



ASPECTS OF POLITICAL LEADERSHIP SERIES

Leadership of Service

Cape Town
5th August 2013

Welcome: Dr. Wolf Krug, Hanns Seidel Foundation

Welcome to today's Roundtable discussion, the fourth in the Leadership Series. I would like to thank our partner organisations. Today's theme is Leadership of Service. South Africa has come a long way in overcoming the apartheid regime and in improving the lives of the black majority. But recent years has shown questions in the quality of leadership and corruption. This calls for debate. Along with our partner organisations, we aim to facilitate these discussions. Today we have three notable key speakers – thank you for being here. We wish you all fruitful discussions. I wish a warm welcome to all.

Judge Albie Sachs

In 1967 in London at Peace House a few hundred of us were quite excited and a bit puzzled. I had been told to be there for a very important meeting: Oliver Tambo was speaking. When OR (Oliver Tambo) spoke he said he has been extracted to make an announcement: "A detachment of MK had crossed over into then-Rhodesia to make their way to SA to build the armed struggle. Eventually they were discovered and a fierce fight ensued. The enemy had retreated with three deaths; none to ourselves."

We cheered: "At last, we are fighting back!" An English voice from behind shouted: "That's murder!" We thought: 'Doesn't he understand our situation? We are being repressed.' OR said: "Yes, we have become killers. One of the worst things apartheid has done is make a generation that wanted to be engineers and teachers become murderers, soldiers, killers."

I was absolutely stunned. OR had the greatest influence on my life, was a shining example of leadership, but today - besides having an airport named after him - is virtually unknown to the world.

Some years later, while working in Mozambique doing interesting work in family law, I got a call from OR, asking about my health, work, etc. He asks if it is possible for me to come to Lusaka to assist with a problem. "I know your work is very important but this is also really important. If you can't do it I understand." A week later I was in Lusaka! I still remember that he was swatting flies! Eventually, he says, "We've captured a number of agents sent by Pretoria to cause mayhem and we don't know how they should be treated. There's nothing in the statutes of the ANC to deal with captured persons. There's nothing in our constitution to deal with this." I said that

there are international constitutions that deal with torture, etc. He said, “We can’t use torture!”

The assignment was to help the ANC draft an internal document for norms on how to treat captured people. Of all the work I have done, including on the Constitutional Court, I see the Codes of Conduct for people in exile as probably the most important. The ANC didn’t have courts or prisons, and the host countries were saying to us: “Don’t make this our problem!” We were a state without a state. We had to invent a whole system to deal with every issue. For example, how to treat the guys who come a little drunk to a meeting and is a little irritating, versus a Pretoria-trained person come to position our food. Other issues included comrades assaulting others (sometimes sexually), drunk driving and crashing vehicles. The right to be represented, to a hearing – all of this is in the codes. And then eventually the serious, great crimes against the organisation such as people who are from the oppressed community trying to destroy the organisation. We drafted a code of conduct.

OR felt that this was a deep issue that went to the core of the organization and that the whole organization should take it up and debate it - instead of only the president or the NEC deciding the issue. In 1985 the code was put on the agenda for a full day conference. We were discussing the question of internal regulatory control, the discipline of an organisation fighting for freedom.

One issue had to be put to delegates: Should extreme methods of interrogation be allowed in certain circumstances – what the Americans say the “ticking time bomb”. The first person who stood up was a young MK delegate. He said: “We cannot allow the smallest opening for torture because it will never stop.” The next said: “Comrades, we are fighting for life; how can we take life?” I was so proud. The conference decided unanimously not to allow torture, whatever the reasons. It was that deep morality – that you are fighting for freedom, fighting for life – that was key to the organization. The instances of abuse were cut down dramatically after this conference.

