



COMMUNITY DIALOGUE

The 2010 Legacy: Exploring the Myths and Realities of the FIFA World Cup

Transcript: Provided by the Democracy Development Programme

Mr. Brad O'Neil, Mr. Vernon Seymour, Ms. Colleen Ryan, & Dr. Dale McKinley
Square Hill Civic Centre
27 July 2010

Contractual Agreements:

Agreements have to be signed specifically between FIFA and the host cities and specifically between FIFA and all stakeholders, whether those are private or public owners.

Also protected from scrutiny by *confidentiality clauses*

- Nobody knows what's in those agreements yet. We don't know. We don't know what the Cape Town City Metro signed; I don't know what the Jo-berg City Metro...none of us do. Because they're in those confidentiality clauses.

They forced onto every city and stadium owner where the World Cup is played a whole range of different *demands*.

- Quoting the executive manager of the Department of Provincial Government, Dr. P J Boener. He was testifying in parliament back a few years ago

QUOTE: Government Official Dr. P.J Boener

"Each city had been required by FIFA to sign agreements on a "take it or leave it basis"

"Many of the terms in the contracts had been framed in an undetermined fashion."

- Meaning they were left open-ended because of over-expenditure.

As part of these agreements also FIFA loaded up the nine host South African cities with outrageous demands for additional and costly expenditure on stadiums and



training grounds a large portion borne by national government through municipal grant subsidies which otherwise might have gone to a whole range of other things in those municipalities.

No massive pot of money. And don't believe that it doesn't affect any other expenditure on social basic services, of course it does. We all know that from making out own budget. They tried to convince us four years ago that the entire World Cup was going to be funded by increased tax returns from SARS (South African Revenue Service). That was almost 2.3 billion not 40 billion.

Special medical services:

Hospitals that had entire wings cordoned off for those injuries associated with FIFA.

While poor people couldn't get in, any thing to do with World Cup

- Best treatment and best doctors, set aside for FIFA and their delegations.

Stadiums:

Complete risk indemnification.

Exclusion zones:

No informal traders could sell, people evicted from those sites.

Fan Parks:

What kind of politics is involved?

Commercial Restrictions Zones:

Corporate sponsors including: *Adidas, Coco-cola, Sony, Visa, Budweiser, McDonalds.*

- Only their products could be sold, total monopoly on everything.

Why is this, because they wanted to brand South Africa. Brand it how? As it truly is? Including the good and the bad? Or brand it under a false image?

Benefits are for those who have money, the elite.

Ticket sales:



3.7 Million tickets available right from beginning, before any went to the public:

- FIFA allocated itself 3%
- Complementary 2%
- Contingency 10%

Total: 550,000 tickets gone before they were even released to the public

- Corporate Sponsors 6%
- Commercial Affiliates 18%

Tout tickets: Selling tickets

- Yet nobody was arrested for doing so when it is illegal.
- Not one arrest with all the special FIFA courts, yet people were getting harsh punishments for stealing cell phones.

Empty seats: Mexico v. South African match there were *10,000 empty seats* in Soccer City.

Additional Protection:

In 2 or 3 years, South Africa was able to build world-class stadiums yet in many communities open sewage still runs down the road. Why?

Who are we trying to show?

- If a democratic government can't show their own people that they can deliver basic services why show the world that we can build world-class stadiums? What kind of democracy is that?

Sounds like old past. "Yes boss mentality"

The questions is weather FIFA is satisfied, to portray a specific image to the world. And for what?

Crime:

Police, prosecutors, and 56 courts: To handle any criminal activity during events.

In normal times you can rape someone and get R500 bail, but during the World Cup someone gets 5 years for stealing a cell phone.



We ask ourselves, aren't we proud? We are showing the world we are cleaning up crime. For who? Not for ordinary people, not for the good of South African citizens. For the good of FIFA and all its affiliates who are making money.

QUOTE from Jerome Valcke, FIFA General Secretary:

During the World Cup, everything became FIFA property. This was said when courts were handed over as FIFA property:

"We will protect our World Cup whatever we have to do. That's my role, to protect the World Cup and protect FIFA. And to do this I need the police, I need justice, because the World Cup has to be a success."

