confidentiality and privacy was revealed in the course of the study. Area of residence

was revealed for the purposes of the study, but in the most minimal way conceivable; interviewees residing in Langa were classified as Person(s) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, interviewees residing in Stellenbosch were classified as Person(s) A, B, C, D, E, F and interviewees residing in Bo-Kaap were originally planned to be classified as Person(s) Q, R, S, X, Y, Z. The content of this ISP and other related materials pertinent to this project was distributed to only the relevant SIT staff, the ISP adviser and the interviewees who personally requested information in the study about themselves upon the study's completion, which they were informed of and empowered to do under the consent form. This was set up as such in order to maintain as much confidentiality of information about the involved interviewees as possible.

### **Limitations of Study**

Although six interviews were successfully conducted in Langa, Stellenbosch and Bo-Kaap, with three men and three women interviewed in each area, the study had its limitations.

The primary limitation was the very limited and constrained time frame in which interviews had to be conducted. A total of eighteen interviews had to be held over a span of only a month, in three distinct areas, with Langa and Bo-Kaap being within approximately a 10 km radius from the interviewer's place of residency in Observatory and Stellenbosch being around 45 km away from the interviewer's place of residency. Furthermore, the interviews were mostly conducted during the Good Friday and Easter holidays, the Family Day and Freedom Day holidays and another public holiday on April 28, 2014. The frequency of holidays made it so that many people in the communities were away from their homes spending the holidays. This made inquiring for interviews more challenging, particularly in Bo-Kaap during the Freedom Day and April 28<sup>th</sup> public holidays, when most of the interviewer's leads for potential interviews were unavailable due to the holiday. The limited time frame for interviews also made for a rushed interview transcription and data analysis process in order to meet the submission deadline of the project. The final set of interviews were completed in Bo-Kaap on April 28<sup>th</sup>, giving the author and interviewer of the study only about a week to analyze over six hours of tape footage. In the end, the data collected from the interviews from Bo-Kaap were unable to be transcribed and analyzed in time and the author and interviewer of the study was unfortunately forced to cut the originally planned Bo-Kaap section entirely from this study altogether. (I have addressed this issue in the Recommendations for Further Study section.)

An interesting limitation that was confronted, particularly in Bo-Kaap, was that women

seemed to be much more reluctant than their male counterparts to be interviewed. This proved to be a challenge after three male Bo-Kaap residents had been interviewed, in which it was difficult to find women living in Bo-Kaap who were willing to be interviewed, thus dragging out the interview process. Because of the strong Muslim culture throughout Bo-Kaap, it could be possible that a cultural influence played a role in this reluctance among Bo-Kaap women, though this is only an unconfirmed, superficial presumption. (I have addressed this issue under Recommendations for Further Study section.)

On the technical side, the time constraints made it so that it was out of the question to redo interviews. This made it so that interviews that were recorded during circumstances that were not audibly comfortable (ie loud and noisy atmospheres) were unable to be redone or refined. Interviews with Person C and Person F were the prime examples of these sort of interviews. As a result, the interview was transcribed to the best of the author's auditory ability.

Furthermore, the codes that were developed for qualitative analysis of presidential traits had the tendency of overlapping at times, especially the Competency/Experience code with the Responsiveness code and the Unity/Consensus code with the Statesmanship code. If more time had been given for the project, potentially a better coding system could have been developed that would have minimized the risk of overlap.

Also, Person 4 and Person 5, interviewees in Langa, were interviewed at the same time, but their responses were analyzed as two separate individuals. There were instances throughout the joint interview in which the two may've influenced the other's answers. However, instances of this were very minimal.

## Findings and Analysis

### Langa

The six men and women interviewed in Langa generally had similar perceptions and opinions regarding political efficacy, conveying little excitement over the upcoming elections, lukewarm or disapproving of the government and viewing presidential leadership mostly through traits of responsiveness to the public, ability to manage and deliver, and statesmanship.

#### *Person 1*

Person 1 expressed three counts of low political efficacy. She expressed lukewarm feelings about the upcoming elections, stating that, “I think, a lot of us are not really looking forward to this election. Because the choices are limited. The ANC really has not fulfilled people's expectations.” Person 1 also expressed disenchantment with the current state of the education system in the country, another sign of low political efficacy. When asked what she thought about the ANC's campaign slogan, “we have a good story to tell”, which argued that South Africa is a better place to live in now than it was twenty years ago, Person 1 countered by conveying that “We wouldn't know because they've been in power for 20 years. If they say South Africa is a better country than it was 20 years ago, it's true because we were all oppressed, we were under the National Party. But certain things haven't changed in this country.” She then reiterated her unhappiness with the education system in the country.

In regards to presidential leadership, Person 1 valued most traits of experience and competency. Person 1 expressed skepticism for Julius Malema, the charismatic yet controversial leader of the EFF, largely because of his lack of experience. Person 1 largely talked about Malema perceived lack of experience. She replied, “Julius Malema, for me personally, as a

person who is over 60 and has seen a lot of politics in this country, I'm not convinced he's the person that I want to be the president of this country...He is still somewhat in the past. We were fighting the struggle the way that he is doing now. But the struggle is different now,” reflecting a belief that he hold a naïve mentality towards leading the country. Person 1 elaborated, conveying that, “I don't want to vote for Julius Malema, I think 'what does Julius Malema know at 40 years old?' He can't lead this country. To me, as far as I'm concerned, he's illiterate...I don't think he's ready to run South Africa”, viewing Malema's potential for presidential leadership with negativity because of his inexperience. Person 1 further comments on the importance of experience and competence by contrasting President Mbeki, who was highly educated and “groomed for the role” and thus generally a good president, with President Zuma, whose ability to run the country Person 1 held as questionable.

Person 1 also valued highly leadership qualities of statesmanship and charisma, each being mentioned three times during the interview. Regarding charisma, Person 1 continued her contrast between Mbeki and Zuma. Mbeki's penchant for being raised in England and its subsequent perception that he “lost his African heart” may've overshadowed his tangible talents. Mbeki's “distant philosopher king” image (Calland, 2006, 20) was contrasted with Zuma's image as “the president who was singing his freedom songs, [who] would dance around and...would go out into the rural areas among the people [where] you would see him on farms wearing a green overall.” Person 1 maintained that this image “was closer to what I think most South Africans' expectations of a president should be.” When talking about Nelson Mandela and whether or not if he was still alive and president the country would be better off, Person expressed that “I think we're all looking for leaders with principles...In this day and age, we're looking for the servant-

leader, which Mandela was. A lot of people who take up the role of presidencies don't see themselves as the servants of the people.” This implied that Person 1, along with many South Africans, thirsted for statesmanship akin to Mandela's.

Person 1 also placed high importance in trust, responsiveness to the public and ability to bring people together in regards to national presidential leadership. Person 1 continued praising Mandela, particularly his ability to bring people together and care for the welfare of the entire country, even musing that Mandela would have fought for white liberation had the black majority used their newfound power to oppress whites. On trust, Person 1 spoke about Person 1's inability to cast a vote for Helen Zille and the DA saying,

“Me included, the vast majority of us black people find it hard to vote for the DA, because it's a white party, it's led by white people, you know, in the top positions...And coming from the history of South Africa, it's the question of trust, between black people and white people and I think black people are not ready yet, in the majority, to vote white, DA...I'm not relaxed with Helen Zille. Helen Zille is trying too hard to be black, to get the black vote. She will do anything, she will go to Khayelitsha and toi-toi and do those things you know?”

Person 1's inability to vote for Helen Zille and the DA as both president and the governing party reflected a sense of mistrust, mirroring the value that Person 1 placed in trust in regards to presidential leadership. Lastly, regarding responsiveness to the public, Person 1 noted the importance of a president to “know what the needs of the country is, what the needs of the majority are.”

### *Person 2*

Person 2 possessed four counts of low political efficacy. Person 2 expressed a declining eagerness for elections since her first one in 1994 and was disappointed in government discrepancies and a lack of interest by public leaders in helping people, overshadowed by rampant corruption. Furthermore, Person 2 disapproved of government performance, arguing that “those who are really benefitting [are the] people that are almost close to the people who



work...but still, there are people who have staying at the back [of township homes] [for] almost 60 years...because they don't have any places to stay.” To Person 2, this disparity signaled a lack of improvement due to poor government performance.

For Person 2, responsiveness was the most salient leadership she sought in a president. Person 2 valued a leader who can prioritize goals for improvement, starting with education, health care and housing. Person 2 expressed admiration for a South African philanthropist, who was “out of his own pocket,...building houses.” Person 2 described the philanthropist as “a person that you can see is very much interested [in] taking people out of poverty,...seeing that schools are being built... [and] that children are busy with sport. I can even chose him to be the president of this country.”

Person 2 also valued traits of statesmanship, consensus-building and competence in a president. When asked to compare the three post-apartheid presidents, Person 2 replied,

“I don't think there is any president who will ever get into Mandela's shoes. He was really our hero. When he came out of jail, he really proved that he was just like Jesus Christ, we almost felt that he could die for the people. It takes, how can I put it, it takes a particular person, I don't there will be any other person like him, who would sacrifice his family, who would be prepared to die for his people”

Here, Person 2 highly values Mandela's extraordinary ability to sacrifice so much to advance the country and its people, an exemplary show of statesmanship. Person 2 also noted that “[Mandela] was really eager that we must be a united country”, implying a valuing of unity-building traits as well. Additionally, while Person 2 excoriated Zuma's leadership and performance all throughout the interview, she expressed some approval of Mbeki's performance as president, largely on terms of competence, noting he did create jobs, broaden South Africa in comparison to other countries and fought corruption.

### *Person 3*

Person 3 had a wide array of thoughts regarding Person 3's political efficacy. Person 3 did indicate a rapidly declining interest in elections, noting that the 2014 election is “not exciting... Like in 1994 when I first voted. That election was very exciting and...its going down, going down. That excitement now it's disappearing, it's disappearing...The interest is not there anymore because of what is happening in our country.” However, when asked about whether or not she thought the government was doing a good job, she replied, “The government tried, especially in the houses...But I think the main thing is jobs. That is why there is a lot of poverty. People are living in poverty because there are no jobs. I think that's the main thing.” This indicated neutral political efficacy in which she gave the government credit for trying but remained dismayed at the lack of progress in employment. In contrast, Person 3 expressed two counts of high political efficacy, mostly in regards to the performance of the local government in her community. Person 3 expressed that Helen Zille and the DA was doing “a good job” in governing the Western Cape, to the point that “I never voted for them, but this time, I know that your vote is a secret, but this time, I'll go for DA.”

Person 3 mainly viewed ideal national and presidential leadership through a lens of public responsiveness. She chided Mbeki's supposed disengagement and uninvolved with the development of the country and prioritized implementing specific policy prescriptions, especially jobs and crime.

#### ***Person 4***

Person 4 expressed six counts of low political efficacy. Person 4 believed education and health care, Person 4's top public issues of importance were “going backwards” and blamed the government for ill coordination which policies in shambles. On a scale of a 100, Person 4 gave a

score of 5 for government performance. Person 4 also saw Zille and the DA's local, provincial leadership with disdain, arguing that they prioritized helping the more affluent areas instead of struggling communities such as his. Although Person 4 expressed that previously, he didn't vote because he felt his vote wouldn't make a difference, he intends to vote against the ruling party this time, largely on the basis of his heavy disapproval for the ANC.

In terms of presidential leadership, Person 4 placed a high premium on a leader that was accountable and free of corruption, even expressing that Julius Malema, his preferred choice for president, must be held responsible and accountable if he does something wrong. Person 4 also valued competence and responsiveness in a president. He strongly condemned the government's passage of a secrecy bill which enabled the government to withhold certain public information and advocated for its repeal. Furthermore, he gave Mbeki some positive recognition, noting that he selected qualified, educated people to be government officials.

### ***Person 5***

Person 5 mostly expressed low political efficacy, but also had counts of neutral political efficacy and high political efficacy as well. Person 5 displayed immense frustration at the current state of affairs and his inability to punish the ruling party at the ballot box, because of the ANC's widely projected retention of the majority of parliamentary seats. Person 5 bemoaned the desperate situation of the nation's employment, health care and education situations to proportions of absurdity and gave the government a failing grade of 8% in its attempts to alleviate those situations. However, when asked about general government performance, Person 5 was more lukewarm, acknowledging that the government was trying and yet also criticizing various aspects of its performance. Person 5 also actually expressed high political efficacy for the

performance of the local and provincial government, writing that “with the DA, I don't want to be harsh to them. Job well done, the city is clean. Our area is clean. Also for us, in certain places here in the different townships, like Langa for example, I would say Langa is clean. There's activity going on, etc. compared to other provinces that are run by the ANC.” At the same time, Person 5 expressed low political efficacy by maintaining that the provincial government prioritized the more affluent areas, in tandem with Person 4.

In terms of presidential leadership, Person 4 valued competent, corruption-free leader. His appraisal of Mbeki reflected this. Person 4, while believing generally that Mbeki was a competent leader, criticized his adoption of more foreign policies for South Africa's domestic problems, indicating that Person 4 placed a value on being responsive to the people's needs as they are.

### ***Person 6***

Person 6 generally had low to lukewarm political efficacy. Person 6 thought that the provincial government run by the DA has not done much and expressed a lack of excitement over the coming election. Person 6 relayed a count of neutral political efficacy as well, vaguely indicating that “we have come a long way”.

Person 6 primarily saw presidential and national leadership in terms of competence, responding in the interview with six instances of competence-related traits. Person 6 argued that “the mere fact that you're delivering, that's the core thing, that service deliverance. If you deliver, according to your promise, then I'll be happy until I die.” He valued the notion of delivering and getting things done so highly that he was openly willing to turn a blind eye to corruption, expressing that “I don't mind if you are robbing me, in terms of just taking that money, but as

long as you're delivering” Person 6 praised the presidencies of Mandela and Mbeki for being able to achieve accomplishments despite their different circumstances and criticized Zuma for his lack of solid accomplishments. “You just want to see more...you just want them to deliver” fully encapsulates what Person 6 valued in a president. Person 6 also valued traits such as charisma and trust in a president. Person 6 praised ANC Deputy President Cyril Ramaphosa, saying that “I really like that gentleman, because he shows and he's a leader, you can see it in him, you know, that he's a leader, in the way he portrays himself” On the other hand, his dislike of Helen Zille largely rested on terms of trust, in which he thought her to be “a phony” that merely delivered out of political need and expediency.

### ***Trends and Issues in Langa***

Issues of corruption and accountability pervaded deeply amongst all those interviewed in Langa. This was both in terms of both political efficacy and presidential leadership. In total, the six interviewed in Langa brought up corruption fourteen times, as both an important issue and what they did not want to see in a president. Corruption was also frequently used to characterize Zuma and certain functions of the current government.

Incorporation of the youth, or lack thereof, was a gripe expressed commonly, particularly by Persons 4 and 5. Person 4 charged the government of not “want[ing] to incorporate the educated youth into the hierarchy...they should freshen up, maybe let other people who come from school be able to run the economy and stuff [but] they're not giving them a chance.” Person 5 agreed with this assessment, arguing that there is a great need for more youth participation in the government because they will soon be the ones addressing public issues.

The nature of the presidential election system also cropped up in midst of the interviews.

The interviewer asked if a direct election of the president would be preferable in lieu of South Africa's current parliamentary system to Persons 2, 4 and 5. All of them expressed favor for such a system. It was noteworthy to mark that when asked if an ideal president can be envisioned, Person 4 responded that such was impossible, largely due to the parliamentary system's feature of empowering parties to select the presidential candidates. Furthermore, Person 1 expressed favor for a more two-party system more characterized with direct presidential systems over the multi-party system of South Africa's parliamentary democracy, saying that, "why don't we just do what America does, have a Republican Party and a Democratic Party, so have like the African National Congress party and also like have the DA, which are like big parties." At the same time, Person 5 expressed how he was voting for the EFF based more in terms of the party's ideology than Julius Malema's initial candidacy for president, stating that, "I vote for...the ideology of the EFF because they've got a different ideology compared to other parties. And it's not like Julius Malema is going to be an absolute monarchy of the party, there are other members..."

### **Stellenbosch**

The six individuals interviewed in Stellenbosch painted a very different picture on their perceptions of government and the president in comparison to Langa. Although those interviewed did not universally express positive sentiments in terms of political efficacy, it was more a mixed picture than Langa, both in terms of perceptions on presidential leadership and political efficacy.

#### ***Person A***

Person A had a count of high political efficacy and neutral political efficacy. Person A expressed general excitement over the elections and when asked if she thought the government

was doing a good job on issues that she deemed , she responded by saying “Maybe they're trying. But it's not coming over quite as I would think it could. Yeah perhaps their trying. I can't say that they aren't trying. It's not for the lack of trying,” indicating a neutral outlook on the perception of government performance.

In terms of leadership, Person A valued traits of unity, trust, statesmanship and responsiveness, with two counts for the final trait. Person A expressed admiration for Nelson Mandela largely due to his ability of persuasion and to not alienate people during such a fragile, sensitive time in the country. Here, Person A values Mandela's ability to foster unity and consensus as the defining point. Person A also placed a high importance on a leader being responsive, listening to the needs, experiences and viewpoints of people and incorporating them. Person A also valued statesmanship, arguing that leaders “can't just live for themselves. When you're in a position where you are a head of a country or political party, you can't just live for yourself. You're there for a purpose.”, and lamented the dearth of trust that she had for some of the nation's leaders, including the president.

### ***Person B***

Person B demonstrated a strong sense of high political efficacy all across the board. She expressed excitement over the elections, saying that, “it's a good thing that we have such contested elections, and I think it shows that it's a healthy democracy at this stage.” Furthermore, she found inspiration in her first experience voting and her enthusiasm for it over the years had not waned. Person B, when asked about some concerns or issues Person B might have with the current state of affairs, conveyed that, “I must say that in the Western Cape, we've been very lucky...we are the only province not ruled or governed by the ANC...there's nothing in my day to

day life that I sort of feel is lacking or I don't feel safe or the roads are falling apart". When asked if Person B felt the government was doing a good job, Person B responded that "considering what the government has to deal with...I think they're doing a good job" and also felt that the provincial, local government was doing well.

In terms of presidential leadership qualities, Person B prized competency and statesmanship the most, while maintaining a deep concern over corruption in government. In assessing Mandela's presidency, Person B praised his ability to pave the stage for reconciliation as "somebody who wouldn't estrange one group or the other...because it was such a fragile situation in the country. It was needed for somebody to be a statesman". Furthermore, Person B "would like to see somebody that...really has the interests of the people at heart," again an instance of valuing statesmanship. Person B also placed a premium on competency. Person B envisioned Cyril Ramaphosa as a potentially good president largely due to his credentials, because he "is...a level headed guy,...well-educated, he knows a lot about the economy...he's a good candidate because he's clever, which Zuma unfortunately isn't. And he has economic savvy...he wouldn't make stupid decisions financially, he knows what's going on around the world, especially in business, and I don't think he would do things that would harm the country or investors."