That was the origin of the *Bill of Rights* in the South African Constitution. The Bill was already functioning in our organisation. This story showed the manner in which OR functioned as a leader – to put the issue on the table for people to debate and discuss after careful consideration. I’m not sure he even spoke at all during that debate. The story helps to dispel any myths about OR. The one is that Mandela came on the scene and with his extraordinary charisma got us to walk on a democratic path. Mandela has been an incredible leader but he didn’t create the values of the struggle; he articulated them. This is not to diminish Mandela at all. All the qualities

that people love in Madiba were in Albert Luthuli. People were aching for the idea of a sense of unity, to be able to link up. When it's three, it's not a coincidence anymore; it's a culture. Yusuf Dadoo with his pipe, Moses Kotane, Helen Joseph – generations of people expressing a form of leadership that helped us achieve the constitutional state we have today, feeding in to something very special, from perhaps different revolutionary traditions.

A second myth that I find very distressing is that in the late 1980s the leadership in Lusaka was centralised, didn't allow any debates and simply issued instructions – and South Africa was the place of creativity, debate, etc. e.g. the UDF. This is not true. OR maintained that level of debate, open style and freedom all the way through exile e.g. the issue of torture. He frequently said, "The ANC is the parliament of the people". By that he meant that everyone had free debate, a voice.

A third myth is that Kempton Park represented a pact between elite leaders of both sides, sharing the spoils. Negotiations were tough! We fought, and during the time there were breakdowns, massacres; it was very hard. For the people I know that were directly involved in the making of the Constitution, we were making one for the people, not for political parties. We were fighting for self-determination.

Two issues cropped up: If we had constituencies at the first election, the ANC would have taken 80% of seats. The ANC said, No, this was a disaster. Proportional representation was adopted for that reason. The idea was that in the second election there would be a mixed system. In terms of choosing a presidential or a parliamentary system, a presidential system would have suited the ANC with Mandela being such a charismatic person. Much of Africa followed the presidential system. We looked at our history: colonial governors, traditional leaders who under apartheid had become ruthless and despotic; habits of secrecy in the underground struggle – these were antithetical for Parliament; therefore, the ANC argued against a presidential system. A directly elected President would have been disastrous for South Africa. I'm not as a former Judge taking any sides here. We were very idealistic at that time but we also felt that the most lasting contribution we could make was to design a constitution that would last, that would serve the people.

One of the paradoxes of our lives was that we fought with all our passion to create a boring society. One knew the risks of joining the struggle, but the values were very profound and deep. We have got what we were fighting for. The Constitution doesn't solve the problems of inequality and unemployment, but it gives us the openness and the tools to find the answers. Things have changed totally: we are a free nation. We are not a secure or moral nation, but we have won our freedom, and we need to use that freedom to create the country we want.

Minister Trevor Manuel

We need to start by asking the question “What is that we’re looking for?” As one who worked very closely with Mandela, I have a problem with the beatification of Mandela. It’s wrong historically and creates all manners of problems.

It is important to draw a distinction between leadership and authority of office. We often conflate the two. Leadership is behavioural. It may happen whether we occupy office or not.

We are asking a series of questions of ethics and morals in office:

- What is the intention and coherence of action in leadership?
- What is it that we’re looking for from public representatives?

The key issue is whether there is an inner core of values. Some aspects are set out in Mandela’s 1975 letter to Winnie Mandela. “Some things are easier when sitting in prison,” he writes to her (she is in Kroonstad Prison) as to how to use her time in prison. “In judging ourselves as individuals we tend to concentrate on external factors such as one’s social position, influence and popularity, wealth and standard of education. These are, of course, important in measuring one’s success in material matters and it is perfectly understandable if many people exert themselves mainly to achieve all these. But internal factors may be even more crucial in assessing one’s development as a human being. Honesty, sincerity, simplicity, humility, pure generosity, absence of vanity, readiness to serve others – qualities which are within the reach of every soul – are the foundations of one’s spiritual life.”

The challenge occurs in everyday life: how do you evaluate your inner core against daily life? Being in office has certain trappings, appears as an easy life, so how does one deal with these things?