The arrogance, we'll do it whatever it takes. And while all this was going on we were waving flags.

Legacy:

Main sales pitch from government leading up to the World Cup:

This was going to be:

A special event that would light up the country with a dark and divided past and it would leave a lasting developmental legacy that would benefit the people of South Africa for generations to come.

- Promotion of economic growth
- Stimulation of urban redevelopment
- Infrastructural development
- Advancement of soccer development
- Engendering of nation building
- Social cohesion and national unity

Big list for one event to deliver.

Construction companies

Who benefited? Money was definitely made, but who got it?

- Construction companies (Group 5, WHPO, Murray & Roberts)
 - WHPO increased profit by: 142%
 - Murray & Roberts: 99%
 - Group Five: 79%



The bid book said that 590,000 jobs would be created.

- The actual number turned out to be 129,000 (1/5th of the jobs that were promised) *Of those; most were short-term, temporary jobs.*

Average wage of construction worker:

- 3,000 Rand per month.
- While executives were making billions.

That gives one an idea of who benefited.

Profits:

Last estimate from FIFA regarding profits:

- 20-25 billion Rand, taken directly out of the country. No taxes.

Estimates of SAFA's share:

- 600,000 to a million, to perhaps billion. (We don't know)

Other Concessions:

All exchange of foreign currency was allowed at no cost

- FIFA could transfer as much as they wanted.
- They came in, made huge sums of money, and took it all out.

Be careful with opinion polls:

- Door to door survey conducted on 12,500 households in South Africa internationally by a recognized institute showed that
 - 79% of South Africans thought the World Cup was far too expensive and not beneficial for them.
 - 65% of those polled in 23 other countries said that same thing.

Take issue with the idea that there is a mass acceptance and euphoria on the part of citizens regarding the World Cup.

- We need to question those kinds of things
- It's day light robbery in the name of sports and development

Economics:

Gautrain, highway projects:



- Were already in place and not necessarily directly associated with the World Cup, yet all these things are being included as benefits.

What's being included and when is it included?

Growth: 1% increase in the GDP (Gross Domestic Product)

Expenditure: 6.5% of GDP (According to SARS)

QUOTE from SARS Official:

“Our approach to the World Cup has been that it was never going to be a revenue raising exercise. Certainly it would be wrong to view the World Cup as a significant contributor itself. The concessions we had to give to FIFA are simply to demanding and overwhelming for us to have material or monetary benefits.”

-Adrian Lackay

Social Legacy of the World Cup:

Soccer development:

- Decent recreation facilities in normal communities and villages
- Basic equipment and a good pitch

SAFA & Soccer Development:

- SAFA: Failure at grassroots level in regards to soccer development
- So, money was made, but will local communities see any of this money? That remains to be seen.

FIFA & Soccer Development:

- FIFA has done very little to aid soccer development on the ground.
- Out of 1.2 billion in the FIFA 2009 budget:
 - 2.2 million went to football development programs for kids.
 - 65 Million went to hospitality and business for executives.

Claim of legacy-contribution to:

- Nation building
- Social cohesion
- Patriotism

You no longer hear the economic growth/benefits argument being sold; it's now the intangible things that are being cited as the benefits.



Counter argument: A successful World Cup will live on as a social and political unifier.

This argument is undermined immediately by the practical ways in which the World Cup impacted the most socially repressed and economically marginalized. If we are serious about nation building and inclusively then why were the poorest people treated with contempt?

This is what happened with the World Cup, it was Middle Class and Upper-Middle class people, for the most part, who were able to go to the stadiums to watch the games. The working class was left aside. They could only watch on T.V. and in the Fan Parks, but certainly not in a more direct way.

The World Cup is not metaphoric for the historical triumph of diversity, etc.; it was hugely costly and ephemeral temporary exercise in myth making. Reality, unfortunately, is a different story. Thanks.

Ms. Ryan: That was a mouthful, Dale. But thank you so much. Ok, ladies and gentlemen, the floor will be open for questions now. Just say who you are directing your question to, we'll take about five questions and then we'll have the speakers respond.