### ***Person C***

Despite Person C's repeatedly expressed love for country and patriotism for South Africa all throughout the interview, Person C only expressed one count of explicit high political efficacy and two counts of neutral political efficacy. Person C looked forward to the elections, but when asked about Person C's thoughts on both the national and provincial government's performance,



Person C said, “I think they try to do it, but I don't think they're trying hard enough. I don't know if they're trying hard enough to do that...Our municipality...here...I think...try their best [but] There is some stuff that is not right,” indicating a tepid feeling towards government performance.

Person C valued in a president and national leader mainly traits that would foster unity, convey competence and reflect responsiveness, followed by trust, charisma and statesmanship. Person C express disgust with political partisanship, stating that “They fight against each other. I politician to the other one, the want to get...everybody wants to get people in their party. But who's the right one?” Furthermore, Person C expressed that the country seriously had to come together to address it's problems, as Mandela would have wanted,

“How many people can come together, and stand right against other and all cheering for one country? And how come only sports can do that and other stuff can't?...After 1994, we came up to higher standards. That was all...Mr. Mandela. The icon and we must follow in his footsteps. He could have come out after 27 years and say, “let's have war” because they put me in there. But he came from there and said, peace in this country! He wanted us to love each other.

Person C also placed a high value on competency and responsiveness, repeatedly saying things such as “There's no use in talking like what Mr. Mandela do...They say your deeds must be harder than your words,” and “Put the deed to the word. They must put the deed to the word, there is no use talking a lot. And a little fingertip comes out of what they talk. Do it and less talking.” In evaluating Mbeki and Ramaphosa, Person C warned that there is a danger of setting expectations that are too high and failing and ensuring that people receive what they specifically need. Person C's thoughts on statesmanship, charisma and trust, largely derived from Person C's continued praise of Mandela and an assessment of Zuma, accusing him of “do[ing] things wrong and then sa[ying] it wasn't me.”

### ***Person D***

Person D had very high counts of both high and low political efficacy, due to Person D's

frequent assessment of service delivery during the interview. According to Person D, in terms of service delivery, while the national apparatuses needed “improvement massively”, the service delivery in the Western Cape and the municipalities in both Stellenbosch and across the Western Cape were top notch and high yield in positive results. When talking about the elections, Person D expressed deeply low political efficacy, due to feelings of pressure and alienation that he receives during elections. Person D says that,

“I work in government. So I feel the elections every day. I experience it every day. Not the elections itself, but the waves it cause, it causes, goes through the whole of the civil service. And being a white male, almost 60 years old, I experience a lot of negativity coming from political parties who would like to get rid of the “pale males” as we're commonly known as.”

Furthermore,

“We also refer to it as “silly season”, the time just before elections because I'm in the service delivery department. The politicians wants to accelerate service delivery during this time. To get onto the podium and say, “we've delivered so many schools, so many hospitals, whatever, so many kilometers of roads” because they want to impress their constituencies. So it's a lot of pressure, I experience that pressure everyday”

In terms of leadership, Person D had little to say, but did place emphases on competence, statesmanship and corruption. Person D criticized Zuma and his lack of education, stating that, “No schooling, no university or college degree and he's trying to run a country.” Furthermore, Person D praised Mandela's statesmanship during his presidency with F.W. De Klerk, expressing that, “I doubt if I would have stayed in a prison for 27 years, and still had the same tolerance levels as he had towards white people. I don't think I would have been the same or did the same as he did. But he put the personal experiences behind him and looked at the greater good for the country and the people living in the country.” Person D also attributes Mandela's successors' failure to live up to his legacy largely to corruption and forsaking democratic nation-building.

### ***Person E***

Person E had four counts of low political efficacy and two counts of high political

efficacy. When asked about the elections coming up, Person E replied, “I don't feel that much about it. I don't really expect any kind of change of a result from the last 4 years. Maybe a couple of figures might change but not, won't be too convincing.” When talking about elections in general, Person E conveyed that “every single election for the last 20 years [has been] promises, promises and promises and no delivery,” reflecting a deep degree of ambivalence and even apathy. At the same time, Person E expressed that “they say 1 vote isn't going to change much, but you get a million of those people and...something could happen,” indicating a lingering degree of faith in the electoral system to bring about change. Furthermore, Person E had a high disapproval of the government's performance, scathingly charging that “the current government that's in place is raping state coffers and not appropriating those funds to necessary sectors, like service delivery and poverty and all of those sort of things.” In regards to local government performance, Person E had a rosier outlook. Person felt that the Western Cape “definitely” has been doing a good job because, “I've toured most of South Africa and I've seen the state of what Limpopo and some of the smaller provinces like Limpopo, Mpumalanga, Northwest, what some of those places look like and it doesn't look like there's not much going on there...you can see the difference here compared to what it looks like over there. There's tar on these roads. There's not much tar on those roads.”

Person E's perceptions of presidential and national leadership hinged greatly on terms of competency and corruption. When asked to compare the presidencies of Mbeki and Zuma, Person D faulted Zuma for producing “very, very little, except...a palace for himself” while crediting Mbeki for greater focus towards fulfilling national goals. Furthermore, Person D was confident that the DA should be given the chance at the presidency, largely due to their good

track record in governing the Western Cape. Person E was also the interviewee in Stellenbosch that brought up issues of corruption the most, a total of five times, consistently characterizing government operations and the Zuma presidency with corruption and valuing leadership qualities based on “Integrity [and] honesty.”

***Person F***

Person F possessed five counts of low political efficacy and a score of two counts for high political efficacy. Person F expressed that, “Things look good around me so I'm guessing [the government] is doing a good job” When asked if that was a reflection of provincial, local governance, Person F acknowledged is as so, saying that, “that stuff is more provincial than the whole country...Western Cape is very different to me from the rest of South Africa. If you go outside of Western Cape, you can actually realize you're in Africa, but here in the Western Cape, things are very more chill...but if you go up to Durban or Joburg, there's a lot of problems, on the way you find a lot of things...lots of poverty, cows standing next to the road”. Person F confirmed his favorable appraisal of the Western Cape government, replying that “I won't say I'm DA but the DA is doing the best in the Western Cape for us...they show us good results, they know what you want and you get what you pay for.” Simultaneously, Person F demonstrated low political efficacy in terms of participation. Person F expressed that,

My thoughts are quite limited because...I have never registered to vote. I try not to get involved, although my dad...has been very angry with me for the past couple of years that I don't give my vote...The thing is, I don't really want to take too much part because I learned [that] my dad learns things from the news about the government of South Africa...he comes home from work in a good mood and he watches the news and then gets in a negative mood, just from watching an hour's TV, the news. So I've decided...to just be concerned about things around me.”

Person F elaborated on this sentiment by saying that, “I know my dad says every vote makes a big difference, but it feels to me like my vote doesn't make a difference.” Furthermore, Person F expressed skepticism over government's ability to publicly solve social problems, lamenting that

even regarding the president, the head of state, “how far can one person go change such a big thing in South Africa?” Person F also maintained that “the government can only go so far” and that “you can't help everyone.”

In terms of presidential leadership, Person F placed most value on unity-building traits and charisma. Person F expressed that he liked Helen Zille's tough as nails disposition, saying that, “she's very no-nonsense, that's what I like about her, she takes no-nonsense, if she someone says something she doesn't like it, she'll tell you she doesn't like it.” Zuma on the other hand, commanded little charisma, causing Person F to simply “just lose interest” whenever the president spoke. Person F bemoaned the partisanship behind the election campaigning, dismayed that Helen Zille and the DA are “so focused on showing like what the ANC is doing wrong instead of focusing on what they could do better.” Person F was taken aback by Malema's intimidation, particularly his singing of the “Shoot the Boer” song and was disappointed in Zuma's unwillingness to admonish him, remarking that “you can't be screaming things like that on TV. There must be justice in that. But it just seems to me that Zuma didn't do much. All of the articles came in the newspaper but no one did anything. He was in the ANC Youth League, with Zuma, he should have definitely taken care of him and not scare people in South Africa.”

### ***Trends and Issues in Stellenbosch***

As it was in Langa, the six individual interviewed universally expressed concern for corruption, both in terms of presidential leadership and political efficacy. For many interviewees in Stellenbosch, corruption was almost a “make or break”, defining factor in shaping their valuations of political efficacy and leadership. In total, corruption and accountability-related issues were mentioned fifteen times. Much like those interviewed in Langa, corruption was

viewed through both the prism of defining presidential leadership and the prism of influencing political efficacy.

Incorporating youth into the body politic, much like those interviewed in Langa, was an issue that was called for among the Stellenbosch set of interviewees as well. Person D lamented that, “unfortunately, in both the national ruling party and the Western Cape ruling party, all of the politicians, bar one or two, are all elderly people. You won't see a young face on TV. So, no real shiny stars, which are in their 50s or 55s. It's 60, 65, 70 year old people who are really stealing the scene.” Person A hoped that a community of intergenerational relationships could be formed in South African society, expressing that “maybe you can have a community...for younger people to work with older people, not only to care for them, but also to learn from them. So shouldn't you have a community here, where you have all young people to work with older people and children, for 1 year in their life, and get a situation where you have intergenerational contact?”

As with the six individuals interviewed in Langa, the nature of the presidential election system also arose. However, unlike those interviewed in Langa, the idea was met with a more mixed reception. When asked whether a presidential election system in which the president is directly elected would be more favorable, Person B thought that,

“I think it'll get people excited, because at the moment, there are a lot of people in the ANC who do not like Zuma. They know he's bad for the country and for the party. But historically, they've always voted for the ANC and they cannot not vote for the ANC...So they won't vote for another party, it'll be like betraying them. So people aren't very excited because they know they'll vote for the ANC and it's going to be more of the same.”

At the same time, Person B feared that a popularly elected presidential system holds the risk of demagoguery and deception. “I'm not sure that voting for a president is necessarily going to be better because you have a huge number in this country of illiterates...I'm afraid that they will go for rhetoric and that they will be easily pleased by answers that aren't necessarily realistic, and

that might be dangerous.” Similarly, Person D thought that such a electoral system might be possibly more favorable, but also was skeptical, saying that, “the president is but one and he can't follow his own head...He's more or less just a spokesperson of a group of people. So maybe it will bring about some change, I'm not too sure that it will.”

The issue of the government consulting experts and proper expertise was a recurrent issue that was unique amongst the Stellenbosch interviewees. Person A believed that government performance was lukewarm because

“I think it's the lack of expertise. They are not willing to listen to people that really knows a lot. They're not willing, because they want to do it their way. I think there are a lot of people with enough knowledge and enough expertise. If they would just give them a change to work with them, not against them, to work with them. I think together they could make a very strong team, in health care and in education. And well on, actually, every level. But it seems to me that it's not important to them or important enough, that they get expertise, help from somebody that really knows.”

Similarly, Person B also thought that the government and the president needed to consult with experts, because

“I think what's happened a lot, in the ANC, often if you take a look at the list of parliamentarians...Often the same surname keeps cropping up because...So there are families in the ANC that have a history of taking part in the struggle. What's happened was in forming a government, these people were rewarded for their service by having a position in parliament and stuff...People are in power that aren't necessarily equipped to be there or shouldn't really be there...So if they would just use experts, and take advice from experts, I think that would really help in getting good and sound advice.”

The narrative of Person D's experience of feeling alienated and chased out in the civil service, despite his 40 years of expertise, adds an interesting perspective in the notion of a supposed dearth of expertise in government.

### Conclusion

Through qualitative data analysis coding, this project was able to draw a picture of the narratives of those interviewed in Langa and Stellenbosch about their political efficacy and their opinions and perceptions of post-apartheid presidential leadership. The results are as follows:

Political Efficacy (Mentions)	Langa	Stellenbosch	Total
Low Political Efficacy	20	13	33
High Political Efficacy	3	15	18
Neutral Political Efficacy	3	3	6
Corruption/Accountability	14	15	29
Presidential Leadership Traits (Mentions)	Langa	Stellenbosch	Total
Experience/Competence	13	9	22
Charisma	5	3	8
Trust	4	2	6
Unity/Consensus	2	6	8
Statesmanship	6	5	11
Responsiveness	8	5	13

Although no direct correlations could be drawn from the interviewees' measure of political efficacy and their thoughts on presidential leadership, a few patterns become apparent. Although both areas indicated a fairly large degree of low political efficacy, it was more prevalent for those interviewed in Langa. Furthermore, there is quite a disparity in high political efficacy between those interviewed in Stellenbosch and Langa. Interviewees in both areas had similar rates of occurrences regarding both neutral political efficacy and corruption. The high frequency of mentions regarding corruption and accountability from interviewees from both areas demonstrate



their impact among the interviewees in assessing both political efficacy and ideas regarding presidential leadership. In regards to presidential leadership traits, qualities that reflect experience and competence, the expertise and ability to deliver through policies and get things done was the most prominent trait valued, by both those interviewed in Langa and Stellenbosch, with it being slightly more valued by those in Langa. The second most important quality valued, again by both those interviewed in Langa and Stellenbosch, was responsiveness, the ability to listen to the needs and desires of the people and to act on them, again, with those in Langa expressing value for it slightly more. A general picture that can be drawn is that both those interviewed in Langa and Stellenbosch have doubts and feelings of low political efficacy entering the 2014 general elections. Corruption holds a looming influence over both those interviewed in Stellenbosch and Langa. Both those interviewed in Langa and Stellenbosch perceive presidential leadership largely in terms of competence and leadership.

The qualities of unity/consensus and statesmanship are important to note here because those are the leadership qualities most associated with the Mandela presidency. The literature review asserted that Mandela's consensus-building traits and statesmanship awarded him the best presidency in promoting a healthy democratic South Africa. While such traits weren't the most salient, they were very salient indeed, holding a hefty influence among both those interviewed in Stellenbosch and Langa. It is interesting to note that those in Stellenbosch appreciated unity-building and statesmanship in much more frequency than those in Langa.

Issues and trends that interviewees from both areas agree upon in its salience include corruption and incorporating the youth into the public sphere. However, the issue of government performance being tied to a dearth of technical expertise was an issue raised uniquely by those in

interviewed in Stellenbosch.

The opinion of those interviewed on the South African presidential election system is fascinating. According to the literature review, a multiparty, parliamentary system of presidential election is a device that promotes good democratic governance by checking the powers of the president. However, among those interviewed, such a prospect has much more of a mixed reception. Many of those asked with the question during the open-ended interviews responded favorably of a popularly and directly elected presidential election system, with limited political parties, supplanting South Africa's current system. However, doubts of its impact and its risk of promoting demagoguery, a legitimate constitutional concern addressed in the literature review, were also expressed. It is interesting from the author's American perspective that many of those interviewed would express a presidential election system more in line with the American model, when back in the States, it can be argued for the exact opposite.

### **Recommendations for Further Study**

As expressed earlier, the interviews from Bo-Kaap residents were unable to be analyzed and ultimately removed from the scope of this project due to time constraints. The author's first and foremost recommendation would be analysis of the political efficacy of Bo-Kaap residents, their thoughts on presidential leadership, along with an articulation of key trends and issues that are found in that area.

Furthermore, this project has the potential to be expanded and categorized throughout different communities, both across Cape Town and the country. For example, the study can be narrowed to do analyze the thoughts on the post-apartheid presidency and political efficacy of residents living solely in Cape Town's township or suburbs. The author has not found many studies that explore how a post-apartheid South Africa views presidential leadership, so therefore, the possibilities are near endless and rich for future discoveries.

Other topical studies that could be pursued from the findings in this paper include potentially looking into the possible cultural influence on Muslim Bo-Kaap women towards conversing with men, particularly those that are not of the Muslim faith. Another potential study can include the role of technical expertise in the post-apartheid South African civil society and government.

## Bibliography

- Balch, G. I. (1974). Multiple Indicators in Survey Research: The Concept "Sense of Political Efficacy". *Political Methodology*, 1(2).
- Breytenbach, W. J. (2006). The Presidencies of Nelson Mandela and Thabo Mbeki Compared: Implications for the Consolidation of Democracy in South Africa. *Africa Insight*, Vol. 36 (Nos. 3 and 4).
- Butler, Anthony. (2000). Is South Africa heading towards authoritarian rule? Instability myths and expectations traps in a new democracy. *Politikon: South African Journal of Political Studies*, 27(2).
- Calland, Richard. (2006). *Anatomy of South Africa: Who Holds the Power?* Cape Town: Zebra Press.
- Calland, Richard (2013). *The Zuma Years: South Africa's Changing Face of Power*. Cape Town: Zebra Press.
- Campbell, A., Gurin, G. and Miller, W. E. (1954). *The Voter Decides*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson & Company.
- Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, No. 108 of 1996, Chapter 5.
- Converse, P. E. (1972), Change in the American Electorate, A. Campbell and P. E. Converse (Eds). *The Human Meaning of Social Change*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation
- Fombad, Charles Manga. (2011). Constitutional Reforms and Constitutionalism in Africa: Reflections on Some Current Challenges and Future Prospects. *Buffalo Law Review*, 59 (1007).
- Glense, C. (2006). In *Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction*. Pearson Education Inc.
- Hamill, James. (2010). South Africa's Continuing Leadership Challenges: Will the Real Jacob Zuma Please Stand Up? *The World Today*, Vol. 66, No. 2.
- Ndulo, Muna. (2002). Symposium: Presidentialism in the Southern African States and Constitutional Restraint on Presidential Power. *Vermont Law Review*, 26 (769).
- Rotberg, Robert (2014). After Mandela, South Africa has fallen into a leadership vacuum. *The Globe & Mail*. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/south-africas-post-mandela-malaise/article17008078/>
- Sapa. (2013). Poll: Many ANC voters want Zuma to quit. *Mail & Guardian*. <http://mg.co.za/article/2013-12-15-more-than-half-of-anc-surveyed-want-zuma-to-quit>.

## Appendices

### Person 1

**Q:** So I guess just a quick rundown, my project is on the upcoming elections coming up and how people like think about the government, and how people think about the president and just on different opinions on how people would think about those things, so I guess my first question, it's just going to be kind of a conversation, so, no set questions or anything like that. So the first thing I would have to ask is how you feel about the election coming up? Tell me everything.