There is not always a continuity of issues in my life as an activist and as a minister. One of these issues is access. An activist is always available. A minister has houses in different cities, moving as government does, and a myriad of meetings and other responsibilities. There is a fundamental problem in the expectations if people think an activist should still be as available once becoming a minister.

Policy continuity is another important issue. The core issues that developed in the Bill of Rights were taken forward in the Constitutional Court. There were very difficult judgments in the First Court e.g. Soobramoney who believed the State had to provide dialysis as part of his Right to Life. The Grootboom Case was another case in point. These are fundamental to show that there are no absolutes in government. The Constitutional Court has to be trusted as the arbiter when asked to do so, and

has shown its readiness to apply its collective mind in some very tough circumstances.

I am sure transitioning from being a movement outside of government to the responsibility of government may have been easier where continuity was facilitated, such as in law. In our own context, in terms of economic policy, we got by with a few slogans before we got into government in 1994. Policy was still at a general level where the responsibilities of government led. Because of the commitments of our interim constitution to non-racialism and non-sexism, we had to equalize e.g. a female teacher in Transkei earned 45% of a white male teacher in the city. Pensions had to be equalized in the context of constructing a state that was demonstrably non-racial.

We were sitting with deep economic problems. We inherited a fiscal deficit that was 9.3% in 1993. By 1997, debt service costs would be the highest item of expenditure. Madiba said: "Isn't this money already spent? Shouldn't we have education as highest expenditure item in our budget?" And we had to take tough decisions. We took them in good faith. That is where Growth, Employment and Distribution (GEAR) came from. And the first time that trust was broken. The intent of government was not to invoke hardship or poverty on people, but we were confronted with tough issues for the first time. The challenge of leadership in an organisation is not the fair weather issues, but whether we have built the wherewithal to deal with the challenges that are outside of a script that you haven't written because you don't write history. And many of the issues that arose from this issue have never been healed.

Part of being government is to take decisions, and part of that ability is to influence people, but you can't do that if the opposition stonewalls and says: "No, you may not!" Somehow, one has to take a decision. It was clear that the Gauteng Freeway Improvement Project was going to be very costly and somebody has to pay for it. There are two approaches: tax everybody and get the poorest in a rural area or take some approach as going to movies (pay per use) and tax those that use it. In the context of the Gauteng Freeway Improvement Project, all public transport, including taxis, is excluded from paying: this is not a pox on the working class. Everybody who uses private cars will be paying for it. 'Have the steps been taken to align decisions with values and ethics?' is the question to answer, not whether one likes to pay tolls or not!

Another question to answer is: 'Do you remain debating this issue or should government, having engaged in public process, take a decision?' These are fundamental issues in context of leadership that is accountable. You have the

responsibility of office, where you say “We’ve consulted, no agreement was possible, and we have to proceed.” If we don’t resolve these issues, we set out to undermine the very democracy founded in Constitution.

These things are fundamental questions of democracy and will arise in other places. Thirdly, there are organisations and sometimes holding organisations together is not the same as appealing to the masses and those become interesting challenges in a democracy as well.

Ethics and the law are not the same things. The checks and balances question between these two are going to be of fundamental importance.

There was an article in *The Star* that raised a very important question: “Is Pope Francis too radical for his followers?” It’s a worthy point to debate.

Ms Zubeida Jaffer

Why are our leaders straying?

Endless numbers of our people have lived lives of service to this country. I am presently researching the life of Charlotte Maxeke. She was born into a life of service in 1871. When she died in 1939, she had established a school in Evaton and was a founding member of the AME Church in South Africa. Her focus was her faith and education.

We have a history of service. It is virtually in our blood. My father and his friends created a school in Wynberg, a Muslim School which I attended. And eventually we were all part of building a madressah that combined all the little home teachers. I remember as a child going to the building every Sunday and helping to carry bricks.

Both these institutions are still functioning. In Wynberg, my family (through my dad) was part of a network of men and women who believed in education both Islamic education and secular education. I was the beneficiary of both and it gave me a very strong sense of what was right and what was wrong. Not that I always got it right but at least my conscience worried me tremendously.