Q 1: Where did Mr. Seymour get his information from when he sourced the statistic that 84% of South African people felt the World Cup was going to help them?

Given the World Cup, where is the development in our area, where people are languishing in poverty in this area?

Q 2: Why was the investment centered only in the city? Where you find the majority of citizens you see a lot of under development.

How do we reclaim our power? How do ordinary citizens begin to hold government accountable?

Q 3: I went on the fan walk because I was inquisitive and I wanted to see what was going on. You didn't see a poor person on the fan walk or anybody that was badly behaved. We must face that fact that we have a degenerate government, in that it can do this to it's own people. Which means they have the same kind of mentality that our erstwhile government had, that id you are black you count for nothing.

Q 4: What happens now to Green Point? Who owns it now? Who do we lobby as concerned citizens?



Will it be used as Somali refugees themselves suggested, to have anti-xenophobic courts with this infrastructure that we have?

What happens to disaster and emergency management? God forbid if a Tsunami or a natural disaster hit, would that facility be available to its citizens?

Will the money spent on the infrastructure only be recouped from a cost-recovery benefits model or will it be used and heavily subsidized by the companies affiliated with the government to make transportation for people far flung?

What percentage of the turnover of FIFA or any company associated with the benefits there from would give as part of their corporate social investment to be put in a transparent trust to improve the quality of life of children?

Where then do we lobby? What are the avenues in term of holding government accountable and the state entities responsible for the delivery of FIFA projects?

Ms. Ryan: Okay, I'm going to hand it over to the speakers now, so who would like to...

Mr. Seymour: Thank you very much madam chair. I must say I enjoy this debate. It's a debate that must be had in this country as often as possible. However, whilst I respect professor McKinley's viewpoints, and I think there is a lot of merit in what he had to offer, I do think it is premature at this stage to make categorical judgments about the effects of the World Cup.

I do think we have to be patient, I think as a country we need to first wait for the results, for the assessments by the experts that currently are working on these things, they're looking at these numbers...before we begin to say it was a failed project. The first point I'm going to make.

Let us be patient; let us engage in these issues based on fact. I said at the beginning that my presentation was more of a reflection of the World Cup than any attempt to project any hard core information to particular legacy issues.

The second comment I wanted to make was that SAFA, who is a body who lobbied for the World Cup, not the government, SAFA. The football community, we never ever said the world cup is going to solve every single problem in this country...never said that. I don't ever recall the government saying it either, we always



knew as SAFA, as a football organization, that the Cup was an event. An event over a specified period of four weeks that is pretty much the same way we organize our tournaments, our league programs, etc. We always knew that, its one event over four weeks.

What we did say, that's on record everywhere, what we did say it presents an opportunity for us to begin to deal with deficiencies, particularly with infrastructure in this country. And especially football facilities; we said those things. And so I think it's important that we don't walk around with the notion that there was an expectation that the World Cup will deal with poverty, inequality, unemployment, all of these things. Not going to happen. It's not going to happen. And that why also in my presentation I advanced the notion that the World Cup is a catalyst for legacy in this country. It's something we use as a springboard to begin to build or rebuild.

Response: Polls

The figured are quoted from a polling institution. But as Dale pointed out, polls are subjective. It depends on how you do the research, what is your methodology you use, where do you go. We can debate those things, it's simple.

I disagree when you say the people of this area won't benefit, I disagree with you. Because I really believe that the children in the area will say I want to be an engineer, I want to redesign this whole area and become involved in Urban planning over here. We can debate the issue of development planning over the years or why we are in Retreat or why there is a railroad line, etc. We can debate those issues. I really believe, and we must believe that what the World Cup can do and will be doing is to ensure that the next generation will say we can plan this country better, we can make it work better. We can deliver services better to our people.

That's how we see the World Cup as a legacy, and that's why I don't agree with you when you say...because I didn't get a new fence I don't benefit. I don't believe that's the position you should take around that question, but we can discuss those things.