**A:** Well, it's got to come up, because 5 years are up. But, what I have seen over the years is that people break away from the ANC and form small parties, and they never go anywhere. You know, like, they never gather clout. And I'm just sitting here thinking like, why don't we just do what America does, have a Republican Party and a Democratic Party, so have like the African National Congress party and also like have the DA, which are like big parties, you know, the DA's the opposition. And I think, a lot of us are not really looking forward to this election. Because the choices are limited. The ANC really has not fulfilled people's expectations. I think my biggest grouch is about education. Because the vast majority of people who suffered educationally is the non-white population of South Africa. And I think when we account for illiteracy in this country, 45%, there is 45% illiteracy and the vast majority of that percent is non-white. So, education is very expensive, and as far as I'm concerned, we still have township education and white education in that way. Because I know I'm a grandmother, my kids go to school, and I know exactly how the schools operate. The township schools are not equipped as the [inaudible] schools or the private schools for that matter. And to me, that is devastating. I think every country deserves a relatively working health...I don't know how to put it, national health...the hospitals and the clinics...there are those things. But then, look at who's who and who's doing what. I know that, maybe me included, the vast majority of us black people find it hard to vote for the DA, because it's a white party, it's led by white people, you know, in the top positions. They may have black people, but we don't know how much clout they have in the party. And coming from the history of South Africa, it's the question of trust, between black people and white people and I think black people are not ready yet, in the majority, to vote white, DA. Maybe, someone is still coming who is white, who people will feel is for us. Look at the EFF, Malema. Julius Malema, for me personally, as a person who is over 60 and has seen a lot of politics in this country, I'm not convinced he's the person that I want to be the president of this country.

**Q:** Why is that?

**A:** He is still somewhat in the past. We were fighting the struggle the way that he is doing now. But the struggle is different now. We can't fight it the way he's doing it now. Secondly, Julius Malema amassed a lot of wealth at the age of 35. How on earth did he get the money that he has now, you know? I mean, there are other young people his age who are struggling. But because he was in the ANC, we believe, you know, he got a...what's the right word?

**Q:** Like a leg-up?

A: Yeah, yeah! You know? Just to keep him happy you know? And as long as he's happy, he'll do what the bosses of the ANC want. My belief, honestly, is that I like Zuma, as a person, but at the same time, his presidency has been marred by a lot of indiscrepancies. When I was looking at the history of the ANC, way back, the ANC was the kind of party that was in exile, and then after democracy, they came into the light and the part of the political scenery of South Africa. I remember that the leaders, Nelson Mandela's group, were not politicians really. They were more statesmen than politicians. They were concerned about the welfare of everybody, not just black people, but everybody's welfare. So if they fought for black liberation, if black people turned around and oppressed white people, they would still fight for white liberation, so they were the kind of people who wanted the people of this country to come together as one. People may think that that is impossible, but I think, had they lived a little longer and been given more time, but they were old you know, and they spent a lot of time and *[inaudible]* we have got to take that into consideration. But you know, they might have brought people together. But then Mandela left and we had huge arguments about Thabo Mbeki's way of handling the HIV situation in South Africa. And of course, again, he was a very intelligent man, he was groomed for the role by Oliver Tambo in exile. He was educated, you know, and all of that stuff, but he didn't actually grab the hearts of the people. Sometimes people say it's because he grew up in England you know, so he has lost his African heart in that sense. He was intelligent, but then Zuma, is the direct opposite. He is an African, through and through and people related to him you know? Because he sang, he was the president who was singing his freedom songs, he would dance around and he would go out into the rural areas among the people you know sometimes when you would see him on farms wearing a green overall. Even if he was doing it for publicity, but he was closer to what I think most South Africans' expectations of a president should be. He should be a person of the people but at the same time he should be able to run the country properly. But of course, everything about Zuma was like, from the moment he came, he was under the cloud of the rape issue, which I think a lot of women were never really happy about the final decision. And then there was the issue of money being laundered, you know? And so in a way, now, when you look at the ANC, you're seeing a party sometimes, not all of them, because you know we can paint them all black, but the people in the ANC who are straight, who are concerned about how people live, you know, everything in this country. But on the other hand there is the other group of people who are in the ANC for the money, for the positions you know? And of course, the third thing is that they went into exile to fight, meaning that we people who stayed behind who suffered under the regime, didn't we fight? We suffered also. You know that kind of thing. So, you kind of like hear those things sometimes, from the comrades. And then, I thought, I said okay, I don't want to vote DA, because I don't trust a white government yet, I'm not relaxed with Helen Zille. Helen Zille is trying too hard to be black, to get the black vote. She will do anything, she will go to Khayelitsha and toi-toi and do those things you know? And to me, I'm not interested in what you're doing because Cape Town, which is the Western Cape, is still racially segregated. Because, in the old regime, there were 4 provinces, there was Cape, the Cape Province, there was Natal, there was the Free State and there was the Transvaal. Now, if you go to Gauteng, you will see something different. Because Gauteng was, how can I put it...? In Gauteng, they would employ black people before colored people. I want the word, there was a name for that, that was used. In the Cape, the Cape is still a pro-colored province. Okay? Even in this theatre that I'm working in, you can see there are more colored people than black people. And that hasn't changed really, in a way for me. But now, I'm saying I don't want to vote for Julius Malema, I think what does Julius Malema know at 40 years old, he can't lead this country.

To me, as far as I'm concerned, he's illiterate, you know? He's right for the youth, he must have that party and he must give jobs to the youth, but I don't think he's ready to run South Africa. He should wait another 30 years or 20 years and then we can see what he looks like after 20 years. So, I'm stuck with the ANC. Again. When I was thinking this through, I said you know something? We love the ANC, as a party. We just don't like the way the ANC has gone now. So, if you love something, and it's going the other way, you the people who still want the ANC in power, I think it is your job to put the ANC straight. I work in theatre. I should be writing plays protesting about the government, about what's going on. Because theatre in South Africa, especially black theatre, played a very big role in making the outside world aware of what's happening in South Africa. So, if I can't reach Zuma in Parliament, the only way to reach Zuma is by the telephone, theatre, the theatre telephone, to write a play that talks about my unhappiness about the way the party is going, the way South Africa is going. And somebody else who is in another place who also likes the ANC and likes to see the ANC in power, should in their own space, use whatever is available to them, to make the party aware that you are not happy. Of course there are former ANC cadres, several people who were in the government with Nelson Mandela and Thabo Mbeki who are no longer in the government. If you saw the headlines this morning, Roni Castrales (?) who became the next minister of water, you know, water works and that stuff, he is actually very angry and he's voicing his anger against his own party. I think he has a right to do that and I like that. The former minister of, she was first the deputy minister of the armed forces, and then later on under Mbeki, she became the deputy minister of health, is also starting her own campaign against the party. She's an ANC member, you know what I mean? But if the ANC does not stop and listen to those voices, then they are going to have a problem. They are going to have another wave of, as you can see, the country is having wave upon wave of protests and eventually people are going to get sick and tired of them and you know, just chuck them out. But they need to stop defending the party, they need to listen to what the people are saying to them. Otherwise, eventually, their following is going to dwindle you know? Because they are doing these things knowing very well that they are a very powerful party, they have a very big following, I think they've got something like 1.2 million card-carrying members. But that means shit because when people are sick and tired of, you know, of being where we are now, people are gonna throw them out or just leave and find somebody else to support.

**Q:** Wow, thank you so much. You obviously thought a lot about it. There was something, so the ANC talks a lot right now how we've got this good story to tell, how South Africa is a better place to live than it was 20 years ago, but you've talked about how, even now, there are so much problems with education, and with health care, some issues that are obviously important to you for this election. Do you feel that, in that sense then that is the ANC is kind of right to say that... has things gone better, do you think they've done a better job? That the work they put in?

**A:** We wouldn't know because they've been in power for 20 years. If they say South Africa is a better country than it was 20 years ago, it's true because we were all oppressed, we were under the National Party. But certain things haven't changed in this country. As I said, the education is making me very unhappy. The health care system is making me very unhappy. I know they started the tendering system to try and take jobs away from the government and away from the provincial governments as such and give more wealth to South Africans. But the tendering system has also become corrupt, because you do not create a system and then hand it over to the public. Who is watching over the tendering system? Houses are being built, but if you go through

the whole country, you'll find that every province has problems with houses that have been built under the tender system. Houses that were built with cheap materials or houses that were not completed you know, things like that. So for me, really, a caring government really takes care of its people by giving them proper housing, giving them good health care and by giving them good education. Because in the end, the education comes back to empower the country.

**Q:** Did you vote in '94?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** How did it feel? Do you have a story behind that?

**A:** I wrote a play.

**Q:** Oh you did? Wow, what is it called?

**A:** The Dawn.

**Q:** The Dawn?

**A:** The Dawn, yeah. My mother was 88.

**Q:** And she voted too?

**A:** For the first time.

**Q:** Wow.

**A:** So, we took her to the voting polls, in Langa, at the, at the center, social center in Langa. And when she got there, I think, when the reality hit her that "I'm here, I'm free, I can vote for whoever I want", she was completely overwhelmed. She just trembled. We kept on asking her to take the voting paper, ballot paper, and she couldn't, she was just trembling. So the woman behind her kind of saw and she said to us, "it's fine, you can sign, you can put the X for her." So I leaned over because she was in the wheelchair and I asked her which party she wanted to vote for and she said, "you know, don't ask me." Of course, it was the African National Congress. So I put an X and then we went to the next table and then "who do you want to vote for?" So I asked her. "You know who I want to vote for: Nelson Mandela." We put an X. And we took her back home. That was on the 26<sup>th</sup> of April. When we got home, the TV was on and you know, all the polls and all the voting places were on TV and Nelson Mandela's face kept coming up. And she sat on the sofa. When we were busy folding her wheelchair and stuff, we heard [*clicking sounds*] outside so it was her friend, also a pensioner like her, and she was coming to visit her friend and share notes about voting. She was walking with a stick and that was the stick making the noise. We open the door because she's got maid's knees, she can't sit on soft chairs. We took a hard chair and we placed it in front of my mom, who was sitting on the sofa. And then the two of them sat there. What was going through my mind was like, I was like blown. I was completely blown. I was sitting there thinking, "They're free. They're South Africans. My God, how do they



feel inside?" Okay. And we just could not take our eyes off their faces as they were sitting there chatting. But the funniest thing was that they were talking you know, about the past, and they were still whispering, like in the old days, you know in case the house is bugged. So the other one leans over to the other one and says "Sisi." And the other one says "Yes?" "Finally this day has come." "No sisi! Don't talk, we waited for this day for years." *[inaudible noises]* Then the other one came back and said, "To think, we spent all our lives washing away our lives down white peoples' sinks! But this day came! Oh amen!" But the conversation was bringing tears to my eyes. But at the same time, it's like: it happened. Now we are here. We've got it, you know, this victory. Then my mother leaned back, she was rocking herself back and forth and humming a hymn and her friend was also looking at the TV and then my mother was just turned like this and saw Mandela's face on the screen. "You see that man?" The other one says "I see him, I see him." The other one said "That is a man amongst men. He made a promise 27 years ago, today he kept it!" But there was this emotion. And then, we voted on the 27<sup>th</sup>. Me and my sisters. All of us, we went to vote. We got into my sister's Mercedes Benz. We went to all the suburbs. There were queues going all the way, you know? Finally we gave up and we went back to Langa. I was so *[inaudible]* you know and we voted. And then later that year, in August, I went to Australia to attend the International Womens Playwrights Conference and I was one of the keynote speakers in that conference. I remember coming on stage, everybody clapping and cheering, and I just said, I just shouted at the top of my voice, "I am free!" And the entire hall just jumped up.

**Q:** That's amazing.

**A:** So nobody can ever *[inaudible]* 1994, when the country came together for one purpose, to vote and finish the past. And start the future. To go into a democratic country.

**Q:** So, I think, you talked a little bit about like how each kind of president has been so far. Something that kind of comes up is if like do you think that if like Tata Madiba was still alive and still president, that things would be better, like he would run the country in a better way?

**A:** You're talking about a person with principles. I think we're all looking for leaders with principles. I think every country is looking for a leader with principles. In this day and age, we're looking for the servant-leader, which Mandela was. A lot of people who take up the role of presidencies don't see themselves as the servants of the people. To me that's the key thing because once you understand who has put you in power, you know it creates respect between you and those people that actually they have trusted me enough to give me this power to rule. So I have to go to do things according to the wishes of the people. Of course people are different, that one will run things like that, but you know what the needs of the country is, what the needs of the majority are.

**Q:** That makes me kind of think you know, it's always like, you always compare like Nelson Mandela is like the gold standard and if you compare like Thabo Mbeki and like Jacob Zuma right now, it just makes me think, so I just wanted to ask, like, down the, down the road, past this election and things, if you could picture like, that servant leader, what would he or she kind of be like?

**A:** It's the kind of person who has time for people. For the people that have given him the

position of presidency. He does not need to drive a half-billion rand car, he can drive any car, you know what I mean, a nice car, stable car, you know what I mean? He has to be very aware, what has been given to him, that the control he has is not his. He has to do it for the people of South Africa. So he can't try to be above the law. Even God is not above the law, God also has laws that he obeys. I know people can say to me "no, God is all-powerful", God is all-powerful, that's what makes him all-powerful. The only way I can give an example ne I belong to an organization that is called the Bramakhumaris (?) World Spiritual University. It's a spiritual organization, like a university, we learn all about spirituality and we have class every day. It's run by women and at any given time, there are three women who are in the position of ruling the whole thing. But, we don't have to make appointments to see them. You know like, okay, you want to go to the person who looks for the elderly ladies, so they got young people who look after them. So you just try to find out, "is it possible for me to see Dadi (?)" "Okay, just wait a moment, I'll go ask Dadi (?)" Dadi (?) would say "Come in now", do you understand? And the person who was the chief, I remember one year, 2006 or 2005, we were coming back from the pilgrimage in India. And she was crossing the courtyard to go into the living quarters. And one young lady saw her and ran over to her and said to her, can I please take your picture? She just stood, put the shawl off of her sari (?) and just stood and waited for the picture to be taken. And the lady who was asking for her picture became very nervous and she couldn't take the picture. So Dadi (?) just said to her very nicely, "You know that I have to go and do something else, don't you?". And then she became even more nervous. So I just said to her "Go stand next to Dadi(?)" and I took the picture. Now imagine that being the CEO of a very big company or the president of a country. If he's inside his country, does he have the time to take pictures? Not really, because he's busy. Or his bodyguards will say, "No, no what are you doing? Let's search you first", you know that kind of thing. There was none of that you know. I noticed that a lot with the seniors, because we love them, you know, you want to go home and say "Oh that was me with Brother Nevere (?)" Oh Brother Nevere (?), can I please take a picture?" And Brother Nevere (?) says "No, come and sit next to me, you will ask another brother to take a picture of us." You know what I mean? They are always available. Not that they are not busy, they are busy. This is an organization that is run without funding. We're not allowed to go out and look for funding. So we, the people in the organization have to donate money to keep the organization going. It happens in every country also. We mustn't think that the government must always do for us, we also have to do for ourselves. If you are in a situation where the governing body is transparent, people are willing to do things, it's not that the people are always wanting the government to give, give, give. But it's just that when people don't know where their money goes, it becomes a problem. So the servant leader takes his direction from the people. He looks at the needs of the people. And he will work forward towards fulfilling those needs. He's not going to go live in a palace, he's not going to buy the most expensive car. And that kind of person eventually does not even need a bodyguard because who is afraid of him, who wants to kill him, because he's working for you. So he's an asset. I'm looking for someone like that to rule my country.

## Person 2

**Q:** Thank you so much [*person was referred in first name*] for taking the time to have an interview with me. So just once again, the project is just about the upcoming elections coming up and like issues about like the government and your thoughts about that and your thoughts about the president, and those kinds of issues. I thought it just was important for my project to kind of

explore what people living in Langa thought as the elections come up. Just to start off, how do you feel about the elections coming up.

**A:** Actually, I'm not as eager as I was before. Because before 1994, we were so desperate because it was the first time we were going to vote. And most of the things we were promised with we anticipated that they were going to be there. But as time goes on, with the first president everything seems to be okay, now as time goes on, as time went on, I've noticed that things are no longer the same. This president, this one, is not treating us well at all. So, I'm not that much as crazy as I used to be with our elections. But otherwise, I have to vote, because I'm South African, because I want things to go on for my country. Maybe, things will change, we never know. So I have to vote.

**Q:** What are some issues that like for this election are the most important to you? Like jobs, education, things like that?

**A:** As we were promised from the first time, there's too much of people who are unemployed. There are a lot of, what can I say, people are crying out for basic services. There's no service delivery. People are still poor. They thought maybe, if there is a black person in power, things will change. But most of the things have not changed. People are still living in poverty. People are jobless. Education system has not that improved as they say was going to improve, but at least there was some change, that our kids can go to white schools. But somewhere, somehow, things are not happening quite well because if you can listen to Limpopo, the province of Limpopo, almost a year children couldn't get books to study. So there are a lot of discrepancies that are not going well in our government.

**Q:** So I was going to ask how you feel, do you think that the government is doing a good job, but let me kind of shift it a little bit. So do you think that the government is doing a good job like in this area?

**A:** Not as such. You know our government...there are those who are really benefitting, people that are almost close to the people who work maybe in the government. There are places that have improved, like the hostels, before they were not the same as now. There's been some improvement but still, there are people who have staying at the back, the back dwellers (?) who have been born there, it's almost, other people are almost 60 years, there still staying at the back of their home because they don't have any places to stay. There's not that much improvement.

**Q:** I kind want to go back to what you said before about how things were different, when it started in '94. Of course, it's like Nelson Mandela. The legendary Nelson Mandela as president. If you had to compare how president Mandela did things with how president Mbeki did things and how president Zuma is now doing things, what are some of your thoughts on how our national leaders tackled the issues, like the three men?

**A:** I don't think there is any president who will ever get into Mandela's shoes. He was really our hero. When he came out of jail, he really proved that he was just like Jesus Christ, we almost felt that he could die for the people. It takes, how can I put it, it takes a particular person, I don't there will be any other person like him, who would sacrifice his family, who would be prepared to die

for his people, and really when he came out, he showed that. You know, he forgave all those people who did bad things to him. He was really eager that we must be a united country. And he strived for that. And he left, for the 5 years that he was there, really his promises were coming up because there were a lot of changes that we could see. Then he handed it over to President Mbeki. Definitely, when he handed it over to him, he saw that this is the man who is going to carry the baton. Really, Mbeki was good. But now, politics are politics. Politics will always be dirty. So there were those people who didn't want Mbeki to be their leader. Mostly in the ANC, I understand that President Mbeki was a very strict person, he didn't like the corruption. He really stood up with Mr. Mandela's wishes. And I still maintain, with President Mbeki, because he was the one who also carried on with the other countries. He made some jobs available. There were things that were really happening with him. Now came this one. *[laughter]* you know, even from the beginning, we could feel, we could see that he's not, his interests is only for his only needs. He's not interested in other people's needs. He can pretend that he's doing so, but I don't see him doing so. He has failed dismally, I can say that. He's just totally different from the two presidents that he preceding from. Look at the Nkandla thing, it's a typical example that really, his interests are only for himself. So, I think that he's going to be the one who's going to drain this country down.