Why when we have it in our blood, are we seeing so many people straying off that path?

They are straying because they see that this is the way of the world- take as much as you can for yourself and bugger everyone else. In 1994 when we attained our freedom, we set out to change ourselves into the way of the world. We did not affirm our right to our South Africanness.

We flung open the doors to the world and many of our people had to step aside and abandon their own way of doing things. Let's take the small business sector. We had a reasonably solid small business network. Instead of allowing those people with experience to share their experience with those who did not, we changed the rules of the game. So many conscious small shopkeepers in the Southern suburbs told me that they could help others set up their little businesses but before they could do anything, the 7/11's arrived and the food franchises from America. Very quickly we became the 51st State of the United States. Business had to be done in a particular way.

We were told that this would result in us getting cheaper products but it is not so. Our former mayor, NomaIndia Mfeketho said their family did not starve in Gugulethu because her mother made vetkoek and sold it to the neighbours. Today people go to the local Shoprite or Pick 'n' Pay to buy their cakes. We have become beholden to the big companies. And we call this modernity. We call this progress.

We missed an opportunity in 1994 to consolidate our own approach. Our own approach essentially gave ordinary people agency. They could do the little bit they were able to do. The leadership through most of the 80's tapped into that knowledge and were able to mobilise thousands if not millions for justice. Unfortunately we got stuck because we did not transition from war times to peace times on our own terms. We dismantled the UDF. We took on wholesale the systems of the old order. The easiest time to have built on the knowledge in our blood was then.

Imagine our leaders then had said we will ask each community to work out a plan for themselves and we will help support that plan. Imagine if we had said that all political leaders will live in the communities they are from and will get the necessary security where they are. Dullah Omar did just that. Imagine we if we had said only essential banquets and definitely a good car but no lavish-lifestyle for political office-holders.

Well it is done and I am not saying this because I wish to blame others. We are all to blame in a sense because we went along with this. We agreed to dismantle the UDF. We agreed to take over the old government and its trappings. It's done. It's no use crying over spilled milk.

At the heart of this however lies the dislocation that we all experience. Being a person of faith I strongly believe that we are in the middle of a spiritual disconnect. I believe the faith-based organisations are not at full capacity. The two sectors that Charlotte believed in – the church and the school – are weak.

What can be done now? Before I speak about this I am amazed how people believe that they are leaders but bring little hope. They paint a picture of bleakness. Unfortunately this is built into the party political system. Each party has to set out to rubbish the other. I wish we could place a moratorium on this – only allow this behaviour for six months every five years. For the rest of the time our parties must find common ground and get things done. All parties can unite around education. There is nothing stopping the faith communities from defining the agenda.

I want to share with you my experience in Parkwood, a community near Wynberg where I live. For the past two years I have been helping a school there. I have an uncle who is an educationist who is now 80. He was a trainer of teachers. He said that all through the years most schools only had a handful of dedicated teachers. The rest just did the bare minimum. It was that little team that pulled the school through onto different heights. The problem he says that today many schools don't have that little team. Those teachers have left the poorer schools and taken up better offers elsewhere or they have retired.

Our challenge is to make sure that each school has that little team and to support that team. Fortunately for us we found the team at Fairmount High in Parkwood and have been working with them. It's a bit of a long story but we have focussed on changing the mind-set of the pupils. Last year, the RCL decided they were going into Parkwood to clean up the area for Mandela Day. When the principal heard of this, he said all classes should go with their teachers and that was what they did. Some of them have said that the motivational course we presented has changed their lives. But mostly the teachers say that it has made a huge difference that they can call somebody to help. The major problem however is with the Primary School. Once the children make it to High School, they have come far.

In Parkwood, high school is referred to as doing your PHD. The teachers at the high school and the leading learners are now thinking how they can help at the Primary School. I am just touching on our approach but I am sure you get the idea. The school supported by the faith institutions has to become the centre of a community. Once we have a model like this, it is easy to repeat it elsewhere. Many of you will remember that this is the way in which we built the UDF – develop an approach and then allow others to copy. This for me is Peace Time Action.