Response: Urban focus of the World Cup

Urban based model. Is agree with you, I agree that there was a biased towards urbanization, a biased toward the developed part of the country. But the planners and the architects and the experts who advised SAFA, who advised the government in terms of extracting maximum benefits out of the event, they argued and we listened to their arguments, that if you really want to achieve maximum you've got to go that route. We then ensured, SAFA particularly and the government, that rural areas were apart of the



World Cup. We also said that we would try and spread the tournament event through all of our provinces. And when we discovered the Northern Cape wasn't part of it, we then said what can we do in the Northern Cape, what can we take to the Northern Cape. And so we came up with the idea of a training base camp, so investment went there as well. We wanted to ensure to some degree that we could include those areas outside the major metros.

Response: Commercial Benefits

The issue of the commercial benefits, I think Dale really eloquently outlined how it works. Coke sponsors our local football; they do not allow Jive to be sold at our kiosks at our events. They tell us, we will come, we will sponsor your football, we will do what you ask us to do, our condition is, no competing brand will be there. And one day they came to one of our events because one of our kiosks was selling Jive and they threatened us and said they would pull their sponsorship. That's the way the market works unfortunately, and so therefore how then do we ensure that local people can become involved. We look for other opportunities, our fan parks, the training base camp areas; we try to explore possibilities for other vendors to have access to the World Cup, but as you pointed out and Dale eloquently, the market forces do determine whether you can sell Kentucky Fried Chicken for example in an area where McDonalds spent money to sponsor the event.

Response: Demographic at Fan Walks

Mam, you said you saw no poor people on the fan walk? I have news for you. 90% of the members of SAFA in this province come from the Southeast Metro, there is a poverty belt in this city, God knows that. 90%, all of them, or most of them were at the matches. These guys are unemployed, many of them are drivers, they drive taxis, they work in shops, they're factory workers, so on and so forth. They were there, at the World Cup. Now, your right if you say that generally the poorer sectors of society struggled to acquire tickets because of the prices. You'd be correct. How then did we succeed at getting smaller guys at these matches? Various ways and means. In our case, because the World Cup is football focused, there were plans in place for the past couple of years, 4-5 years, to ensure we were able to give a ticket, we gave our tickets to our members, they didn't pay for it. We gave it to them. Now, Dale early on spoke about FIFA's allocation of tickets, and he's right, he mentioned the 2% FIFA keeps, that 2% goes to the FIFA membership. All 281 federations, and we're one of them. And for every World Cup, we get those tickets. But I think it is not correct to say that there were no poor people at the stadiums, there were. Not as many as we liked, and I agree, I concede, that perhaps the issue of our economic situation was a limiting factor, but I do



think that many efforts were made to ensure that less affluent areas were part of the World Cup.

Response: Greenpoint Stadium

The last question, from the Black Sash representative, what happens to Green Point? It is owned by the City of Cape Town. You own it, as a rent payer. The Major publicly, to her credit, for a number of years, over and over emphasized

One: It must not cause the rent payer any burden. In fact, the Major threatened to stall the project unless she was satisfied that this stadium will not be a burden to the taxpayers of Cape Town. And over and over, we know the battles we had in persuading the then Major and the Council to support the project and give the go-ahead. I mean it's important that we at citizens acknowledge that. And today we have the stadium, it is there, it is built and Dale early in his presentation spoke about some of the monies that were spent to do so. I won't today challenge some of the facts and figures that he has quoted or refereed to, because I don't have the facts myself, so therefore I can't challenge. I will wait when all the auditors have done their work, then I will comment of those figures. I think it's premature at this stage to begin to condemn the project as money wasted and a tax burden to the rent payers.

But I do want to say I know that the Council at that time, the Major at that time, the current Major, the current Premier, the current representative for sports development in this province, and the National Minister; for them it's a huge issue that these properties do not become white elephants, firstly, and secondly it does not result as a tax burden for our rent payers. And I do believe that these people enjoy the confidence of the majority of the people in this province whether we like it or not. They are there, they have done those things, I am hoping that we will support the project and we know that everyone involved, the City Council, Provincial Government, the National Government, the football authorities, our clubs, etc. The first event will be held this August, and we hope we will be supported by the people of Cape Town.