**Q:** I guess like to put it in like a more somewhat hopefully for a positive future outlook, do you see anybody in our, anybody in parliament, the provinces, a national kind of figure that's in politics and government right now. It can be anybody from Helen Zille, Julius Malema, Cyril Ramaphosa, do you see anybody that would be, in the future, might be a good president?

**A:** It's quite a very difficult one because our country, we are using the organizations. It's not a matter of you choosing a figure. So if I can say I can see this particular person, it will always be the organization, not the particular person. You know people in our days are no longer really interested in helping people. Corruption is the rife thing. I'm not sure, whom I can choose and say this person is going to be the one to take our country forward. But really with Cyril Ramaphosa and Kgalema Motlanthe, at least from those two guys, I can really see somebody who can really help us to pull us through. There are a lot of people that they aren't even in government, that I can see, like this guy, Patrick Motstebe (?), he's one of the people who is one of the billionaires, and he's the one, out of his own pocket, whose building houses. A person like that, that one, whose got a particular caliber, you know it's a person that you can see is very much interested to see people, taking people out of poverty, and seeing that schools are being built because he's interested in that, he's interested in also seeing that kids are, he's forming clubs he's forming you know, he sees that he needs to see that children are busy with sport. I can even chose him to be the president of this country.

**Q:** You touched on something that was really kind of important I think, is that so in South Africa, it's like the system that the parties and organizations pick the people that run to be the president of the country. Do you think if that system changed and the people could vote for like I want this person to be president, not so much like the party like an actual individual, whether it be man, woman, doesn't have to, not really so much the party, do you think that would be a good thing?

**A:** I think so. I think so. I think it'll be better off choosing a person rather than choosing a party. Because I think there would be less of people who will be involved in corruption. Because that

would be the person that would be looking upon. I mentioned guys, but there are women who I can see also that are really powerful and can take this country far. Like *[inaudible name]* was one of the women that I could see that she could be a president of this country and she could take this country far. But, unfortunately, she was for the United Nations, I think they chose her to be something there. So I prefer, I really think if we can just choose an individual, more than choosing a party, it would be better off.

**Q:** So, I guess for some last closing thoughts, what do you see, what are some of like your hopes, for a role that like the government and a future president can play in helping create the South Africa that you seek and the community that you see in the future?

**A:** You know, I think a person who could prioritize things. And I think one of the best things that I think that person should start with is education. Because I think an educated country will never go down. And a person that'll see that health-wise, that people are getting good health, good medication. Building houses for people. Helping people for the service delivery because you know, one of the big mistakes I think our government made is that they took all the policies from the other countries, I think the First World countries, countries that are well-established already. They came and brought them to us. Now, it's not easy to implement them because we've been far back from those countries. I think it's still going to take some time. Maybe our grandchildren will be the ones who will be benefitting. Because it's still a long way to go. But we are not patient because we were promised and we thought that things would go through easily. But it was almost 48 years that the apartheid regime was in power. It will take maybe double that 48 years to get rid of those roots, you know, that were implemented by the apartheid regime. But, in any way, I think if they could also change the policies, and look at the South Africa as it is, more than copying things that are done in other countries and think that they could be easily implemented in our country. But I think really, South Africa, if really, can be led by somebody who's got a vision, yes, it can be a country that can prosper. Unlike seeing a country like South Africa going down to be like Zimbabwe. So we need people who would really carry the bait (?) home, like Mandela was pushing on for.

### Person 3

**Q:** So, first off, thank you so much again *[Interviewer referred to interviewee by name]*, just for taking the time to have this interview. So first, just to start off, how do you feel about the elections coming up?

**A:** It's not exciting as it used to be. Like in 1994 when I first voted. That election was very exciting and the second time and its going down, going down. That excitement now it's disappearing, it's disappearing. As a result, I did not even go and check at the voting station if my name is still there. The interest is not there anymore because of what is happening in our country.

**Q:** What are some of the biggest concerns and the biggest issues that you have going into this election?

**A:** Come again?

**Q:** What are some of the biggest concerns and the biggest issues that you care the most deeply

about, as the election comes through, like jobs, education.

**A:** Oh just generally?

**Q:** Yeah anything.

**A:** Jobs, first thing, jobs, job creation. Because there are no jobs, there are few of jobs. If there can be jobs for everyone for instance, my daughter is not working, she's been applying, applying, applying, and she's not getting anywhere. And the people who are so called they're holding high positions and jobs, I think they recruit or they employ family and friends. So if they don't know your name, if they don't know you, you're out, you're not getting anywhere. Again, the social grants, the social grant, the money those pensioners and the childrens, the childrens money, I think it's not enough. It's not enough because everything is expensive, education is expensive, food is expensive, I don't think that is enough. Doesn't do anything. And education, education, for those who can afford. If you cannot afford, education is expensive. Look at my grandsons, I'm paying 18,000 per year.

**Q:** Oh my God.

**A:** That is excluding the extramural activities! That's for aftercare, and if he wants to play the ball or do the soccer or do the drum, then I'm going to have to pay extra. So whoever in this country now who is poor, is going to be poor and poor and poor, nothing is going to improve anything. I wish the government can improve the quality of the poor people, especially the people who are living in shacks.

**Q:** So, one of the things that's being said a lot, in like the TVs and the commercials and things...

**A:** What about that?

**Q:** So yeah, a lot of things that are being said, is like the ANC talks a lot about...

**A:** The ANC is talking a lot about Nkandla now. Nkandla, Nkandla is the main thing that people are concerned about. Where did Zuma get the money from to build the Nkandla? I'm not a political person. I'm not really a political person. I'm not and I don't think really care so much about what is going on up there because those, they are the only people who benefits, those who are up there. And the people who are here, down here, they don't benefit anymore.

**Q:** So you mentioned how you first voted in '94. And one of the things the ANC says a lot is that things have gotten a lot better than it was 20 years ago. So do you think that the government has been doing a good job? Especially here, in the area?

**A:** Okay, the government tried. The government tried, especially in the houses. So there're a lot of houses the government has built for the people. But people, there is more and more and more and more people all the time. Which is why people they campaign or they campaign and say we want houses, houses, houses. When? When will this housing things start? The population of blacks is going, going, going, going, going on. So yeah. But I think the main thing is jobs. That is

why there is a lot of poverty. People are living in poverty because there are no jobs. I think that's the main thing. Unemployment is the main issues.

**Q:** So, I just want to hear your story about how it was voting in '94 and how was having the Nelson Mandela be president.

**A:** Are you taking me back before 1994?

**Q:** I just want to know how it was like to vote then and have Nelson Mandela be president.

**A:** Before 1994? Are you talking about before 1994?

**Q:** It can be both during and before.

**A:** You want me to talk about Nelson Mandela or do you want me to talk in general how the country was like before...?

**Q:** Both please.

**A:** Before 1994, we were living under the apartheid era. There were places whereby we couldn't go to. That was before 1994. And the government before 1994 was an undemocratic government, which means it was a government for certain people, certain people benefitted from those human rights, those human rights were not for everyone. But now, after we voted and after we had this freedom, the human rights are for everyone, whether you are a child or you are an adult, doesn't matter who you are, you still benefit on human rights. Everybody was free, this freedom, you're free to go anywhere, you're free to do anything as long as you don't violate other people's human rights.

**Q:** Do you think that the presidents that South Africa has had after '94, Nelson Mandela, Thabo Mbeki and then President Zuma, do you think that President Mandela did a good job?

**A:** Yes, President Mandela did a very good job. The reason why I'm saying that, President Mandela, his aim was to make everyone have equal rights. And his aim was to black people must educate themselves so that they could better people. And he was also involved in childrens' projects, and all other projects, trying to develop the country. Especially us as blacks because we never had those opportunities before. So he was trying to bring up black society.

**Q:** What about President Mbeki?

**A:** Mbeki, President Mbeki, it was so quiet, it wasn't like everybody is talking, everybody is talking. It was so quiet and he did not even complete his contract or whatsoever. But it was so quiet. He was not fully involved. Yeah, in the country's development.

**Q:** So, thinking about after this election, do you see anybody in South Africa right now that could be a good president in the future, anybody who is in government right now or...?

**A:** To be quite honest, I know it's personal, it's personal, but Helen Zille would be a good president. Helen Zille is a straightforward talker, she does not go around the bushes. What is wrong is wrong, what is right is right. That is what I like about her.

**Q:** This is I guess just to close, just some last thoughts, how do you see the role of...how do you see the role of the president and the government, what do you see them doing to bring about the South Africa that you want to see, both in your community and in the country.

**A:** Okay, I want to see that their uplifting our communities. The way we are living, especially those people, I'm concerned about those people living in shacks. When it's winter, when it rains, those people in the shacks, they get floods. They can develop communities and be in a good standard. And create more jobs for people. And no corruption! I have heard a lot of corruption that is going on up there. It doesn't affect me at all. Because my belief, that's what I believe, I don't know what other people believe. I believe that freedom is in your hands. You must work if you want to be free. You free yourself. You don't wait for other people to come and free yourself. Get educated, educate yourself, so that you can be a better person one day. I believe in that. I believe in hard working, there's a job, that you need to complete. So we must make sure that, that job, we must complete. If you can help other people, then help.

**Q:** The interview is almost over, but you said something that got me thinking, do you mind if I ask it? So, Helen Zille and the DA control the Western Province. And every other province is controlled by the ANC. Do you think that Helen Zille and the DA have been doing a good job in the Western Cape?

**A:** They have been doing a good job. The reasons I'm saying that is that I've never heard any corruptions between those two parties, except the ANC. I know the ANC is the leading party, but the corruption that is happening there. I'm not a political person, that does not affect me at all. But hearing that there's corruption, there's corruption, but I never heard from any of those party that they've done something, screwing money, I never heard anything. The last thing that I want to say, living here in the Western Cape, the DA will always be a leading party, in the Western Cape, I'm sure about that. I'm asking them to look at that the people they get jobs, that they create jobs. There's a number of people that don't have jobs. If they can look at that, people must get jobs *[inaudible]*. And the job that they are doing, they're doing a good job, so far. I never voted for them, but this time, I know that your vote is a secret, but this time, I'll go for DA.

*[Interviewee completed the interview, but went back on the record to add some final words]*

**A:** Safety, the DA must look over our safety. Crime is too much.

#### **Person 4 and Person 5**

**Q:** First off, thank you guys so much for taking the time. It's pretty open, it's just a discussion kind of, on just like political affairs at the moment. The first kind of question is what do you guys feel about the upcoming elections coming up.

**A1 (Saya/Person 4):** First things first, we would like to change the government. Well, not the



government itself, I want to change the presidency. It is difficult to change the president without changing the party that is in charge of the presidency, which is the ANC. They are not accountable for the decisions of one guy's making, which are very wrong.

**Q:** Just to kind of review the procedure, I would like an answer from each of you guys.

**A2 (Hlanganisa/Person 5):** Okay so my answer? Okay, don't want to say like I'm...

**Q:** Oh, hey, be totally open, that's what I want.

**A2:** Okay, the elections are coming up. Kind of frustrated. I know for a fact that the current party is going to win. Although I am not satisfied with the way that they have been running. I am going to vote for a different party. I am fed up all in all with the president itself, as well as some others parliamentarians, within the government itself. Hopefully, we get some many seats in Parliament, and then we'll see.

**Q:** Upon the elections, what, for the both of you, are the top issues that you care about? Jobs, education, the economy, what are like the top issues that you guys care about?

**A1:** My main concern is health care and education. At the moment, it is going backwards, for both of them, which is the basic needs of what our people...our people are not educated. I would like to get them educated, first things.

**A2:** Unemployment, health care, as well as education. Unemployment, I have been unemployed for 3 years. And it's not like I don't have experience, I've got experience, I've got qualifications. And what else? It's not like I've been sitting like a lousy bum, I've been sending CVs left, right and center, no response. Health care, for us people in the township, our health care here, like in the public hospitals, it's all ridiculous to the extent we can all die there without getting attended to. And we don't have medical aid to get better health care. Education, I would say I agree with Saya, it is going backwards, because the current system they are using now, it's weak, it's very weak, it's weak to the extent that even the matriculates of last year, when I saw some of their scope, that there were, it was actually very weak for Grade 12.

**Q:** So, there's a lot of problems that you guys talk about, obviously. Do you guys feel that the government is doing a...putting an effort into it, a good effort, a good job? Trying, at least trying to solve the issues or address the issues?

**A1:** [*inaudible*] but it's not coordinated, that's why now it's in shambles. I'll give you an example about the housing problems. They keep people on the outskirts of townships and they're building houses for those kinds of people only. Whereas there are plenty of other people who live inside the townships who are also in need of houses. Do you understand? Like people that are invade land illegally, they are going to be the first ones to go get the houses. Now, they are giving the impression that in order for you to get a house, you must go invade land illegally, they'll produce a house for you.

**Q:** How about you bhuti?

**A2:** The government is actually trying, to make an effort, but it's not efficient. I'm not going to blame certain individuals but, I would say they don't have more like a proper system, like a follow-up, because as he said before, it's much more easier for people that actually invade (?) the land to end up getting houses. And then for us, people who are still also don't own homes or backherders (?), but it's difficult for us to find houses. I think if there was some kind of a certain body that they would form, first do research, first do research, and then take it from there, I think everything would go smoothly, but then again, it will take a *[inaudible]*

**A1:** Also, another thing, the government of today, they don't want to incorporate the educated youth into the hierarchy. The people in government now are mostly the old people, who were in the struggle, fighting for our democracy. So, they should freshen up, maybe let other people who come from school be able to run the economy and stuff. They're not giving them a chance.

**A2:** Yes, actually, going on what he has said, there is really a need really up there in the government to more like bring in the youth, because we're not in 1994 now, times go by you know, everything evolves, after the youth will be the most relevant people that can more like actually attend to these kind of issues because they actually know.

**A1:** Times are different, they were fighting for the struggle, now we're fighting for the economy.

**Q:** Just to leave off on that note, if you guys were to giving the government a grade, what are the marks?

**A1:** You mean like lower than a *[inaudible]*?

**Q:** Just give a grade.

**A1:** Like in marks?

**Q:** Yeah, yeah like in marks.

**A2:** As in symbols, A, B, C?

**A1:** Out of a 100, I would give it a 5.

**Q:** Out of a 100, you would give it a 5?

**A2:** I would give it 8%.

**Q:** Okay. Okay. I'm sorry man, I should have clarified that.

**Q:** So, obviously, there are a lot of feelings about like the president, like Zuma. But before we talk about Zuma, let's talk about the president in general. Do you guys remember Thabo Mbeki's presidency?

**A1:** Yeah, but he was a misunderstood government.

**Q:** Like, what did you guys think about Thabo Mbeki?

**A1:** Yeah, he was a good president, on the right track, he employed quite a bit of educated people. Whereas Zuma, he put his own friends in. I think...Thabo Mbeki was a *[inaudible]* educated people in the ANC for his presidency.

**A2:** Okay, for me, I would say he was a good president, but he has his own fallouts. In terms of more like he implemented more like kind of policies that would apply to more like developed countries, and we are still, we are still on the rising, some of the policies he actually implemented caused more like a stir because we as South Africa, at the time, were not ready for it. But compared to our current...I would say he's like a *[inaudible]* for me.

**Q:** When was the first time you guys voted?

**A1:** I voted...I think 2009?

**Q:** 2009?

**A1:** 2009. Yeah that was the first time.

**Q:** Was that like a...? Tell me about like that. How was your experience first time voting and voting like now?

**A1:** First time, well first time, I didn't want to vote first time, because I knew my vote wouldn't have made a difference, the ANC was going to win. The reason why I decided to vote was to vote against the ANC because they had the dealings with Thabo Mbeki. Sort of like a rebellion against that, some people were rebelling against that. That should have been the wake up call. Now, it's the EFF, maybe next chance it's going to get other people and stuff, I don't know. But we want to vote against the ANC because they don't listen to the people.

**A2:** No, shit, it wasn't 2009. When was the previous...2004. That was the first time I actually voted. I was a hardcore member of the ANC back then. Ok then, 2009, okay, I wasn't that hardcore, but the company that I was working for at the time was run by the government, basically, even though I didn't agree with what happened to Thabo Mbeki, but I had no choice but to vote for the ANC then. Because, very much we wanted to win the Western Cape, so that our company could continue running. Unfortunately, we didn't win the Western Cape. That is how I ended up unemployed. Coming elections, hoping everything will change.

**Q:** That actually brings up to a very good question. So, you know how right now, the Western Cape is provincially run by the DA. The national government is run by the ANC. So when I ask about like do you think the government has been doing a good job, do you think they've been doing a good job specifically in the Cape Town area? Like in your area?

**A2:** Okay, with the DA, I don't want to be harsh to them. Job well done, the city is clean. Our area is clean. Also for us, in certain places here in the different townships, like Langa for

example, I would say Langa is clean. There's activity going on, etc. compared to other provinces that are run by the ANC. But I think her attention is more towards the white areas.

**A1:** Affluent places. And now, ne, in order for to win more votes, her strategy is, do very little for the masses and say if you want more, if you want more DA, you must vote for the DA. That's her strategy. And she's doing more for the richer people of South Africa.

**A2:** Which are a few, a few majority.

**A1:** That is her strategy: do little and say this is your ANC that's doing this, because people are confused between provincially and nationally.

**Q:** So obviously, when you're casting your ballots for this election, you have like a national leader in mind right?

**A1:** Nationally?

**Q:** Yeah, like a president in mind, an ideal president?

**A1:** No, there is none. Because the thing is, it's different now here than what you guys do over there. He's already...he is the candidate. You're voting for the party, understand? Actually, when you vote, you've got no choice, you're only voting for the party. Doesn't matter who's inside there.

**A2:** You don't vote for your parliamentarian.

**Q:** I guess a different formulation of the question is that like, what would be, like in your minds, the ideal president?

