

On the question of Aids, do you think he fully understands the human cost of his denialism?

Well, firstly, he doesn't call it denialism, and I agree with him.

Let me rephrase that. Do you think he fully understands the human cost of his position on Aids?

No. Umm, no, let me rephrase that. I asked him whether he thought it was worth it, what he had done. And his answer was that it may well have confused or compromised the message that his own government was trying to put out. But he didn't think that was a reason not to ask questions. And because he doesn't believe that there have been answers to those questions yet, he thinks that if there was confusion about it, that's in a way collateral damage.

Did you put it to him that history may hold him responsible for the deaths of hundreds of thousands of people?

No, I didn't approach my interviews with him in that kind of challenging way.

How do you think history will judge him?

I think the deepest scratch against his legacy will be the way he dealt with HIV and Aids.

Do you think he intellectualises all this to the extent that the deaths of so many people because of his policies doesn't actually bother him?

I think that he believes that the damage caused by ARVs [antiretrovirals] is greater than the damage caused by Aids.