I don't think if we take a negative attitude toward some of these things if we are going to win these battles, the issues being raised are real, and I acknowledge that. I acknowledge the fact that yes it's going to be a task in the years ahead, we all heard the stories about Canada, and the Montréal Olympics, we know with Korea-Japan there were debates and articles, they tore down stadia after the World Cup in those countries. But precisely because we know about those things because we know our Major said constantly we will only support the World Cup in Cape Town if we can sustain it after the World Cup. I personally, I was sitting as a SAFA and a football member; I'm confident that the people we have in charge at present have got their act together and I think



Captonians are going to be surprised in the years ahead in regard to some of these things I think when all is said and done, we've examined the books, we read the reports by the auditors and the experts we will come out saying we actually did a great job.

Ms. Ryan: Thanks, Vernon.

Dr. McKinley: I'll try not to make another speech, but I just want to deal with the three questions and then just a couple other comments in response, because I do like to deal in facts. I don't like to deal in ephemeral suggestions and projections and on all sorts of others things, which is precisely what often times confuses things because when you don't talk about facts you can claim anything almost, you can claim anything might happen and that's unfortunately a hallmark of our government, and SAFA as well as FIFA.

The very fact of the matter is that Sepp Blatter, for the past 16 years, has refused to be transparent about how much he earns or how much any of the executive earns. They refuse. Why?

Response: Greenpoint Stadium:

Let's just get real here; I've seen the contract between the city of Cape Town and Stade France. There is, in that contact, a specific clause that's says if money is lost by Stade France it will be subsidized directly from city government to make up the loss. That's what it says.

Folks, you can bet your bottom dollar, or rand, or whatever that that stadium is going to be a loss making exercise. I just was reading the reports from Soccer City, Gauteng and in Mbombela, Mpumalanga asking how now that the World Cup is over how are these stadiums going to be used.

In soccer city 95,000 people said we're going to have wedding functions. They don't have a clue about how they're going to sustain those stadiums other than the few soccer matches that will happened, and maybe a few mega events, and of course possibly the religious folks, like the Church Assembly of God will hold their big rallies there and other things, but those are going to be minimal, those are going to be fairly minimal.



This is precisely the point, Vernon, this is what makes it so sad to me is that South Africa new what happened in Canada, they knew what happened in South Korea. And yet just like a drunk they went and drank anyway. There are no plans to make these white elephant stadiums commercially viable, there's no plan, no systemic plan. And the public sectors will absorb the losses juts like the South Korean government did and they had to destroy three of the stadiums that they built. So, who owns them? Yes, the public owns them but they outsource and corporatize them. Who makes the money? The Private. Who pays for the shortfall? The public, whenever it happens. That's the equation, very unfortunately.

Transport infrastructure

75% of the transport budget was spent in Gauteng for the highway improvement area. The rest of the country got whatever was left in terms of transport; the vast majority was spent in the Gauteng province; billions on this highway improvement.

In 2011: All those public roads will be tolled. Public roads built with public funds are going to be privatized, and sold. We'll all have to pay double to travel on those roads, taxi fares will go up, etc. This is the transport infrastructure legacy with regards to who's going to benefit.

Claim of power:

With all do respect, Vernon, it is incredibly patronizing to say that it takes a World Cup to convince poor kids they must have dreams. As if poor people can't have dreams without the World Cup, as if they can't be engineers without the World Cup, as if this brought them some kind of hope when there was no hope at all. That's patronizing, that says that poor people have to have some kind of outside inference or outside spectacle just because they're poor or downtrodden. I would argue that in fact, there was no need for the World Cup to stoke our dreams, to stoke anybody's dreams. Kids are always going to have dreams, the question is; Are there things in place that are going to help make that dream a reality? That's the question, not whether there's a one-month World Cup that gives us a nice feeling for a while and then it gets back to reality.

So, with all due respect, I don't think that is the correct thing to be saying and I think you should stop saying that, because when you come into a community hall and say this it's very patronizing and I'm even from this community, and I don't even claim to be so.

QUOTE: SAFA to FIFA



"We have developed a plan to present FIFA with a risk-free opportunity on South African soil. The 2010 World Cup to South Africa will be the greatest gift to the people of our country and our continent."