**A1:** Corruption-free for one. A corrupt-free government, which is very hard nowadays.

**A2:** An existing person?

**Q:** It doesn't have to be an existing person.

**A2:** You want us to give the characteristics of an ideal president?

**Q:** Yeah, like just throwing it out there.

**A2:** Educated, corrupt-free, let me see, let me see...

**A1:** Someone who is open to the public. You see, our current government, they're putting all these policies in place so they can keep whatever information they need to keep from the people...the bill's called secrecy bill, whatever they deem secret, it can stay in the government.

**A2:** The public cannot find out.

**A1:** You see, that's one big issue.

**Q:** Yeah okay, makes sense.

**A1:** They can do as they wish, and then they can, whatever documents they have, they're just secrets and they can just keep them. Without the public seeing it. People who are accountable as well, make a mistake, you must account for that.

**Q:** Accountable. Say, we talked a lot about the principle actors, but I guess, if Julius Malema were to be president, right, do you think he'll be a good president?

**A1:** There are people there that will guide him to be a good president. He's got people around him that will guide him to be a good president.

**Q:** Same question.

*[The interview was briefly interrupted]*

**A1:** If he's an accountable president, if he's found guilty of anything, he should be willing to step down. That's a party I want to vote for. I'm giving the benefit of the doubt.

**Q:** To Malema?

**A1:** Yeah to be accountable.

**A2:** The misconception of most people, when it comes to like the EFF for example, it's not like we're actually voting for the individual. Like for myself, I vote for like the ideology of the EFF because they've got different ideology compared to other parties. And it's not like Julius Malema is going to be an absolute monarchy of the party, there are other members of the party that can push, whoever maybe that would be Julius Malema, if it happens to be him, to the right direction.

**Q:** Yeah, okay.

**A1:** And there is a misconception about the EFF. There are quite a lot of a, there are a number of people voting against the change, against the ANC. The DA would have been the obvious choice, against the ANC, because they are the majority opposition. But people don't want to vote for the white people, white opposition, there're looking for a black, they're looking for good black...party let me say. And then the EFF came up with a good, educated young people in their structures. So the majority of people in South Africa are black people who want change in the current system, that's why they're going to the EFF. Quite a lot of them are going to the EFF for change.

**Q:** So one of the biggest things that *[Person 3]* talked about is you obviously here you vote for the party and the ideas of that party, versus like the one guy. Do you think that's a good system, in your opinion, versus like a system where you elect like a person?

**A1:** It can be a better if you were to choose the people in the system. If they were to give us a pool of people in that system, and we had to choose, what kind of *[inaudible]* must people come into *[inaudible]* It can be improved.

**A2:** Yeah, the thing is, it's actually what I'm actually thinking is it's something that will never happen in SA. It is similar to what he just said right now. If we can more like kind of choose it would be much more better, but that unfortunately...

**A1:** Because what happens ne is that they submit their own people to go on the lists, in the ballot papers. We don't even know yeah we don't even know the current people *[inaudible]*

**Q:** Well, yeah that's all I wanted to ask.

**A1:** Ok, I just wanted to add one more thing for you. There are two types of voters in South Africa, the educated and the uneducated. The educated, they want to make informed decisions. Mostly uneducated people are emotional about their votes. They're going to say "I've been ANC all of my life", let's say, maybe a 60 year old, "I've been ANC all of my life" "Even though they're not doing a good job, I'm not going to change."

**A2:** Actually for me, it's not really a question of educated and non-educated. It's with our mother's generation, the 60 year olds, I would say late 50s and so on, although they are not satisfied with the current government, and always they would *[inaudible]* "Oh, we can't go turn down the ANC. Nelson Mandela spent 27 years in jail for us, we cannot let down." Regardless of what Jacob Zuma does, those are the type of people that are going to vote for the ANC for the rest of their lives." Like my mom for instance. She hates Zuma with a passion, she will never vote for another party and she will vote, each and every time, for the ANC. So I think it's the youth that are going to change that whole way of thinking.

## Person 6

**Q:** Thank you so much again, it's just a really conversational kind of thing, so there's no real too much set questions. So, I want to learn about your thoughts on things and that's all I really want. So, be as open as you want, no hold bars. So you mentioned that it's your first time voting right?

**A:** No actually, they were making a joke. But it's going to be my second time voting. My first time was actually a nice experience, even though it wasn't like those people back in '94. The experience that I had, it was great in the sense that it was my first time, but to those people, it was greater because it was their first time and they've been fighting for it. So my first time was basically an echo of what was happening back in 94, being their first time and for coming a long way, for them to stand in a long queue, of which that was actually nice, standing in long queue for hours, however *[inaudible]* just to mark the X you know? To say that you have a say in what's going on in your country. So, this is now going to be my second time, obviously, there's expectations, because too much is happening. And you just want to see more. Should one delivers, you understand, it's their thing, but you just want them to deliver. I'm not voting upon what you have done, I am voting based on what you are saying, so you are convincing me that,

Richard, vote for me because I'll to this and that and that. Not because you've done that and that and that, in the sense of whatever, things that you've been implicated with, but now, I'm just you are coming to me and saying *[Interviewee referred to self in third person]*, I am going to do this, so now, basically, I'm going to vote, regardless of which party.

**Q:** Cool, that's awesome. So, in the coming election, what are some of the issues that are the most important to you, and if you could like, do you think like the government has done a good job in tackling those issues that you care most about?

**A:** You have to understand, we've come a long way. South Africa is a country that has come a long way, given the circumstances that we were in...we've just come from an era... of when people were being discriminated...you know what I'm talking about, we all know what was going on. So, for a country like South Africa, for a country like Zimbabwe, and most African countries, it's a struggle, getting things like, getting jobs, because that's the most important thing. We as youth, we don't have many jobs. And it's getting frustrating. As much as those people can do their best, of which I believe they are doing their best, but now, it's all of these things. Because if you look at it man, people who say, "maybe,..." Okay, say maybe I'm a journalist, I'm studying to be a journalist. In order for you to get a job in journalism, someone has to retire and say now, in order for there to be a post in journalism, someone has to retire, or someone has to just quit or someone has to just do whatever because it is all just concentrated. And what's happening now is people are getting, in fact we are getting educated, meaning that we know what we're doing, but now, it's a concentrated industry, meaning that not only those people who actually studied what they want to be are going to be, do you understand? So, basically, it's a struggle, so first and foremost, we want jobs. But we do understand the circumstances, and we do understand that it's not really easy. People do get their big breaks, but that's 1 out of 20 people. Of which, that's bad. Bad ratio. Say, I'm not sure how it's like in the U.S., but here's it's just bad. And in terms of social development, we do want to live in a society where we just feel safe, a society where there are houses, you know, just basic things. Like health, housing and jobs. So, now you have to just provide that because you're saying to me that should you put that X next to my name, I'm going to deliver those things to you. So yeah. That's it. But, we do want those basic things, social development being housing, jobs and health, like, just infrastructure, you know what I'm talking about. And security also.

**Q:** So, this is your second time voting, do you remember I guess like who was in leadership before President Zuma?

**A:** Yeah.

**Q:** Do you know how things were before?

**A:** Okay, things are different from the Zuma era and the Thabo Mbeki era and the Kgalema Mothantse era and the Nelson Mandela era. The Nelson Mandela era was basically, I was too young. But judging from my observations and from my actual basic research, it was a matter of let's just fix whatever we can fix, now. So everything happened at a quick secession. Let's basically just do damage control. Because we were coming from an era that last for over 50 years, but now let's just fix it in the next 4 years. So it was hard. So came Thabo Mbeki.

According to my observation, of course, Thabo Mbeki was like, “okay guys, let's just try and put South Africa on the map.” Like amongst countries like the U.S., amongst countries like Great Britain, let's just take this country and and just put it somewhere. Not just take this whole country, but this whole continent. That's how we got the, a typical example, the 2010 World Cup. That was a big thing for South Africa. I don't know how people, international people like as in foreign people take it, but to us, and sometimes we don't really portray it that much, but it was really a big thing for South Africa. And after that, I think South Africa has been taken seriously. And South Africa, if you understand this, South Africa is a very sensitive country, meaning that everything we do, we do it with caution, you know, we just don't want anything bad being implicated towards this country, because we've had so many bad things for so many years. So, now coming to the Mbeki era, we've got South Africa was put on the map, *[inaudible]* map by the whole world, got the World Cup, we got several world cups, cricket world cup was here in 2007, 2010, so we've got everything. Now, it's the Zuma era, that's the most important. That is where everything has just, goes down, in *[inaudible]* aspects. But, let's just hope man, you know. I can say let's just hope. Zuma era is like every dog for himself now. If you are there in parliament, it's like you have to just make sure that you and your family are okay. Don't mind the people. But all I can say is let's hope. If you give him another 5 years, yes, there will be talking points, a lot of talking points, but I can say, let's just hope for the best. He's not certainly one of my favorite presidents, he's not done a lot, from what I can see and what Mbeki and Mandela, the late Nelson Mandela, did, he has not done half of what they did, what they contributed to the country. But, let's just hope man. So, coming to this election, I'm not really excited about it, to be honest with you, I'm not really excited about it, but I will vote. As they know, I will vote for ANC because of the historical aspect. Because my great-grandfather was the president of ANC in the Western Cape. Do you know that big hall, Johnson Novela (?), opposite Gugasthebe, that's named after him.

**Q:** Really?

**A:** Yeah, that's named after my great-grandfather. Nelson Mandela actually named that hall, after they finished building it, he named the hall after my great-grandfather because they were close friends. So yeah, I am going to vote ANC because of those historical moments and a few certain things.

**Q:** So, thinking forward, you've kind of talked about your thoughts about the Mandela era, the Mbeki era, where we are today with Zuma, thinking forward, do you see any national leaders that are in play at the moment? It could be anyone from Helen Zille, I forget the Deputy President's name.

**A:** Kgalema Mothanthe, that's the Deputy President.

**Q:** Oh no, Cyril Ramaphosa, or Julius Malema, do you see anybody at the national stage who has the characteristics to be a great president? Coming on?

**A:** You see, when it comes to Cyril, I really like that gentleman, because he shows and he's a leader man, you can see it in him, you know, that he's a leader, in the way he portrays himself. And when it comes to Zille, I really think she's a phony eh, with all due respect.



**Q:** Oh, be honest man.

**A:** Yeah, with all due respect, I think she's a phony. And it's a matter of her doing all these things, like basically, okay like what's happening, I'm not going to beat about the bush. What's happening with Helen Zille, she comes to Langa, she goes to Joe Slovo, have you been to Joe Slovo?

**Q:** No.

**A:** Joe Slovo, the shacks, you see where N-2 is?

**Q:** Oh, I've seen it before, on the come in.

**A:** She goes there, she gives them food, prior to the elections. So she gives them all these things, she goes to other places also. She gives them all these things prior to the elections. Then she wins the Western Cape. So DA basically wins, she becomes the premier of the Western Cape. But now, she cannot do that with other countries, with other provinces like KwaZulu-Natal, because KwaZulu-Natal is ANC. And Gauteng, Mpumalanga, you know what I'm talking about. What she does, she doesn't and what do you call, her motives, because she just goes to certain people. But you mustn't just do that. You mustn't go to disadvantaged people because you know there are more of them. So okay guys, let's just go to those disadvantaged people because if you get that number of percentage then we are fine, let's not go to the people who we can consider advantaged people, like to the more urban areas, like to Pinelands, to Observatory, let's not deal with those people, those people can rather decide what they want. But now, let's go to Khayelitsha, let's go to Langa, let's go to Gugulethu, let's just make sure...So, it's not really what I want, but then, she does all these things and she basically capitalizes on ANC's mistakes. If ANC's not doing this, they won't do this, do you know what I'm talking about? So that's what she does, she basically counteracts, counterattacks whatever the other party is not doing. And that's why I say she's a phony. She's not being original, being "okay, this what I am about. Let's take this country forward, let's do this." When you get to Malema, that's another case on its own. You have a guy that's been kicked out of the ANC, because of him talking a lot, because of corruption, you know what I'm talking about. Understand this Richard, wherever you are, whatever organization that you are, that you're a part of, there will be money that's circulating. Take that money and run, you know? I don't mind if you are robbing me, in terms of just taking that money, but as long as you're delivering, you understand? If you're not delivering, that's when people actually take notice that oh, you're actually taking money from us. But then, if you're delivering, in terms of service delivery, if you're consistent, if you're doing everything else, people will overlook the fact that you're taking, stealing money from them. I really don't mind if you're doing that. And I really don't want anything from the government, but as long as they are basically taking care of other people...okay, I do have a job...I did get an education, because my parents afforded...my parents could afford, due to them doing whatever they had to do. But when it comes to other people, whose others parents cannot afford, you must step up to the plate. Be like "okay, this is the number of people that cannot afford to go to tertiary level, let's take care of those people, let's take care of them. Let's take care of those people. Then, I'll be happy. Then, I'll be like, okay since, I'm painted as an advantaged, it's okay. But the people who are at a

disadvantage, they must be taken care of. I really don't want to be given money whereas I don't really need money. If you don't have money, then they must take care of you. So we can be at a same level. That's what I believe that the government should do.

**Q:** There's actually something interesting that you said that I kind of want to talk a little bit more about. So, you obviously have very like, you think Helen Zille's a fake, not really genuine. But it seems to me at least, tell me if I got the wrong idea, for you, a great...leadership is based on if they can produce results, if they can deliver right? And the Western Cape is the only province in South Africa that's controlled by the DA obviously, Helen Zille is the premier. Do you feel that the provincial area, since it's controlled by the DA, do you think they've been doing a good job on results here, locally? Like in the province, or nearby where you live, do you think that's reflective of Zille's leadership?

**A:** To be honest, the thing is that, the things that she has done, obviously, as I've said, prior to elections, she will dirty on her knees on her knees, I'm telling you. Heels off, make-up off, everything off. I even saw a picture of her actually dishing up and washing pots and stuff like that. That's a leader you know. That's a leader. That's a leader. If you're a leader, you must basically lead by example. That's a true definition of a leader. I will not expect you to do it every day though, it's okay. You also have other things you need to do. But now, don't do them prior to elections because you want to win over people. That's not how it works. Why do you just squeeze it in, like in a diary, that okay, let me just do this. But now coming to your question, she, I don't really think that she's done that much. Because if you...I always like to make living examples. If you're coming from Langa, and you see that there's something happening, development, houses being built. That's not DA my friend. That's ANC. They promised us those houses for a number of years. But now, they are actually delivering. But that's not DA. What has DA done? They did put pavements here, of which that's good. But just check, when did they actually do those pavements. I'm not saying ANC is good, but...you have to look at it like this, from when they said they were going to do this to when they are actually doing it, you must always take notice, that you are saying that you're going to do this, 5 years ago. Okay, Richard you're going do this. Let me vote for Richard. Richard doesn't do anything for 5 years Richard actually delivers on the promise, after 5 years, before the elections. Do you know what I'm talking about? It's a simple logic thinking. So now basically I will be thinking like, Richard is doing that, oh snap, shout out to Richard, let me put another X. That's the problem, with the ANC and DA. But thing is, with DA, they are in control of the Western Cape. I'll be surprised if they don't win the Western Cape again this election. I'll be really surprised. But now, as I'm saying, the timing of the national people, of those people up there, is really bad. I don't know if it's psychological, or I don't know what you call, but it's more psychological I think, you know, they're basically bringing smiles to our faces, be like, "oh Richard is doing this". So you know what, I'm going to vote for Richard again. Richard, we want a park. Ok, I'll give you a park, don't worry, I'll give you a park. But when is Richard going to give me this park? After 2 years when it's provincial elections? The timing is poor. We just have to take that into consideration.

**Q:** I learned a lot about what you think and it's really helpful just to get some thoughts for the project. Is there...down the road, like in your hopes and ideals, how do you see government, the president and the national leaders playing a role in truly making the South Africa that you dream about? Both here and nationally.

**A:** The South Africa that I dream of man, and I just wish that this can...come to fruition...I just wish there would be less corruption. As I said before, there will always be corruption. The company that I'm working for, there's corruption. The school that you're...there is some form of corruption. Nevertheless, that we know or we don't know or whatever, the mere fact that you're delivering, that's the core thing, that service deliverance. If you deliver, according to your promise, then I'll be happy until I die. If you want this, people must get that. If people can't get this, people must get that. And, I really can't get this but, when it comes to education now, I really don't understand because South Africa is not a First World country, a Third World country...?

**Q:** It's like a country on the rise.

**A:** Yeah, we in between First and Third...but we are on the rise. But when it comes to education, I think that we should emphasize more on education. And people are actually going back to school, I'm going back to school next year because I want a better life for myself. I'm like yo, let me just go back to school. But now, I do not have the resources to go back to school. So what must I do now? I must take a loan. I'll go to a bank, guys just give me a loan. The bank will be like, "okay, but how are you going to pay this loan?" I'm going to pay this loan after I'm done studying. Bank will be like "okay, sweet, we'll give you that loan." But now, I finished studying, I get my whatever, the bank is like "yo, do you have a job?" "Not really, I don't have one." "Yeah, we need that money." Then I'm like uh, guys uh. Then I'm basically dead, without even starting to work. I'm basically dead because I still have to pay those guys. And to be honest, there are now learnership programs, I won't even lie to you, there are learnership programs there are internship programs, there are all those programs, that just basically they help people just go back to whatever, go to school, to do this. But when it comes to tuition fees, it just go up each and every year. For some reason, I don't even understand why. If they are basically pushing education, why must tuition fee rise each and every year? What about the guys who don't have the resources to go to school. I think the government still needs to intervene, when it comes to that aspect. But yeah, I think they must...service delivery and education, those are the 2 key. And they must build more relationships with other countries, more businesses, more black businesses, outside the country to invest. And people won't invest if they see that the country is not in a state where, for obvious reasons, how are we going to make a profit and yada-yada.

### **Person A**

**Q:** Thank you so much for taking the time to speak to me about my project. So, just kind of a recap, it's a conversation, it's not really a formal interview, about your thoughts and opinions on the elections coming up, issues that are important to you, your thoughts on the president, leaders before and after. I guess, just to start off, how do you feel about the elections coming up?

**A:** It's quite an exciting time, for our country, for us. I'm 53 now, so I've been through a few elections. Being 53, I actually come from the previous regime, and being in since 1994, the new South Africa as well, it's been quite exciting. The changes that have happened, we actually thought that South Africa would change a lot. Which actually it did. Stuff changed, but it wasn't

that dramatically changed. Everything is more or less the same. One big thing that's bothering me is that everything is not dealt with properly, like health services. I'm in old age care, and I feel that they could do more for old age care and children. But I suppose, maybe they've got a plan, I don't know. But I'm quite positive about the elections. I just feel that everyone should vote. And it's quite terrible to see to see that people don't even register to vote. And it's scary. And it's quite a big number of people that did not register and it's young people that were born after 1994. So that's quite disturbing to me. Why wouldn't they? Why wouldn't they put their voice behind something behind something that's actually their purpose in life? To me, it's quite disturbing that they don't vote. That they don't want to.