The Rwandese have taken a tribal custom called *Umuganda* and turned it into something that works for them now. Their country comes to a standstill for two hours once a month from 7a.m to 9a.m. All citizens, including the president, are expected to go into their local area and clean up. After cleaning up, they spend a

short time discussing what has to be done in their area. I describe the approach in this pocket book on Rwanda.

The interfaith community must be in the business of spreading hope and inspiration focussed on developing fineness of character. Madiba understood this very well. If we have an Umuganda day every month, perhaps each person can be asked to spend five minutes quietly assessing their own behaviour and then talking about what is good for the community.

If we are serious about wanting to transform our country, we each have to transform ourselves. We could also follow Charlotte Maxeke's example by placing issue of faith and education at the centre of our efforts to build a wholesome country.

QUESTIONS TO PANELISTS (ORGANISED THEMATICALLY)

Leadership Qualities

How do I prepare myself as a citizen for the election campaigns going on? I do not see servant leadership in many of our politicians. What does it mean to be a servant leader e.g. OR Tambo and Madiba? How many of our current politicians are displaying this kind of leadership – and especially our civil servants?

One leads irrespective of portfolio. Our challenge then [in the Struggle] was our leaders were mindful; they had time to reflect and hence had wisdom. My understanding of leadership is there are four aspects: physical intelligence, EQ, IQ and spiritual intelligence. Society evolves – how do we navigate around it? What has happened to *ubuntu*? It's a matter of being selfless and community. We have not yet transcended as a nation beyond what we have gone through. This discussion comes during Women's Month; as women we are nurturers, selfless. *Destiny Magazine* writes how Lindiwe Sisulu grew up with selfless leaders. Our current generation does not understand being selfless. We have left a generational gap.

There are two areas where leadership in South Africa have gone wrong. One is leadership and Aids: why did things go wrong there? Leadership and the Arms Deal still have not been dealt with.

From the examples given, especially Luthuli, Mandela, Tambo, and the Pope, I've picked up that you panellists could have given us so many stories of incredible leadership moments; yet, you chose the ones where the leaders challenged their own followers to a deeper integrity. Your examples of leadership and integrity was turning to own followers, risking alienation and calling them to a deeper integrity. A

leader who is willing to lose his own followers is a true leader. I am yet to hear a leader in the Western Cape risk alienating her followers by reminding me that I have more than one toilet in my house while others have one for ten families. Until leaders are not about scoring points out there, but to call his followers to a deeper integrity, will we lack leadership.

First, the leader of nation is their servant. He exists not to show his power; he is to serve them. Two, there should be love for the nation in the heart of the leader; a nation must feel love for their leader. If there is no love, the nation is a crowd and the leader is an ordinary person. There is no example like the love of a mother with child – and this is true love. Three: Love for all, hatred for none. Leader must have love for poor, ordinary, uneducated people. He must deal with people of his nation equally, without difference of colour, language, education, wealth.

Taking responsibility

It is very exciting to blame government for everything. Words like “accountability” and “corruption” get lost in translation. Are you accountable to your party, yourself or the people you serve? These conflicts need to be dealt with in greater detail. How do we as people get involved with good governance to ensure that there is good governance in South Africa?

Electoral systems

There are pitfalls of using a Presidential system, but parties are discontent with status quo...there is a failure of checks and balances in closed party system. How do we find a balance between constituent-based system and proportional representation (PR)?

Sometimes people don't understand the policies made by government e.g. equalizing pension system. Good [policy decisions] were taken at the beginning of democracy, but [now] this is not the case. We need to [look] back to find out where we are going wrong.

The present system gives too much power to political leaders off the list. The Van Zyl Slabbert Commission recommended something similar to what there is in Germany which could be an improvement to the current electoral system.

Codes of conduct in political parties

There was a code of conduct which was developed in ANC structures during struggle period. To what extent does a code of conduct exist today, what is it and how is it being implemented in case of misconduct?