Expectations:

Now if that's not raising expectations, what is? If SAFA is saying it's going to be the greatest gift ever, which SAFA did say. They said it was going to create all this developmental legacy.

Expectations were raised. What happened in 1994/1995 in this country, after we elected our first democratic government? Expectations were raised. And then came GEAR, the neo-liberal program which dashed all our expectations and what were we told? Be patient, be patient. Just deal with it folks, sometime or another it will come, maybe in your lifetime, maybe not. And now we're being told the same thing with the World Cup.

We were being told all sorts of things and now they're backing off on those claims, they're saying wait. Be patient. Maybe it'll come about, maybe it won't. And, I think we've been patient enough, with these kinds of plans. The revisionism doesn't work anymore, it may have held water in '94 & '95 but 15 years later I think people have grown up a little bit with regards to that.

Vernon, we do not need to wait for experts, this is the problem in our country. People know reality, people are not stupid. Auditors can be just as crooked, KGMB has been involved in all sorts of fraud and wrong audits, and so there is no necessary connection between the truth and expert reports. As if we have to wait for the experts to tell us...oh my God, the experts have spoken.

I present you all with facts from our government, if we can't believe that SARS is correct in giving us things, then why should we believe a private accounting company. And some expert who's appointed who gets a multi-million rand contract to do a report, because it sounds very nice, it depends on who the pay master is often times.

So, I don't buy into this issue of experts and assessments and let's be patient and wait, we know, we can see, we can trust ourselves. People should trust themselves and not have to be told what it is that they must think and what it is that they must know. It's not premature to make categorical judgments, we must engage on the basis of fact.

Response: Reclaiming Power



I have two words in that regard, and think that we have lost this. And by the way, I don't just come from an academic research background, I've been an activist for 25 years, I was a member of the Communist Party for 10 years and I was expelled from the Communist Party and I have been involved in community organization on a variety of fronts, so I come from an activist background.

Organize, organize, and organize. We are unorganized. That is our biggest weakness. We are unorganized as communities. Because what did we learn in the 70s and 80s and everything? That organization is power. Collective organization is power: When we're disorganized what this neo-liberal system has done to us is individualize and divide us. All over the place. So we're each trying to survive in our own little ways.

People don't have capital in the form of money, like the capitalists do, but we have power collectively. That's where our power lies. How do we hold our government accountable? Well, let's go have an NGO go and present expert testimony in front of parliament, well that's okay, maybe for a bill. But that cannot take the place of collective community power. We cannot rely on others to speak for people all the time, so we need to take back that voice, take back that collective power and organization that can tell our government hold on you cannot do this in our name, you will not do this in our name. Not just saying please don't, and then they go ahead and do it and get away with it.

Ms. Ryan: Now it is eight o'clock and I really don't mind having another round of questions if you so desire, but you do need to tell me if you have any questions that you'd like to...anybody else have any questions? Okay, I will have one last round of questions and then we will close because it is eight o'clock, and then I'll have some closing remarks. So let's just see where we are, question?

Q 1: Did the government or the people put any thought into what parents were going to do with children for the six weeks they had off for the World Cup. Were there thoughts of any programs at grassroots levels?

Q 2: (Inaudible)

Q 3: Firstly, I don't buy Mr. Seymour's argument because SAFA bid for the World Cup, if you then bid for the World Cup on your own, then you must pay the 90 billion. Not the citizens of this country.

Q 4: There was a lot of police visibility, but now the World Cup is over. In the mean time, in places like Khayelitsha, people weren't working with their cell phones in their bags because they were still being robbed. Actually, the saying, the World Cup slogan "Feel it,



it is here” but in Khayelitsha it was “Steal it, it is here.” (laughter) So, the reality is people in Khayelitsha were walking in fear, even though we had tourists walking in town and some South African walking in town not having any fear of anybody actually robbing them. And the whole police visibility; it was not in Khayelitsha, or anywhere else but in town. What is going to happen to all those people who were recruited to make sure the visitors were safe in our country? But then what about us? We are the citizens who can’t be safe every single day.

Q 5: (inaudible)...The lotto donated 81 million to SAFA

Q 6: There were thousands of volunteers; did SAFA or FIFA ever think about giving a small handshake to volunteers?