**Q:** So you mentioned health care for seniors and for children. Is there any other issues that are important to you coming this election?

**A:** Education. A country is built on what you feed children. Education-wise. If you got a strong base in education, then you will have a strong young person and you will have very strong grown-up person. So if education is not dealt with in the right way, then you cultivate a young person that has got no motivation and no. that can't stand pressure. But if education is from the beginning, done in the proper way, then in the end, you'll build a strong young person. And building a strong young person, you have a strong leader for years to come.

**Q:** So do you feel that the government has done a good job on education and health care, both on a nation level and perhaps on a local level?

**A:** Maybe they're trying. But it's not coming over quite as I would think it could. Yeah perhaps their trying. I can't say that they aren't trying. It's not for the lack of trying. I think it's the lack of expertise. They are not willing to listen to people that really knows a lot. They're not willing, because they want to do it their way. I think there are a lot of people with enough knowledge and enough expertise. If they would just give them a change to work with them, not against them, to work with them. I think together they could make a very strong team, in health care and in education. And well on, actually, every level. But it seems to me that it's not important to them or important enough, that they get expertise, help from somebody that really knows. And South Africa's got a lot of expertise, I think.

**Q:** Oh, you're absolutely right there. So. I think it's really important to talk to you, just because like you said, you lived in South Africa before and the new South Africa, post-'94. Looking in a post-'94 lens. It's still a young democracy, it's still a fairly young country. There's been three presidents and national leaders. If you were to I guess compare and contrast them, who do you think steered the country in the best way and why do you think so?

**A:** Well, every leader after 1994 had very good aspects of leading aspects. They were quite good leaders in their own way. Well obviously, Nelson Mandela was a very good leader, he wasn't only a good leader, he had the sense to do it in the right way, without aggravating people. He could chat to people on a very sensitive subject, but he would do it so good that that they would actually, in the end, turn around and be on his side. I don't think you can compare the other leaders with him. He had just a way with working with people and everyone had a lot of respect for what he did, what he went through, what his goal was. At this stage, I don't there is anybody

that can actually compare to him. It's not that they're not good, they've all got their special ways and means of leading. But it's not done in the way Nelson Mandela did.

**Q:** So, looking at the field of candidates that are present for this election and looking beyond, do you see any faces or people that you feel could be good national leaders or good presidents looking forward? For the country?

**A:** I am not that into politics.

**Q:** Oh yeah, it can be anyone that comes into mind.

**A:** But, maybe, I don't know, there's somewhere in the future, a strong woman. That can take the lead. But maybe not as president. But as a team. Or a group of women that could...Because from a woman's side, women look at life differently. They see problems far more into the future and got problems for them, or resolutions to problems, than men have got. It feels as though men only think of themselves, and a woman being a leader, to me it feels, maybe she'll be more positive to old age care and children care and whereas if men, I don't really know if they really care. I would love to see a strong woman in the future. I don't know who it's going to be, but if there is someone, but I think South Africa's got strong women.

**Q:** Oh yeah. That's really interesting because, so I've been only in this country for a little bit as well, so I don't really know the political scene as much. I think one of the most prominent women in the field is obviously Ms. Helen Zille. And it's interesting because she's also the premier of Western Cape and this region, so do you think that she's a good leader?

**A:** Yeah, she's a good leader. But I don't know about the future. She's not very young. I don't know for how long she can still run around and jump around in a jet again. Maybe as a brain behind. Or a teacher. I don't know how long she will be able to keep up. Well, she's not old. And older people by all means can lead. But I don't know if it will be she. There might be another one.

**Q:** That's interesting because she's always the big name that comes up, as president of the main counterpart to the ANC. Do you not really, you don't think she can be president?

**A:** Maybe she could, for say 1 term, but I don't really know if she can handle the bigger picture. I mean if you got the Western Cape, you got the Western Cape. The big picture is still quite a heavy load. You have to be quite strong. She is. She is almost like the Iron Lady. But yeah, I don't know if she is able to. Maybe she's got the expertise and maybe she's willing to teach somebody or guide someone, but I don't really know. I'm not really in politics. I'm just looking at it from this side.

**Q:** Oh no. I think your perspective really is invaluable. It's not really the head-honcho, political people that are important in a democracy.

**A:** And in the end, if you listen to local people, just people in general, and you listen to what they say and where they come from and what they've seen and what they experience in normal day

life, like in my job, working with older people. Older people in the white community as well as in the black community and colored community, there is a lot to be done, there is a lot of work. Really. Everybody screams about jobs and jobs for younger people and opportunities for younger people. Yeah sure, sure. But, first get your house in order where its concerned your older people, and from there, jobs will, then there will be a lot of jobs available if you look at older people, because they need caring after and maybe you can have a community here for younger people, to work with older people, not only to care for them, but also to learn from them. So shouldn't you have a community here, where you have all young people to work with older people and children, for 1 year in their life, and get a situation where you have intergenerational contact. You teach a young child or a young adult what it's like to be old. What it's like to work with an older person. What you can draw from them in knowledge and insight and just basically life. And then from there on, you can say well you've cared for an older person for 1 year, you've got knowledge about this and this and this. I think it could work.

**Q:** I think so too. What are some things you would like to see in like a future national leader or even a provincial leader or like the next South African president going forward? What qualities?

**A:** One without corruption would be number one. One that you could trust. Trust as your leader. Not make jokes about stuff that he does. I grew up in quite a conservative upbringing, you had to have respect for your leader, your president, your prime minister. It's just how I grew up. And these days, I'm sorry, but they're making jokes about these people and you can't really have any respect for them, because they don't operate that way. Respect has to be earned. Whereas, my friend the other day said, "no, respect is not earned. You start off with a full bucket for everybody. Everybody, you don't know the person, but you start with a full bucket. But that respect gets less and less and taken away, until the bucket is empty, and that's how you lose respect. Maybe that's another way of looking at it. But at this stage, my buckets are quite empty for the leaders in this land, country because they've just done stuff that you can't respect them for. Weird things. But, I think we've got a strong group of people. They must just start to know, that they can't just live for themselves. When you're in a position where you are a head of a country or political party, you can't just live for yourself. You're there for a purpose. And that purpose...it's the same as...I work here for older people. What's my priority? To feed my family? No. My first priority is caring for older people. With that, I get the benefit of a salary and caring for my family. So if they can just click the basic stuff, get their priorities right and work from there, then maybe it'll be better. I don't really know if it fits in with their culture, but it could. Ubuntu. If you take the ubuntu word and you see what it means, then I don't feel that they live the ubuntu rule.

**Q:** Thank you so much, I'm really learning a lot, just from our conversation. I guess if we were to put a little bit of a closing lid on, what role do you see the government and like the president play in bringing about some changes and things or some improvements that you would like to see going forward?

**A:** If we have a president and a government that are willing to listen and to learn from previous experience and from the knowledge that we do have in this country. They don't have to go to America or to the UK or to wherever, or Zimbabwe. They could look at Zimbabwe, but if they use the expertise that we have in this country, if we look at the resources of mining and

agriculture, you've got like a gold mine, not literally, but we've got a gold mine of experience and expertise in this country. You don't have to go far to go look for another recipe. We've got a whole recipe here of being successful and working together and everybody is so centered on for his own doing and his own thing and my things and what I want and my house and my...I would love to see that everybody could work together, doesn't matter if you're black or yellow or grey or brown, that's not the point, it's not about that. It's about a human being with another human being and having an open mind for teaching and learning from one another. Because ask anybody, you, being a 21 year old could learn from me being a 53 year old and I can also learn from you. It's not about you being a younger person and I'm being an older person or I'm working with an 86 year old and, "okay now, they're old and what do they know?" It's not like that. It's the same in the government. If they can open their minds and just look around them, you've got everything here, you've got the whole pot of gold here, you just have to start using your resources and if I could get a message through to them, then I would do that. I will give you a very good example. It's been a privilege for me to sing in a choir in South Africa, in a mixed choir. Our slogan is "Freedom in Harmony". We're people from all over. Some don't have a job, they're professors and doctors and mothers and teachers and whatever come together for one purpose. That's the purpose: singing. That's the one things that binds us together: singing. There is nothing else that binds us. Not culture, not race, because we're all from different cultures, race, church denominations and whatever. And it's a recipe for disaster, because it's as exactly the same as the country. But, a 25 year old success story! It's an unbelievable family to belong to. We all look after each other, we're like family. We care for each other. We are not in each others' faces all the time, but we're available, all the time. You and me and everybody. Singing together and making music together, but also caring for each other. And that's to me, in small, a very good success story, of how the country could be. You must just have patience and you must be open to see what's around you and use that. So, I think it could work and because as you said, the democracy is quite young. Yeah, it is. So I would love to see that in the next...or the next time that it comes, it develops into a workable situation and not a greedy group, bunch of people, here and there and everywhere.

### Person B

**Q:** Thank you [*interviewee referred to in the third person*] for taking the time out of your busy schedule to just talk to me about my project. So, just kind of like a basic recap, it's basically just talking about your thoughts on the elections coming up, the government, the presidency, things of that nature, issues that are important to you. So like, it's just going to be conversational, I don't have any set questions, I just kind of want it to be open and comfortable, that's all I'm asking. Thank you very much. So I guess the first line of inquiry would be how do you feel about the elections that are coming up really soon?

**A:** Well, it's all over the news, it's like all we hear about and sometimes, it gets a bit tiring because you don't hear anything else. But I think it's a good thing and I think it's a good thing that people have the opportunity to vote and the fact that it's openly contested, the fact that people are getting angry at each other, in the sense that I think it shows that people can have different opinions and that's okay. And we could be different from each other and that's fine. I must say, there have been times that I have sort of wondered whether a politician or two wouldn't get shot, just because I think sometimes, the tempers really flare and because political affiliation is so closely linked to identity and to ethnicity often...your personal identity...people get so

worked up they take it personally, they get really worked up about if Malema says “we're going to nationalize the mines” or “we're going to have affirmative action” and often Afrikaans people get really upset because it means reverse racism. So, if you see sometimes, at rallies, there's even a bit of violence. Sometimes, at just a regular rally, there's...not people shooting, but just intimidation like people arriving with bricks or traditional weapons, just to intimidate the others. And because we have such strong feelings, just always, they're hoping that it doesn't erupt into something more. But I think it's a good thing that we have such contested elections, and I think it shows that it's a healthy democracy at this stage.

**Q:** Alright yeah! What are some issues that are most important to you coming to the elections?

**A:** I must say that in the Western Cape, we've been very lucky...we are the only province not ruled or governed by the ANC, so...yeah...so, there's nothing in my day to day life that I sort of feel is lacking or I don't feel safe or the roads are falling apart. So in terms of infrastructure...I'm worried more about sort of national issues. Like for example, the autonomy of the legal system and the fact that the government has the power to influence the judges in certain cases. Or like for example, if a politician, if there is legal action against a politician, that can be interfered with. So that for me is an issue. I know there have been police officials that have been...had legal action against them in the past for corruption and all sorts of things. Then what happens is that the file just disappears or they throw out the case. That for me is one concern. Another concern is for example, economic policy in the sense of, like nationalizing mines, what Malema and them want. Just because it's not a good financial model and it's not good for the country and it's going to scare away investors. So that kind of thing. But then obviously things like education and crime. But I think that's important for everybody. I don't think a party is going to win based on their policy on education or on health care or...but it's more these radical economic policies and I think how much power the government has to interfere with other institutions and bodies.

**Q:** Do you think that the government overall has been doing a good job in kind of like addressing these issues. I would say...like on both a national level and a local level?

**A:** I think, considering what the government has to deal with, the inequality in terms of wealth and in terms of infrastructure, and that many areas are not yet serviced in terms of electricity or water or sanitation or services like refuse removal. I think they have an enormous amount to cope with. So yes, I think they're doing a good job in that sense. However, two things happen that impede what they're doing and prevent them from doing better. The first is that unfortunately, there is an inherent culture of corruption and self-enrichment that is emerging time and again in various aspect. Every now and then you hear that money that was meant to go for a feeding program has gone for a bonus or people claimed things, claimed the pensions of dead people. So there's that. So the money which should be going even more to education and health care and all, it is not reaching those people. The other thing is, I fear that often the government blames the past, in the sense that because we've inherited the poor situation from apartheid, they use that as an excuse not to do better. And while that is true, and of course they've got huge backlog in terms of housing and all of the things that I've mentioned before, if you look at a country for example like Japan and where they were after the Second World War and how devastated they were and how long it took them to rebuild themselves, I wonder for how long it will be possible to get away with blaming what we've inherited you know. It's 20 years



afterwards, is it not now time to say, to not blame that anymore? So I think they are doing alright. I think they can do better. I think that if the corruption could just be less and obviously stop ideally you know, but be less, then there will be more money channeled towards the right places. I think that'll be really important. That's nationally. Provincially, I think the government is doing pretty well. I think, what happens is a lot of people moved to the Western Cape because of urbanization. Most people come from the Eastern Cape, but if you speak to a lot of people that are here now, a lot of them will tell you that "I came from the Eastern Cape" or I came from" somewhere else. So the government has to keep up. I heard a statistic about three weeks ago, let's say that 5 years ago, the percentage of people that had houses, well let's say that it's 85%. And 5 years later, it's only 86%. Now what the ANC has done is they have said that okay well that proves that only 1% more people have houses than they did 5 years ago. But what they don't say is okay but in that 5 years, about 2 million people moved into the province. So yes, only 86% of the population now has a house, but it's now 86% of a larger total. So I think considering that, I think the Western Cape government is doing alright. Obviously, there are things like the farm workers, issues in De Doorens (?), even in Stellenbosch as well, that's causing unhappiness. But I think generally, they're doing okay.

**Q:** Could you just share with me, how was your first experience voting like?

**A:** I was a student when I first voted. We all got together, we all registered at our student residence. So we also got into the whole action and being inspired to do that and then went early in the morning and went to go join the line at the town hall that was where we had to go and vote. And I felt proud, I felt really proud to be able to do that and to be a part of the voting public and to say that my vote contributed to somebody being in power. Yeah and I've voted in every election since then. I'm not somebody that stays and I think that by voting, you can change the people in power if you're not happy. I don't think you should stay away and not vote. I know there's an action like that at the moment, people are saying don't go and vote but I think rather you should.

**Q:** So, like you said, it's been 20 years after South Africa became a democracy and I think, forgive me if I'm wrong, there has been three presidents so far? And national leaders? So, I guess in your opinion, if you had to like compare how they like, as the national leader, tackled the challenges the country faces, who do you think did the best and why do you think that way?

**A:** I think that it would be an unfair comparison to try and compare anybody to Nelson Mandela, just because I think the roles of the president were different. I think the role of a person taking over in the first 5 years was meant to keep both white and black people sort of happy [*inaudible*] to be seen as a reconciliatory sort of figure, somebody who wouldn't estrange one group or the other, for example, not estrange the white population, and yet make the black people feel that, yes, it's not business as usual, you're not just the token black president. You're really fighting for our rights. Now I think, because it was such a fragile situation in the country, it was needed for somebody to be a statesman, to be a global player, to have influence and to fight for the rights of Africa, because I think Africa hasn't really been on the global map very much. So it was important for someone to come and say, we're a player and you have to keep us in mind. And someone to be the face for Africa and I think Nelson Mandela did that exceptionally well. Then you had...it would have been fatal for the country to have somebody after Mandela because a lot of people felt that after Mandela left, now everything was going to implode. So then we had

someone who was actually an ANC leader who was much more conservative, much more Eurocentric in his education, his outlook. Obviously there were issues about his view on AIDS and all of that, but I think he was unpopular among his own people, but he...he quoted like Shakespeare in his speeches, so that went down well with some people, but not with others. But I think it would have been really bad to have a populist at that stage, which Zuma is. I do think...I liked Mbeki, but I guess it's because I'm sort of...someone too radical may have maybe scared me. So I think he was good, as a person, to follow Mandela. Then Zuma, obviously, I would have preferred if somebody else were president. Somebody like the current vice president, Cyril Ramaphosa, who is also a level headed guy, he's well-educated, he knows a lot about the economy, he's a businessman himself, with a lot of financial stakes. So Zuma, maybe is...I don't know if he's good for the country, I don't he's good for the image of the country. He's not out there sort of globally. Zuma is much more an African president, he's pushing the African agenda. He's not buddies with the Americans or with the Europeans. With China, obviously, with the trade and everything. They want to push the African agenda and sort of sympathetic to people in Africa like Mugabe and all of that. He's not, I don't think he wants to be considered a world player, and I don't think he makes a good impression overseas, I think maybe he is good for the masses who feel that Mbeki was too European in his mindset and now we have a peoples', sort of a populist. But there are too many scandals, and I think any other president with this many scandals would have been impeached by now. He's probably done the worst job whether he came first or last, whether there was a Mandela before him or not I think would have been irrelevant. I don't think he's a fantastic president and I wish somebody else could be president for the next 4 years, 5 years.

**Q:** You brought up a lot of players, obviously there's a lot of people, in the spotlight, like Cyril Ramaphosa and Julius Malema, but there's so many different parties and people that are involved. So I can't help but kind of ask, looking beyond this election and just kind of like looking forward, do you kind of see anybody in mind that you feel would be a good president later on or a good national leader?

**A:** Look, the truth is, the ANC is going to win the election again. I wish that we can have a system, well maybe be careful of what I wish for, like in America where you have to vote for a presidential candidate. Where you have to select a presidential candidate. Over here, the president of the party is the president, the winning party. We have to know that the ANC is going to win. I wish someone would challenge Zuma for the presidency, or it's actually quite possible, political analysts have discussed, that they do not think that he will complete his term as president. They think he will be removed or recalled. Because he's an embarrassment later on of there's infighting, they will then sacrifice him for the greater good of the party. I wish someone like Ramaphosa would be for me, he's a good candidate because he's clever, which Zuma unfortunately isn't. And he has economic savvy and I think he has more integrity. I just consider him as somebody that has...he wouldn't make stupid decisions financially, he knows what's going on around the world, especially in business, and I don't think he would do things that would harm the country or investors. I don't think he's very popular necessarily, maybe again, he's too elitist for the masses, but yeah.

**Q:** You actually touched on something that's really interesting. How...so I'd hate to bring up other kind of things, but the general tone that I kind of got, just from reading the papers and trying to get a hold of the system, it seems to me that there isn't a lot of excitement like with the elections

going on. But, I think what you said about how like, if it was different, if you could pick a person directly or elect someone directly to be president. If the system were to change to that, do you think that it will be a good thing, and that it'll be a better thing for the country and that it could get people excited or what not?