Idealism

Judge Albie Sachs' reflections are critical when found to be wanting among some of those in public office. Many South Africans have become cynical; idealism is necessary. The question becomes: how to apply the qualities of yesterday to today, when we are not in exile? We need to have a practical discussion to force leaders to be accountable, at the lowest level.

Learning from the past and vision of the future

We need to go back and reflect. Twenty years have passed since the end of apartheid; let's take this as a learning period. Post-1994 at least two groups became citizens, but we have been struggling to assume leadership. Those appointed as civil servants need to be re-incalculated into a new dimension of what democracy stands for. The first 20 years we underestimated the backlog and the problems we would face in a democracy. I would like us to articulate the type of leadership for the next 20 years. In most democracies, the first 20 years is chaotic. What have we learned from other democracies as to leadership? What can we do as a way forward, because we need to start articulating what can be attained in the next 20 years. The principle of co-existence has been compromised for so long. The most important transitions – i.e. ethnic, religious, racial - have been compromised for so long.

Point of fact raised by participant: Pensions were equalized in 1993.

RESPONSES BY PANELISTS:

Minister Trevor Manuel:

I appreciate the many comments. Regarding the issue of idealism, the collapse of idealism on the left of the system means that it is now all electoral politics – which is the antithesis of servant leadership. How do we get idealism up? We operated on the basis that the apartheid regime would do nothing for us; we wanted strong, mobilised communities. We got what we wanted e.g. MDM. Then came democracy – and the change happened on 27 April 1994 where people sang: "The battle is won. Now we can outsource to Parliament."

But the public service needed to draw on a cadre of leadership from communities – demobilized community leaders – and a state-ism came about. Communication has broken down. We did not have a choice in this. In leafy suburbs, the norms and acts of 1995 allow for School Governing Bodies (SGB) i.e. oversight of parents. Poor communities do not have functional SGBs as seen in results in grades 7, 9 and 12. We've outsourced responsibility and only take it up every 5 years when we vote. We need to insource responsibility to our communities.

A constituency system will allow the ANC will take 95% of seats. The Van zyl Slabbert model is evident in local government. Our elected ward councillors need a minimum of four times a year report back. This is mandated but public representatives ignore the law. This discussion is one South Africans don't want to have, because we have a 'big man' leadership mentality. This is where we trip up every time. Leadership is not internalized in our beings, in our lives as citizens.

In terms of learning from other countries: Countries like Germany didn't have corruption in foreign countries as a part of law; nevertheless, many bad things happened in OECD countries as a pursuit of sales in emerging countries. Sometimes we (South Africans) have to be introspective.

I've been called as a witness in the Seriti Commission so I cannot comment save to say that there was a process in play to buy arms before democracy, which we stopped. Every party participated in the Defence Review Process. The Constitution allows for a defence force, which must be properly equipped.

Ms Zubeida Jaffer:

The elections are very difficult: There is no fair set of choices. I broadly feel most comfortable within the ANC set of policies but not comfortable with its president. I'm not comfortable at all with the DA. It represents the complete opposite to our efforts for self-determination. The other parties are all small. In the end, my mind will be made up in last few weeks. Many of us are grappling with this issue. One may fit philosophically with one party but inspired leadership is not present.

The sum total of South Africa is not its political parties. We have weakness and problem within our parties, but not in the country. The development of media – including radio stations – has increased more than ever in the last twenty years. It is a vibrant sector, nothing like compared with (under) apartheid. Writers, poets, books, researchers and the arts sector are all very vibrant. Those are two strong indicators that we have made huge progress.

In the USA, they did not throw the baby out with the bathwater when they suffered 8 years of George Bush. I choose (partly because of my idealistic view) to continue working for what I worked for; therefore, my focus is on the communities. I choose to make my contribution there, on the education level. I would like to see a new generation coming through that will make a difference. We need to have a vision; we need to believe that all this energy and sacrifices cannot go to waste. At the University of Free State, I say to students we had some idea of where we want the country to be in 20 years' time, and if they have an idea, they must drive this process. We can bring our experience to bear only. It's a question of people making up their minds and not becoming paralyzed by petty arguments. Many comments made by political parties are not even fact-based.