Q 7: Viewers treated badly at a trophy viewing, we stood in line forever, no chairs, forced to watch a little video full of commercial sponsors, then taken through the trophy experience very quickly, then we got a little bottle of coke. Not a good experience. Transport, as soon as the World Cup was over, it became unsafe to travel on trains again. Traffic is bad because everyone has gone back to using their cars, we can say we’ve invested in transport, but people aren’t using it now. Money to SAFA: what is the status of the president of SAFA, how is the money going to be allocated. There is going to be a power struggle.

Q 8: 30 plus people were shot in Andover park during the height of the World Cup while police were protecting the city. What opportunities are there for our community?

Ms. Ryan: Vernon, it seem as if most of the questions are directed to you. You’re in the hot seat tonight.

Mr. Seymour: I think I should go back to being a councilor (laughter). Let me begin with the issue of security.

Response: Security

I think the questions raised and the comments made are valid. But I do think the place to put those questions would be at the CPF. I am hoping this still exists in all the areas where the commissioner would update the community and brief them on the state of security in the neighborhoods.

I don’t think anybody thought in this country that when the World Cup is gone our crooks, our gangsters, our thugs in our society would have retired. I do believe most people have the expectation that maybe it will dent that activity a little bit; maybe it will



at least make them disappear for a short while. I encourage that question to be put at the CPF in our areas because the people who are responsible for security of our communities, are the police, etc.

The visible policing aspect of the World Cup in Cape Town, 70% of the people seen in the streets and at the stadium were police students. They came from the college and they were used for the purposes of visible police. I don't believe that commissioners withdrew services from the communities but I'm sure that they can be questioned about that. My police friends also tell me that there was a remarkable drop in petty crime during the World Cup, the muggers and the robbers apparently were too busy watching World Cup matches and could not go and do their business.

Response: SAFA Politics

I agree with you, I wish it was better managed, I wish my friends and my longtime associates are able to engage in a more responsible way and I think they will in my view, I think our current president is a man of integrity. I honestly believe he wants to ensure that football is well managed in this country. Yes, there are issues about money, business, that is true. We're not going to run away from that. A few of my colleagues have been abusing their position, it's unfortunate. But I do things that within SAFA as a whole we have the resolve to mirror the image of the World Cup, I think we want to see our citizens saying going forward "you guys did a great job in the World Cup now do us a favor do that also in the ordinary business of football in this country.

Response: Trophy Viewing

Sorry to hear about the issue of the trophy, clearly it's unacceptable, it's not something that should happen. I can't apologize for it, but I will make sure that I convey to them the story, tell them that people came to a particular venue and they were horribly treated. And I don't think any general manager or CEO of a major corporation wants to hear this kind of report. They all pride themselves about their brand name and how reputable they are and so forth and so what I will do is to mention to the local bosses of coke in this province.

Response: Volunteers

The volunteers and the handshake. I don't know. Volunteers joined the World Cup on the basis of making the contribution to this country. I sat in those interviews; we probably had about 70,000 people apply for volunteers at the World Cup, 15,000 became volunteers and I listened to their stories, I listened to farmers, ordinary workers say, "I want nothing, I don't want anything, I just want to be there and I want to help"



I'm sure FIFA considered the idea of some kind of token but I don't think the people themselves who volunteered expect anything; they came, delivered a service, loyally, patriotically, for four weeks and left feeling happy to say I did something for my country.

I think, if I may madam chair, in conclusion. The issues raised tonight are good issues, and I think people like Dale McKinley make sure people like myself are on our toes, that we have our act together, and I don't necessarily believe it's a bad thing for our country, in fact, I think it's a very good thing that we have robust debates around these matters.

But where I do have a difference with Dale and others who argue the way he has argued tonight is that in order for us to build this country we have to continue to engage in matters in a way that will remain positive about our project. We are 15 years old as a democracy and as a nation, and I think we have a long way to go in terms of some of the issues raised by Dale and others, and I think if we begin to engage in it in a way that begins to be judgmental, this is where I have a little bit of difficulty. We're going to find ourselves short changed ultimately. I want to encourage all of us, by all means, engage in these matters, interrogate what we say as SAFA and other public platform people.