**A:** I think it'll get people excited, because at the moment, there are a lot of people in the ANC who do not like Zuma. They know he's bad for the country and for the party. But historically, they've always voted for the ANC and they cannot not vote for the ANC. *[inaudible]* so they won't vote for another party, it'll be like betraying them. So people aren't very excited because they know they'll vote for the ANC and it's going to be more of the same. I'm not sure that voting for a president is necessarily going to be better because you have a huge number in this country of illiterates, our illiterates are many, not most, but I would say a large percentage of the electorate is illiterate. Therefore, for example, that's why Malema's party can have so much popularity because what he does is he goes to a rally, and he says "we're going to up the salaries for domestic workers to this amount" or "we're going to give all miners a minimum wage of that amount." But nobody questions that because I don't think "well, whose going to pay for it?" Or he says "we can scrap all across for health care, there's going to be free education, you're not going to pay tax for this." And then nobody thinks that if this were our system, the country will be bankrupt in 5 years time. So there's nobody to question that. They are happy with the explanation that Malema gives by saying, "well I have to wear expensive watches because that's how I inspire you." No body has a problem with that. The people, the uneducated, don't have a problem buying that argument. I'm afraid that they will go for rhetoric and that they will be easily pleased by answers that aren't necessarily realistic, and that might be dangerous. Because the EFF has got a huge following, they have done incredibly well for a party that has been in existence for less than a year. They are going to be in parliament and they've got drastic policies of land grab and just taking away property. So I'm not sure that misleading people into voting for anybody...because they can be swayed by anything.

**Q:** In that same, similar thread, what are some things that you value and wish you can see in a national leader? That would be good for the country. What are your preferences.

**A:** I would like to see somebody that really, I don't know if there's a politician out there in the world that'll fulfill these requirements but, really has the interests of the people at heart, in the sense that they won't enrich themselves or that they won't just employ their friends or appoint their friends or interfere with legal cases. Independence, not interfering with state or other entities, having respect for the people, realizing that they have a duty towards the people, but as again, I think that's the complaints about politicians everywhere the world, they say they do it for the people, but in the end, it's all about themselves. But I don't think we're going to have a leader, I don't think any leader in South Africa, unless it's Malema, is going to make huge economic decisions because their advisers will tell them it's going to hurt the country, this way or the other. So that's I think is alright. But it's things like appointing a person with no experience as a police commissioner or disbanding an independent unit of investigation, that kind of stuff. I wish it will be somebody who would respect the autonomy of certain bodies and the law and things like that.

**Q:** Ok wow, this is just a rehashing a little bit, but just to cap it off a little, what do you hope to see or you would like to see the government, the president, all the involved entities kind of do to

make the changes that you want to see or the improvements that need to be made or things that you think that should be done. What role do you see them playing?

**A:** I think they need to consult with experts. Because I think what's happened a lot, in the ANC, often if you take a look at the list of parliamentarians, you'll see that it's often a husband and a wife. Often the same surname keeps cropping up because it's a father and a son. So there are families in the ANC that have a history of taking part in the struggle. What's happened was in forming a government, these people were rewarded for their service by having a position in parliament and stuff. So there's a lot of...People are in power that aren't necessarily equipped to be there or shouldn't really be there. The minister of basic education should have been fired ages ago. I mean, she's absolutely useless and making such a hash of, every year, but due to some sense of loyalty, she's still there. So if they would just use experts, and take advice from experts, I think that would really help in getting good and sound advice. And if the will is there to implement it, and if money went to the right places, then I think they could do a lot.

### Person C

**A:** As I said, we know what is going on in our country. We've got a beautiful country, make no mistake, we got a lovely country. But certain things, we're not happy with. Especially with the crime in our country. Where the government seems to they can't find out something how to handle it, how to do it or they don't want to do it. That's what we're not happy with. We're not happy with that stuff. They must really do something that the country, the whole country, like Mr. Mandela said, "no hate, let there be love in this country. Let me take hands together to make it the most beautiful country in the world." And he strived for that. After 27 years, he came out and he said I'm telling you this country will no more have that what has happened. We know how we suffered, the apartheid was there, and we were suffering. Our people were suffering, our fathers, our grandfathers, they were suffering our forefathers ne. But now we have to do and they, who on top, the head of the country, they must lead and they must lead by example, so that we can be followers and take the country to higher steps. To go forward, with the younger ones, we must take the country. They must lead us to that. There is everyday, there's like raping kids, everyday there's women abuse, everyday there's *[inaudible]* that is murdered. Elderly people. How come if they don't do something, what now will happen now? They fight against each other. 1 politician to the other one, the want to get...everybody wants to get people in their party. But who's the right one. And our people must make the right the right decision and say, if I am voting for that party, I know that party, the people will look after us. And that's what we all want. We want to save the country. We want them to see that things go well. Even in the schools, ,in the hospitals, whatever the country may be. But the poorer get poorer and the richest get richer. That's not what we want. We must take our hands and love each other. We had the World Cup there, we had a World Cup here. Me telling you, I was there! On that pavilion there, I was there. It was amazing, tears were rolling on our cheeks. How many people can come together, and stand right against other and all cheering for one country. And how come only sports can do that and other stuff can't? After that we go there. After 1994, we came up to higher standards. That was all about Mr. Mandela. The icon and we must follow in his footsteps. He could have come out after 27 years and say, "let's have war" because they put me in there. But he came from there and said, peace in this country! He wanted us to love each other. But now, the politicians are coming. I heard this

morning on the radio, how they're shouting at each other, how they're screaming at each other to get the people. We who have suffered, we don't want to talk about that! As one girl said this morning, I'm a white girl, but for me, there's no color. If we're still looking at whose black, white, yellow and pink...My grandfather, he told us, he said, white, black, yellow or purple, it doesn't matter. You are a human being. If human beings treat human beings like human beings, then everything is fine. I know, I hear the radios and I check the TVs. In other countries, there's also things happening. It's not right, they're fighting against each other! But ours, in South Africa, it's just on top. They said we're the highest in crime. We are the highest in murder. You come out here, you get shot down. Last week, there was a lady, in her driveway, they took her out of the car, they raped her, took her to somewhere else, put her back in the car and let her go. You're no more safe, not even in your house. That's not right. That's why we must appeal to the government. Enough is enough, do what you must do. Corruption, let it be gone. Be honest with yourself and say I'm the leader, like Mr. Zuma, I'm the leader. So I have to stand like a leader. There's no use in talking like what Mr. Mandela do. And they don't do nothing. They say your deeds must be harder than your words. So I am looking forward to the election, but it all depends on what you as the voter, you must do the right thing, you must stand. You know what, what makes me angry, when you are now say I'm DA and then next month, you say I'm COPE and the next two months, you say you're ANC. What does that mean? Are you not a follower? What are you doing? You are fooling yourself. You must stand what you stand. As I'm telling you, I love this country, I was in Thailand. Man what I see there, how the people work! They work! Old people work. The sewing machine like mine is standing on the road, and there they work. If I were to put my sewing machine here in the road and work, the municipality came, the police came, and say "you can't work here", but there, the people work wherever they want. That was my first impression. And the kids! They teach them how to work in the shops, the little ones. They say "Madame, [*something in Thai*]?"...The sew so gentle, they want to help you. But here, you sit on the street, begging...we beg we don't want to go out and look for work. Sometimes there isn't, you must work they say, but there is no work. People start stealing, they start murdering. And the government must look forward to that, take our hands, sit around the table and say "what can we do for our people in the country?"

**Q:** Wow, that's a lot to learn from you already! So, you said crime is a big issue, is there any other issues that you're concerned about as the elections come up?

**A:** You see, everything is going up, everything price wise, everything. And if there's no work, then how are people going to pay their debts, how there are going to pay for their electricity. When the electricity goes up, people have to buy units at the shops. Because everything goes up. And if the money stays less, how are people going to pay that? Everything goes up. The electricity, water, groceries, food, everything goes up. People, our South Africans, as I hear, as I read, I'm listening a lot to the radio, I'm not actually watching TV a lot. They said our South Africans are the people that save the least. They don't want to save the money. They just want to spend. But the end of the day, they can't afford to keep their houses, the banks take their house, their car. I'm also concerned about the drugs, the drug lords. It's an evil in this country. Young children, from like 9 to old age people, they all use it.

**Q:** Do you think the government has done a good job at tackling those issues?

**A:** I think they try to do it, but I don't think they're trying hard enough. I don't know if they're trying hard enough to do that. Last week, they shot a police man, he was alone there. People come to tell them that something happened to them, they come to submit a crime report and they shoot him. And the guy he was actually a good man. 44 years old with two young boys, now without a father. They arrested somebody, 2 people, and one was inside, a policeman. It's crazy, inside. I don't know if it's like that but that's what the radio said.

*[the interview was interrupted briefly]*

**Q:** how about the local government? Here in the Stellenbosch area?

**A:** Our municipality is here and I think the people try their best. There is some stuff that is not right. *[inaudible]* we had a place where people, arts and crafts people, they're doing their stores there. And they put them away. The local municipality chased them away. *[inaudible]* and I was one of them. I got to meetings with them, *[inaudible]* but I can't find people to work there. They were there, I was there. They are attracting tourists! During the meeting with the local municipality. So they bring them back there. I'm not into the politics, but there is things people are complaining about, there is things that people are fighting about. But they try. There are things that they don't do right, like several instances. If people apply for a job with the municipality, then outside the job, the apply for the job (?) Sometimes, they get an interview. Then they say, we're taking the ones inside...my daughter, they interview her, then they say she's overeducated. Why don't they take the one that's educated?...higher levels. They're going to need someone who is higher educated...They want to pay you or not to pay you, so...(?)

**Q:** Doreen, you mentioned how as president, Nelson Mandela was like a great leader. Why do you think that the presidents that came after him weren't as successful?

**A:** After Mr. Mandela we got Mr. Mbeki. I think the reason why they are not so successful is that either they don't want...they think they can do things better and then they fail. *[inaudible]* You strive to that. To take it to further levels. Don't overdo it. And they don't come out right. We don't want to vote for him, we don't want to stand for him...After Mr. Mbeki, is the Zuma. The main thing about Mr. Zuma is that everybody was against him for the 112 wives that he's got. *[laughter]* Then they say...it is in their culture. He do things wrong and then said it wasn't me. He always step aside for things. When will he come right? As I said again, the people love the country. There was a lady talking this morning again. She said for what Mr. Mandela did, she thanked God and 20 years later we still stand. In February, he was signing the law, the law of our country. They say it's the best in the world!

**Q:** Yeah, it is, the South African constitution...

**A:** The constitution! The best in the world they say. But the main thing is, he must fight against the corruption, he must...the thing there with the mines...the Indians with the plane, all that junk stuff that we don't care about...they say they don't know about it...you see what happened during the funeral of Mr. Mandela? For who was the most president that people cheered?

**Q:** Barack Obama.

**A:** Yes sir! For us, it was heartbreaking, but we know, Mr. Mandela had to go, he must be released. But then everybody was like we must follow him. Obama, he was right there...so we can learn from each other...and the people love South Africa! Why do you come here?

**Q:** So I can learn here.

**A:** The people, they come here to train here before they go play in the Olympics. Because you know, I met the Olympic athletes...

*[the interviewee told a side story about her experience with Olympic athletes. It was not recorded in this transcript]*

**A:** I was there at Mr. Mandela's funeral...I was there because I am a member of this community, my job is to serve the community...you know with the World Cup, I made my own outfit, the flag, everything, I'm proudly South African! So why must I sit by? I don't want people to talk bad about my country. But if something is wrong, we must talk about it! [...] They must listen to us! You know the speaker for us, we must go to him, and he must take it further to the municipality. We must just work through channels...

*[The interviewee went off on a tangent about the missing Malaysian airplane. It was not recorded in this transcript]*

**A:** What are they going to do if they don't care about the crime, the drug lords,...and housing,...there's still a lot of people that haven't gotten housing, that haven't gotten water, they haven't gotten electricity after all these years.

**Q:** Looking beyond these elections to the future, do you see anybody that can be a good national leader for the country in the future?

**A:** *[laughter]* who should I say?

*[the interview was briefly interrupted]*

**A:** What's the vice president's name, Mr...

**Q:** Ramaphosa.

**A:** Ramaphosa is there, Cyril Ramaphosa. Malema, ugh, I don't think *[laughter]* He's actually, he's one of the guys I'm talking about. He was so respectful to Mr. Mandela...why did he change? Why did he change if he believed in what he believed in? Cyril Ramaphosa is there, Maklante (?) is there...I think Cyril will also do...a job. But it all depends.

**Q:** Why do you think Mr. Ramaphosa will be a good president?

**A:** He was...as I said, I'm not reading a lot into this, but what I'm hearing from what he's saying,

he talks about in a sense, how he'll bring this country...I can bring this country to a higher standard. I can make sure that the people get what they want...But at least, he will...(?)

**Q:** Again, looking forward, the government and the president, what do you think they should do to improve South African communities?

**A:** They normally just sit around the table and talk. Put the deed to the word. They must put the deed to the word, there is no use talking a lot. And a little fingertip comes out of what they talk. Do it and less talking. Then we will have a wonderful country. As I said, there always will be bad things. But we can reduce it, they stopped the death penalty, crime is going up and up. Most of the people say bring it back, then we will see what will happen. I believe that when we had the death penalty, there was less crime than this. They must think about it strongly. And give to the people the punishment they deserve. What do you do to a rapist, a guy of 21 raped a baby of 2? What court? He's guilty already, that child can't for herself! Why they gave him bail? To do it again? That is one of the issue they must think about and work on that...I want to see the country...we will see how we grow when they do what they say. At the moment, their goals is to get people to vote. Get people to vote. People vote, nothing happens. They mustn't do it for themselves. They must do it for their country. They should draw up a list of rules of what they will do for their country. Their deeds must do the job. And we can pray, Lord please keep this country...That's how I feel about it.

#### **Person D**

**Q:** Thank you for taking the time to participate in this interview. It's not really an interview, more like a conversational thing. I don't have a lot of set questions, I'm just trying to learn about your thoughts and things so feel free to make it as open as you'd like, everything's confidential, I just want to hear our thoughts. So I guess the first thing to start off is how do you feel about the elections coming up?

**A:** Well, I work in government. So I feel the elections every day. I experience it every day. Not the elections itself, but the waves it cause, it causes, goes through the whole of the civil service. And being a white male, almost 60 years old, I experience a lot of negativity coming from political parties who would like to get rid of the “pale males” as we're commonly known as.

**Q:** The what?

**A:** The “pale males”. We also refer to it as “silly season”, the time just before elections because I'm in the service delivery department. The politicians wants to accelerate service delivery during this time. To get onto the podium and say, “we've delivered so many schools, so many hospitals, whatever, so many kilometers of roads” because they want to impress their constituencies. So it's a lot of pressure, I experience that pressure everyday.

**Q:** Oh wow. This is going to be a very interesting question. Just because you work in government. If you were to give the government a grade, a job approval, do you think they've done a good job, or a bad job, in both a national level and a Western Cape level and locally here in Stellenbosch.



**A:** Remember, my reference is 40 years of service. I've seen many governments and politicians come and go. Working in the Western Cape specifically, in the last 20 years, many different political heads of my department. From different political parties. And I must say, the current government, the current provincial government, in my opinion, has done the best. At national level, I think there is room for improvement massively. I don't think they work optimally. I think they're too entangled with office and work politics that they don't get around to service delivery. It's more important to have a nice office or to be seen supporting the ruling party. It's more important to get onto podiums and say the right things than the actual delivery on the ground. At the local level, I work with 30 different local governments. Stellenbosch is one of the best. Maybe because we're one of the larger municipalities. Maybe because of the type of individuals working there, I can't really say. But they've got everything sorted and they're delivering. Whereas a lot of these municipalities they don't have the capacity, they don't have the knowledge, they got rid of those during previous regimes. Where they decided that the “pale males” needed to go. Or you're supporting the wrong party so out you are. So if I can summarize that, at the national level, there is no real service delivery. At provincial level where I am, great service delivery. Local level, pockets of excellence, the majority good service delivery, 3 or 4 municipalities, poor service delivery.

**Q:** I'm just trying to get a little bit of a better idea. So what are some of the issues that you think are the most important going into this election and specifically on them, how do you think the government has done.

**A:** National?

**Q:** Both, on a national and local. Or like more local.

**A:** On the national level, there was a lot of talks about...alienate agricultural land, mining and state-owned enterprises. And that sent out the wrong message.

**Q:** In what way?

**A:** Well, if you're an investor, you want to invest where your investment can grow. You don't want to invest in a company which the government will take over and the government is seen to be incompetent and the government is more worried about other issues than growing your investment.

**Q:** That makes sense.

**A:** Like China. China has got millions and millions of dollars they can invest in South Africa. Although they say they don't want to see a return on an investment, you know there is no such thing as a free meal. If they bring in the millions, they want to get something out of it. And what they want out of it is our minerals. And you can't extract the minerals if it's a government mining company because your production levels will definitely be lower and the efficiencies will be lower than if it is a private, business run by individuals worried about their stakeholders and profit.

**Q:** So, I think it's really cool how just because you've been in the civil service for so long. At this point, you know how you mentioned you've seen people and leaders come and go and things. So if you had to I guess compare like all the...whether it's President Zuma right now to the previous president, just like the national leaders, who do you think did the best job and why do you think that way?

**A:** At the national level? Very difficult to say. Remember, I was born in an era of apartheid, so I grew up with apartheid. To me, it was the correct way of doing. Because I've never seen or experienced anything to the contrary. It wasn't that I decided one day I've got two options, I'll go for Option A or Option B, there was no option. You grew up with no options and you were indoctrinated, this is the way, even in church, even in politics, this is the only way I could face him like this. If you want to measure the performance of a leader in that environment and compare it to the current democracy environment, I think it'll be unfair.

**Q:** How about since when South African democracy started.

**A:** De Klerk was the president at the time. I think he was a very knowledgeable and wise man. If the question is if he could have gone about it in a correct manner, that would be difficult because you don't know the outcome would've been if he did it differently. But I think he did the wise and correct thing to call off apartheid. I didn't like it when he did it, I was against it because I did not have any other point of difference. But having seen the change in the country, there is good in it. But it's not all good. There's also a lot of nepotism, it really started a wave of criminality, self-enrichment, those are the negative spin-offs from a potentially good decision.

**Q:** Did you think that's a trend that started or started more recently?

**A:** It was always therein the background. And I think in every country, I think there's a limited percentage of it. So it's not unique to South Africa, or to South Africa. It is something more unique to Africa than it is for the western world. But in the last couple of years, it's just deteriorated.