People cry and bemoan fact that all selfless leaders are going and when are we going to get another Madiba or OR Tambo. We've been given so much, the best: we're not going to get it again for a century or two. We've been given an example; all we have to do is follow the example. Young people have all the resources and energy at their disposal, so I have no doubt that we are going to move forward.

Judge Albie Sachs: We reflect a lot on the past and feel a disjuncture. OR Tambo was a religious person and I was secular. Idealism can also be terrifying. Beliefs gave me courage and strength; yet, in the name of them, people were being murdered. Taking part in the Mozambique revolution saw a very dramatic turnaround. The people who built the apartments were now moving in. The idealism was intense. We believed that with idealism we could conquer all – and it didn't. Society needs systems. The challenge is not more or less idealism or systems but to manage the two. We ended up with civil war, several million refugees and injuries, simply because we thought idealism was enough. Many colleagues were angry that there was no revolution in South Africa.

In street cricket, the first ball is called the trial ball. In Wimbledon, there are practice shots. In a political revolution, there are no trial balls or practice shots. We had MK, APLA, Transkei Defence Force plus the SDUs and police force and security force that locked us up, 14 education departments and four provinces [to amalgamate]. Look at what has been achieved! South Africa had elections that are lessons for other countries. The average life of presidents in South Africa has been less than 5 years – not 33 years! We have a press that tells us how important freedom of press is. We have a lively society – including every point of view from every person. It's good we take it for granted, and sad that we take them for granted, too. So the basis is there for a strong society.

There are many examples of good leadership in South Africa: SARS is working well, finding extra money. Revenue collection is like organized *ubuntu* – we do well there. From the press, I hear that the health department is another good department. The minister - someone who has worked in hospitals - has made a huge difference. And home affairs; the new minister has turned it around quickly. She is tough.

Good, old-fashioned leadership is important. There is too much stress on moral qualities of leaders and not enough on institutions. Leaders come and go; institutions go on forever, and we need to focus on strengthening institutions - something quintessentially South African, idealistic and rooted in the realities of country such as the Constitutional Court. It was intense but amazing years, and that is still going. I'm thrilled to see how well the Court is doing.

We grew up in world of epic endeavour: it wasn't always marvellous. During the Struggle, I saw corruption and abuses, but I felt the whole project kept us going. Now I don't know what the whole project is. The Constitution and institutions are there, but there is still an energy that is needed to invest that document in public life.

We can't have a free, open, democratic society with pluralism and expect powerful leadership and mobilization to come together. I'd rather have a free, open society than a hegemonic one e.g. Singapore. We could not have that – we are too diverse and our society is [already] too free. This is a new realism. We are looking for a new theory that will give some understanding to society. Today we have stories and homilies but no theory; we can't rely on old ideologies. We need to live with contradiction, pay more attention to school boards, and not look backwards any more.

DISCUSSION, ARRANGED THEMATICALLY

Qualities of leadership

Leadership is from God, but not all leadership is Godly. In 1995 there was a forum of pastors similar to this on the issue of servant leadership. We will not find in leadership in awkward [strange] places. I can look for leadership in me or in a system that governs the world, but I will fall short. There should be a point of reference for leadership. This is Jesus Christ. Firstly, how He became poor to serve others. Secondly, how He dealt with departments, finances, judiciary, empowering women and men. How He dealt with systems – well and clearly articulating these (and they are still functioning today).

The problem as to where servant leadership lies in community and the focal point is to teach or make everyone aware to become a servant – a leader will come out of it. One cannot make a servant leader; leadership does not come from office, but you can bring it to office.

Vision of leadership

Leaders serve a vision and ideals and goals. Workers work for benefits, leaders with their hearts – they know how to be selfless and to sacrifice. A servant-leader does not look forward to remuneration, but to satisfaction of tasks being accomplished. Sad to say, Mandela and OR Tambo are our icons, but those who have followed cannot be held in the same esteem.