But I do think what would help a lot more is if we learn from our mistakes, and we made some, quite a few along the way in this process but at the end of the day I think we can walk away from the World Cup with our heads high as South Africans and as Africans. I do not believe for one minute that what we saw was a falsity; I disagree vehemently with that view. I don't believe that any of the things we said over the years or we did over the past four weeks or the past five years is a falsity, to the contrary, I do think that the World cup in this country has made a major contribution to the building of our nation.

Thank you very much.

Ms. Ryan: Ok, I'd like to say something in conclusion. I knew very little about soccer and I still don't know very much about soccer, but because we were going to have this discussion Brad and I did some research and I found out a little more about the history of soccer and how FIFA and how everything else related works. But while I still don't know much about soccer, I do know a little bit about democracy and what democracy is supposed to mean for individuals or ordinary citizens.

I also hear you saying, Vernon, that we need to be contacting the CPFs, in some communities those CPFs are really not working. Community police forums that are



suppose to be there representative of the people, there are some people who are sitting on CPFs who are also sitting on Ward Committees. Ward Committees, how effective are they? They should also be a part of our democracy. School governing bodies, how effective are they? Now this is all structures that were created to ensure that we have a democracy and I'm not sure that our democracy is working for us, in even these basic on the ground structures. Why not?

We also cannot be complaining about government when we are not ensuring that democracy is happening on the ground. So I really think that as much as we'd like to criticize the SA government, we are not in a position to do that unless we get our own houses in order. Now, I learned democracy through softball because I used to play softball. And there I learned how democracy works, I was a Secretary and we held meetings and if there was any important decision that had to be made we had to take it back to all the members and then we had to go to the Union and we had a delegate who represented the Club and you were never going to be speaking in your own capacity, and that's how I learned how democracy is supposed to work.

Now I'm also hearing, when I went to a seminar last week about the World Cup and the euphoria that was created and how we are thinking about bidding for the next Olympic games. Now that is another big event and they talk about the possibility of all these big events bringing lots of good to us as citizens of SA. I am an ordinary citizen and I'm thinking as I'm sitting there, now who decides who bids for these things because I have no clue. But surely there is somebody or some people that make the decision that we're going to make these bids at different levels. And I'm saying is we need to be questioning, how do these things happen? And that's what our democracy is supposed to be about. There are two banners at the back, I brought it deliberately (its our old banner) but because it says promoting sustainable democracy, and I think that's what we all should be engaging in. I really think it was a nice robust debate. Sorry Vernon, you seemed to be in the hot seat quite a lot, I thank you Dale, I think that that kind of input is just what communities need to hear to start thinking about their role in our democracy.

We need to also be hearing what people are thinking about what government is doing, but at the same time we need to look at ourselves at what are we doing to make sure we bring government to book. So I really think that I'm not going to be standing here speaking for people like Dale and people who believe and think the same way that Dale does, even though that there are many in the room, but you also need to be saying what are we going to be doing? Vernon has made his presentation and his thoughts and opinions known too.



I love doing community work because you hear what people on the ground say and we did a little talk on the soccer World Cup and one of them said to me that they're mad that government people are undermining their intelligence. And I think that a lot of the time that happens also and we sit back and we watch it, we see what's going wrong, we hear the comments from the lady in the front here and she is right. What are we doing? Creating the same type of government that we used to have? I don't think that's what we want.

So I really think we need to be looking at ourselves and what are we going to be doing in the structures that we come from, the civics, our schools, in our communities in order to make sure we get those local CPFs, School Governing Bodies, Ward committees, Ward Councilors, PR Councilors, all of those people who represent our democracy and we need to be looking at how are we going to make sure that they work for all of us. So, in conclusion I'd like to say thanks you to all of you from coming tonight I really really think it was a really nice discussion and we do hold it every month so we have dialogues every single month, we also run workshops on democracy so if you have an organization or a group that wants to understand democracy, chapter 2, bill of rights, ward committees, role of the councilor, system structures, we do that training as well. So thank you so much, we do have some snacks at the back so please help yourself and then talk a bit. Thank you.