**Q:** There is something interesting that I want to bring up. Back in the States for example, if people don't know anything about South Africa for example, they at least know Nelson Mandela. But they don't know the story behind it. So, I'm just interested, what are your thoughts about him?

**A:** I would put him at the same level as De Klerk. I doubt if I would have stayed in a prison for 27 years, and still had the same tolerance levels as he had towards white people. I don't think I would have been the same or did the same as he did. But he put the personal experiences behind him and looked at the greater good for the country and the people living in the country. And that's exactly what De Klerk did. But because De Klerk was seen as from the oppressor, and Nelson Mandela as coming from jail and preaching freedom to his people, he was made the hero, he was made the hero. Whereas I think, and the fact that they got the peace prize together, the Nobel prize, that is speaking toward what I'm speaking. They were both heroes.

*[The interviewer briefly went off-record]*

**Q:** So like De Klerk and Mandela's successors haven't been able to live up to their leadership standards? As president?

**A:** I think they wanted to fast-forward democracy. And in the process when they fast forwarded democracy, they forgot about the principles driving democracy. And that is not to enrich yourself for the greater good of the country and its people. They forgot about those principles. They all wanted to get on the gravy train because it looked like a nice place to be. And in their efforts to get onto the gravy train, they forgot about the masses without housing, without medical.

**Q:** So I guess looking forward, do you see any rising leaders or anything like that could be like a good president or national leader moving forward, moving forward even from the elections coming up.

**A:** Unfortunately, in both the national ruling party and the Western Cape ruling party, all of the politicians, bar one or two, are all elderly people. You won't see a young face on TV. So, no real shiny stars, which are in their 50s or 55s. It's 60, 65, 70 year old people who are really stealing the scene. They might have wisdom behind them, their years of age. But they don't have the formal qualifications. Like Zuma the president. I think he's got Standard 6 or something? No schooling, no university or college degree and he's trying to run a country.

**Q:** I guess that's a good point. In the future, beyond the elections, or maybe even the next two, what would you like to see national leadership, the president, the government as a whole, both nationally and provincially, what would like to see them play a role in to bring about the change you want to see.

**A:** The change I would like to see is to move away from the three-teer government. I think it's expensive and South Africa can't afford it. There should be two levels of government, the higher national level and the local, provincial level. Immediately that will take away more than a 100 ministers. Just the financial implication of that is a million rand in salary per person times 100. So it's a 100 million just in salaries for the office bearers and you can take that figure and times it by 10 or 15 for support staff and infrastructure. That's the one thing that I would like to see, to overhaul the political system down from 3 teers to 2 teers. Something that I would like to see is to invest more into physical infrastructure because infrastructure grows jobs. You can't grow jobs through services, because technology is growing services. But infrastructure, building roads, building hospitals and building a school. And do it by labor-intensive methods. Like Germany was flat to the ground after World War II. But everybody had a job. Everybody earned a salary. Just about nothing, but they had a salary, they could buy bread, they could survive. And they rebuilt their country in a couple of years time. By just giving a job to everybody and giving a salary to everybody, just building, building, building.

**Q:** You know there was something that interesting that you said that kind of made me think. You know how you mentioned you would like to see some government reform, like how the structure works. One of the things that always comes up, just because I'm American, is that back in the States, we vote for our leaders directly, we don't vote for the party and the party chooses who the president is or like our party leader. Do you feel that if you were to vote directly for somebody for president for example, that would be a better system?

**A:** Possibly yes, possibly yes. I've got no experience of it, but on the other hand, the president is but one and he can't follow his own head. He's again bound by party principles and party decisions. He's more or less just a spokesperson of a group of people. So maybe it will bring about some change, I'm not too sure that it will. But I don't have too much of a problem voting for a party and the party choosing a spokesperson who eventually becomes president.

### Person E

**Q:** Thanks so much for taking the time out of your day just to talk about your thoughts and things. I guess first and foremost [*interview was briefly interrupted*] how do you feel about the elections coming up?

**A:** How do I feel about it? It happens every 4 years and I don't feel that much about it. I don't really expect any kind of change of a result from the last 4 years. Maybe a couple of figures might change but not, won't be too convincing.

**Q:** What are some issues that are the most important to you come this election?

**A:** Corruption. Very, very big issue. Theft of state funds, population taxes used for personal gain instead of the gain of the country. I'm also happy now because 2, 3 weeks ago, they cut about a 1000, maybe 1500 of the police force that were, that had criminal records and weren't suitable to serve in the force. That's a positive. Otherwise yeah.

**Q:** I kind of want to touch on the positive side. Do you feel that the government is doing a good job in tackling some of these issues?

**A:** No. I think the current government that's in place is raping state coffers and not appropriating those funds to necessary sectors, like service delivery and poverty and all of those sort of things. But, I think there's a mind shift happening, which is good. Instead of the usual sheep voting for the same blokes every single year, just because they are scared of the obviously the whole apartheid and that, too scared of, they're coming back into play. I think there's a lot of people breaking out of the traditional mindset, the traditional paradigm of you need to vote for the ANC. People are becoming more educated, they are thinking more about what's best for the country and not just what they've been indoctrinated into believing.

**Q:** Okay, that's actually really interesting. So, I'm still new to South African politics and all those things, that's why I'm doing this project. The national government is controlled by the ANC, but the Western Cape isn't. Do you feel that the local governments have been doing a better job?

**A:** Definitely. I've toured most of South Africa and I've seen the state of what Limpopo and some of the smaller provinces like Limpopo, Mpumalanga, Northwest, what some of those places look like and it doesn't look like there's not much going on there. I just think they're just filling up their own pockets. I'm not a specialist or anything in that department, but you can see the difference here compared to what it looks like over there. There's tar on these roads. There's not

much tar on those roads. Now what's happening to those funds? Because obviously, the budget is in place for a reason, so that funds can be allocated into certain areas where improvements should be made, like the roads, infrastructure, housing and all that. That's happening here, to some extent, obviously not at a pace that is best for everybody, but it is happening, whereas it's nonexistent in other places.

*[The interview was briefly interrupted]*

**A:** Yeah, the roads are shocking out in the Eastern Cape, Limpopo, I mean the water, the sanitation, there's nothing happening, there's no improvements whatsoever. And these are all promises that were made to us, twenty years ago, ten years ago? Every single election for the last 20 years, promises, promises and promises and no delivery so its time that someone comes into play that can make something happen.

**Q:** When was the first time you voted, just out of curiosity?

**A:** First time I voted, I was, you're only allowed to vote when you're 18 and I turned 18 in 2005, and the previous election in 2006 I voted. 2006 I was 19, did it again in 2010 and now, 2014.

**Q:** Did you feel differently back then?

**A:** I'm more educated now, since having completed varsity and everything. A lot more educated, a lot more wiser and a lot more aware of what's going around us. And look, they say 1 vote isn't going to change much, but you get a million of those people and...something could happen.

**Q:** So what of the things that I've noticed is that there's a lot of strong feelings about the president for example. Like, I'm trying to remove some of the cloud over him but obviously you can't really avoid that. So, do you remember when the previous guy was president? Do you think he did a better job?

**A:** Which one, Thabo Mbeki?

**Q:** Yeah.

**A:** Because there was Nelson, then there was Thabo and then there was...anyway, yeah, I think Thabo was a lot more focused to an extent. When you look, he had very, very large shoes to fill from Nelson Mandela. He got a lot more done, the last 4 years have been a joke. Jacob has done very, very little, except build a palace for himself. But yeah, Thabo got things done. But obviously, it takes time, you can't expect change overnight. But the last 4 years sort of put the breaks on everything.

**Q:** What do you think made the two guys different?

**A:** Made them different?

**Q:** Yeah because Mbeki did a better job.

**A:** Personal greed. Very, very, very big part of that. If you look at...obviously when a president gets you know into power, he gets allocated a certain amount of funds to upgrade for security and stuff, but within reason. 217 million rand is not within reasonable for an individual. What else? That's not even taking inflation into account. Maybe spend a few million, I don't think anyone paid over 50 million. So how do you relate 50 million to 217? It's a bit much, it's a big jump.

**Q:** Yeah it is. So I guess looking forward, beyond this election, do you see anybody that could be like a better president?

**A:** What the DA have done in Cape Town, the Western Province, *[inaudible]* I think if you put them on a national scale, they could actually make a difference. Because obviously they'll have the rest of parliament influencing them as well. And they'll have to prove something, if they want to stay in power, they'll have to prove something. Unfortunately, for the last 12 years, we haven't reaped any decent fruits from the ANC, except personally. I personally think that give the DA a chance and they could do it right.

**Q:** What would you say are some leadership qualities that you personally think are important that a national leaders should have?

**A:** Personal qualities?

**Q:** Or leadership qualities in general.

**A:** Integrity. Honesty, I mean everybody should be able to possess those qualities, especially the president, he should be the go-to guy, an example on those. But yeah, I don't think that's what we have at the moment.

[The interview was briefly interrupted]

**Q:** I guess just for some closing thoughts, what would you like to see the president, the government, all the important actors I guess, what would you like them to do, what is the role you feel they can play to bring about changes and improvements

**A:** The major thing they need to do is sort out the basic human rights. Try and get as many people in the country, in the poorer areas, to have access to proper sanitation, access to waterpoints, waste removal, housing, those are all very important, and I say job creation, very, very big part. Before any of that happens, education has to be improved. I mean the schools have got to get their textbooks. I mean there's warehouses and warehouse filled with textbooks but it's just not getting to the learners. That can't happen. That needs to happen. Education is the forefront of society moving forward. So they need to start focusing on that instead of looking after their own personal needs. Yeah, just your basic human rights. We have a very increasing population and we need to be able to educate them and protect them and see what happens in the future and account for that.

**Person F**

**Q:** Thanks so much man.

**A:** Okay, cool man. My thoughts are quite limited because I have never, I am 24 now, I have never registered to vote. I try not to get involved, although my dad like has been very angry with me for the past couple of years that I don't give my vote, because every vote counts of course. The thing is, I don't really want to take too much part because I learned, my dad learns things from the news about the government of South Africa and then he comes home from work in a good mood and he watches the news and then gets in a negative mood, just from watching an hour's TV, the news. So I've decided *[inaudible]* to just be concerned about things around me *[inaudible]*

**Q:** Alright awesome. Yeah, no it's fine, this isn't like a study for political people about political things, it's just regular, day to day people here in Stellenbosch and their thoughts on that. I was going to ask how you felt about the elections, but you already kind of answered that *[laughter]* What are some important issues for you come this election?

**A:** I would say tax *[inaudible]* *[the interview was briefly interrupted]*. The tax *[inaudible]* here in Stellenbosch *[inaudible]* service is very good. The government does look after like catching ourselves *[inaudible]* It seems to me that normal, basic services get thrown to us whenever the government is in charge to pay someone's *[inaudible]* they must show us what we're paying for. They always say this project is coming up, this project, they want to do this thing, but to actually see, to show where your money goes to. That's why there's a budget that shows where the money goes but I mean, that's only on paper. You want to see the difference, you want to see the...

*[the interview was briefly interrupted]*

**A:** What's important for you?

**Q:** What's important for me? Well, for me so far one of the biggest issues, at least in this country, has been education. Just because everyone's been telling me how the standards have gotten worse or it's just getting too expensive for people to like afford. That is the probably...

**A:** The standards are dropping because they want more people to pass. That's why the standards are dropping. So everybody could have a chance. When the standards were high, a lot of people weren't passing and that became a problem. So that's why the standards are dropping because they want more people to, because it was 50% and these days its like 30%...how can you expect someone who gets 30% to do a good job? He gives 30% when he comes to your company from school. Education gets blamed for the children and families get blamed for not putting enough effort. You can only do so much. Schools can only do so much. At the end of the day, the teachers get more money for *[inaudible]* but do the children learn? What can teachers do? They can like punish them by forcing them to sit in the corner or whatever, but that goes to their homes, that's where the real education goes on...it's for the parents to make sure their children do

their homework or...

**Q:** One of the things that I'm interested in is that all the politicians are “oh, we're going to increase transparency” or “we're going to do this with taxes” or like improve education and things. But in your opinion, do you think that the government has been doing a good job on these issues?

**A:** I actually really don't know. Things look good around me so I'm guessing they're doing a good job like fixing the roads and...but that's stuff is more provincial than the whole country...Western Cape is very different to me from the rest of South Africa. If you go outside of Western Cape, you can actually realize you're in Africa, but here in the Western Cape, things are very more chill, we try to do everything fair, but if you go up to Durban or Joburg, there's a lot of problems, on the way you find a lot of things...lots of poverty, cows standing next to the road.

**Q:** Do you think that's like a reflection of how the Western Cape is governed by the DA or a different party from the rest of the country?

**A:** Definitely, I really think so. I won't say I'm DA but the DA is doing the best in the Western Cape for us. We don't know any better, maybe ANC could do way better than the DA does, but for now, they show us good results, they know what you want and you get what you pay for.

**Q:** Let's just turn and talk about what you think about like the president for example, national leaders in general.

**A:** What do I think about them?

**Q:** Them, the president, national leaders in general.

**A:** Well, I don't really think too much about him, except there's a lot of things going around about him spending money. Which I do understand if you're president, you can actually do whatever you want, [laughter] who says you can't buy a big house. But it looks bad when there's so many people in the streets. It looks bad when building like 5 rooms in your house when...only like 5 people, well he's got a huge family. Then again Helen Zille like, she does a very good job, she's so focused on showing like what the ANC is doing wrong instead of focusing on what they could do better and showing... I promise most of campaign ads that came out now, it just shows what the ANC's wrong instead of what they can do better. Which is not the right way to embrace...they want to make the people angry so they can turn against the ANC, I understand that but that's not the way you want to show...every year people say things and it never goes through, everyone knows about...I'm fortunate to sleep under a roof, have transport, do my own thing and have a job, I don't know the percentages, but I know a lot of people suffer and don't have all the privileges but everyone has their own choice. I think the government can only do so much. The people on the street should try and find jobs, I know there aren't a lot of jobs, not enough for everyone...I've thought about this, I've tried not to think too much...I try not to let myself worry about...I should be worried about other people, but I can't really worry about



everyone's issues and myself so...

**Q:** Do you think, I'm going to take your memory back a little bit, do you think that the previous president, the guy before, did a better job?

**A:** We've had two presidents for a while,

**Q:** Except for the guy in between, except it was short so I don't think...

**A:** I thought he did a pretty good job, alright. I was heard he was busy studying and wasn't in South Africa much, but wasn't he studying economics or something?

**Q:** Yeah he had a background...

**A:** Yeah he was more focused on that than and making a great country instead of just making South Africa better. We aren't a great country. We must take what we have and make the best of it instead of looking at other countries. I don't know how to explain this but I mean, he was so focused on making the best country ever but we can't be the best country, we still have to get it though a few levels, before we can get to the...so yeah I think that was his problem. He was very chill that's why people liked him, he wasn't really in TV and things like that. You know Zuma, they're all singing and dancing, that is scary. Who was that one guys that sings about shooting the Boer and all that?

**Q:** Oh, Julius Malema.

**A:** Yeah, he was with Zuma on stage and made Zuma look very bad because he should have took responsibility and told him not to because you can't be screaming things like that on TV. There must be justice in that. But it just seems to me that Zuma didn't do much. All of the articles came in the newspaper but no one like did anything. He was in the ANC Youth League, with Zuma, he should have definitely taken care of him and not scare people in South Africa. Because people always shove it to the rich people, but the rich people are helping try and take care of the poor people. If you take out all the rich people, then everyone is just going to be poor. People say I want that, but things don't work like that. Everyone is fortunate...you wake up as this race or you wake up in like a mansion...you can't choose, it's no one's fault...it just feels like all the poor people just blame the government, there's other people to blame, their parents, that's the people, that's the people you see doing all these strikes, it's the poor people, people looking for more...Did that answer your question?

**Q:** Oh yeah! Don't even worry about it. I just want to hear your thoughts on these issues, they're not meant to be like limiting or whatnot. I want to make it pretty casual. One thing that I've always been kind of wondering is that like, beyond this election, there's obviously going to be a future, but then there seems to be like, any good like leadership being shown by the president. Do you think you see somebody that could be like a good president or leader later on?

**A:** No, not really, I don't really know like political leaders. Everyone says they'll be a good

leaders as soon as they get up there, it's a lot of pressure...you're the face of like the DA or ANC. There's a lot of pressure up there, most of the time, people think you're just a puppet for whoever makes the decision, but you're the face speaking, you're the president speaking, it's not you that's saying everything, but you get hated by people when it's actually a board of people that's decided those kinds of things. Everyone looks at you, but you're just the spokesperson...except for Helen Zille, she's very no-nonsense, that's what I like about her, she takes no-nonsense, if she someone says something she doesn't like it, she'll tell you she doesn't like it. Zuma, most of the time he speaks English, I don't even know what he says, I just lose interest. Let's just get to the bottom line instead of telling me about the future, tell me about what's going to happen tonight, tomorrow...

**Q:** Kind of to cap it all off, what do you see or what do you hope that like the government and the president, the involved people, should do to like make things better in like the country and the community?

**A:** They should choose the best party for South Africa. What else can they do? They can give money, they can give services that you don't get paid for to help poor people, but how far can one person go change such a big thing in South Africa. That's the thing in South Africa, the big things always means like a lot of people. Like a thousand people don't have water...of course it's hard to say, if you save water, it's good, you're not wasting water by taking hours on like unnecessary washing like...there's small things you can do like giving 10,000 rand to help them build houses, but it feels like we're so limited, that's why I try not to think about these things. I know my dad says every vote makes a big difference, but it feels to me like my vote doesn't make a difference...I pay tax, my parents pay tax, that's already so much...we can't help every person...we stay at the corner of a street, every day we get like 4 or 5 people come to our house, the first person, "hey we'll get bread for you, here's 10 rand" but you can't help everyone. Those 4 people are going to be angry with you and be all like you're doing fucking nothing for this country, but actually you did help the first person, so it doesn't help. That's why I limit myself...it just feels to me that black people just ask for money, like every time I walk into Cape Town, it's just 2 rand please, just 4 rand, if I give 2 rand, it's like, then they want 5 rand, it's disgusting, just say thank you, I just tried to help this guy for a second or two, I didn't owe you money...you made me think about all these problems...like I told you, my dad sees Zuma on TV and this happened, poverty, someone got shot here, money's lost here, he sees these things, gets worked up, turns off the TV and gets angry. I didn't even know he watched the news and now he's in a bad mood...I don't read the news, I don't care about things around me, Facebook just shows me my friends and that's how far I go...