In the past it was easier for people to organise to fight against an unjust system, because there was always one pressing goal – to fight apartheid. These days, it is difficult to see the enemy. There is nothing physical in unemployment, violence or gangsterism to fight against. It is challenging to come together around a common goal.

Youth and leadership

There is a problem in that older people do not listen to young people. We would do well to remember that: “Even dumb people get old!”

Government and media should focus on young people who are on the ground and doing a lot of work. There are many young leaders out there – some still in school who are doing great things. For them to continue, to focus, and to get resources and support from older, more experienced people is important.

Need for mentoring

Whether in the workplace, an organisation or politics, one cannot do it alone. One needs members, people, and constituents. There are three kinds of people: those who serve the cause – their hearts are in it, the selfless, sacrificing ones who understand challenges e.g. Tambo. The second tier are the ones who serve the organisation – they work for the benefits. The descendants are the third group – they don't have the experience and need to be tutored. We need to take the youth by the hand.

There is also a transitioning part: how do we develop replacements. That is not happening currently in South Africa. We need to take cognisance of the fact that Minister Manuel's term will expire. Will we have the same quality or will we have

someone appointed for benefits? Mr Manuel needs to develop and coach a young person to take forward the cause – someone from the first tier as we will fail if someone is appointed from the second tier.

Leadership and accountability

As public figures wherever we go and to everyone we need to be accountable, as it is written in Philippians 1:27 “Conduct yourself worthy of your name, of my name and of the environment we live in.”

FINAL COMMENTS FROM PANELISTS

Judge Albie Sachs: I have advice for young people: “Not to listen to advice of old people! But that’s a conundrum!”

Minister Trevor Manuel: “We should not glorify the past. There has to be a different way to earn leadership spurs. We lost people - as in any war. There are people who are forever destroyed, and many had extreme difficulty in adjusting to post-apartheid life. We must be able to rise to different circumstances.

The enemy is out there: in tik (the drug) and in the mobilisation of anti-social forces. Young people have given up on idealism. What used to get us up out of bed for a country we had not seen or lived in was the belief that ‘I will do what is necessary in the circumstances.’ The scale of the challenge now is bigger. Some people are lost to society forever e.g. through addiction.

I think we need a fundamental mobilisation of young people. An organised voice is better than government. Government is not good to organise. Young people need someone from their peer group to build them. The struggle is very much active: many of us think that the struggle ended on April 27, 1994. You [young people] must have the starter motors; we cannot live your lives. But we can guide you.

Ms Zubeida Jaffer: Young people must be the best they can be at their jobs, as this will have a positive effect on the country. There are many examples of what young people are doing e.g. a fun run in Grassy Park. What kind of peace time activities do we organise now to focus young people and help them get through difficult periods?

Judge Albie Sachs: Regarding what some have said in terms of “the sacrifices our generation made...” None of us felt that these were sacrifices at the time. We felt that we were living, living, living: Peoples’ lives today do not compare at all!

Youth must define yourself what the enemy is: You cannot ask us elders what the enemy is and we trot out a straw figure. We were adventurous. We listened to the older generation but we also worked it out ourselves. Go out, find out for yourselves what the enemy is, and link up with others. You will find many people who are not satisfied with a life of acquisition. Go ahead, laugh and do these things.

Minister Trevor Manuel:

[Quoting Tony Judt] http://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/16708.Tony_Judt

“Something is profoundly wrong with the way we live today. For thirty years we have made a virtue out of the pursuit of material self-interest: indeed this very pursuit now constitutes whatever remains of our sense of collective purpose. We know what things cost but have no idea what they are worth. We no longer ask of a judicial ruling or a legislative act: Is it good? Is it fair? Is it just? Is it right? Will it help bring about a better society or a better world? Those used to be the political questions even if they invited no easy answers. We must learn once again to pose them.

END