Power and Politics at a non-racial, ethnic University:
A study of the University of Durban-Westville

Robert Morrell

Preamble

This paper was written in the first half of 1989 at a time when the University of Durban-Westville was wracked with conflict and the political situation within the country showed little sign of improving. The issue then at stake was the future direction of the University. The outcome of the struggles that occurred at that time were by no means certain. The Staff Association had emerged as a powerful progressive force but its attempts to change the racial and conservative character of the University were resolutely resisted by the senior members of the Administration. Since then the University has undergone significant changes. Most importantly, Professor Jairam Reddy, at one time Vice Chairperson of the Staff Association, has been appointed Principal, succeeding Professor Jaap Greyling. Professor Reddy's supporters succeeded in having his term of office brought forward by six months to the middle of 1990 thus hastening the end of an era which had seen the University of Durban-Westville locked into an authoritarian, conservative and conflict-ridden situation. Reddy's accession to the rectorship was based on a series of gains over the previous five years during which time the Council and the Senate had become more liberal, and representative bodies of staff and students had worked together to build a 'non-racial' university. This paper documents the struggles at the University and argues that the achievement of non-racialism is no guarantee by itself of a democratic, academically sound and intellectually free environment. It argues that the exercise of power will have to be closely monitored and that the Staff Association has an important duty in this regard.

Introduction

In the last five years, the University of Durban-Westville (UDW) has undergone important changes. Perhaps most important amongst these has been the huge influx of African students which now make possible the description of this University as non-racial.[1] Ten years ago the UDW student body was overwhelmingly Indian and the staff predominantly white. Its ethnic character was not surprising given the fact that, like all South African Universities, it had been created to serve a particular race or ethnic group. The achievement in breaking out of this mould has therefore been significant. This is not to say that the struggle for non-racialism at UDW has finally been won, nor is it to say that the onward movement towards a more non-racial university is irrevocable. But it is most evident that UDW has shrugged off the old identity of an 'Indian University'.

It is not just the racial composition of the University that has been changed. Within the University, forces have been at work attempting to break with a past characterised by authoritarian procedures, hostility towards dissent, a lack of commitment to academic excellence and political support for the National Party. Here too advances have been made. UDW is now attracting academics of international repute, it is hosting a number of seminar series, it is interacting on equal terms and on many levels with other South African Universities. It has in large measure shrugged off a reputation for being a second-class tertiary institution.

Central to the advances made at UDW has been the activities of the SRC and the staff associations, particularly the existing Combined Staff Association (COMSA). These organisations were both, and still are, dedicated to a non-racial and democratic university and have struggled energetically for the realisation of these goals.[2] This has generally involved confrontation with the University's Administration (hereafter Admin) which for the most part has either tried to block or to control the changes that have occurred.

A challenge to the University's existing power structures which are closed both in terms of accessibility and composition is implicit in the goal of democratising the University. Some progress has been made in altering existing power relations at the University. This has been a result of a number of factors including an infusion of new academic blood, and accumulated gain over a number of years by staff associations and student militancy. Nevertheless, to a large extent, traditional power relations remain intact. This paper is concerned to

examine the reasons for this relative lack of success in the hope that fruitful debate will be generated concerning the way forward. The issues raised are not peculiar to UDW but affect all South African universities in one way or another. They concern the limits of transformation, the path to follow and the compromises that will have to be made. In an attempt to understand the context of these issues, this paper documents and analyses developments that took place at UDW between 1985 and 1988 during which time the author was a member of staff there.

Visions of the Future

There are three basic visions about the University and its possible development and each reflect the political peculiarities of UDW's differentiated population. I shall deal with them in turn. Within the Admin there is a recognition that a process of *controlled change* is required. This vision is prompted by financial realities - to keep the University's finances healthy, student numbers must be kept up and this entails bringing in increasing numbers of non-Indian (primarily African) students. Yet this process is envisaged as transforming UDW into a "multi-ethnic" university and not into a non-ethnic or non-racial institution, which is the goal of UDW's progressives.[3] Another element of change concerns the University Admin's drive for academic credibility. With the heavy emphasis placed by SAPSE on research output, the University has over the past few years paid much more attention to promoting publication, to the extent that it offers researchers up to a third of the monies brought in by SAPSE to continue their research activities.[4] The notion that academic excellence is a guiding principle behind efforts to change the University reflects a country-wide genuflection to this standard. The Admin's vision of change however does not encompass changes within the existing power relations and hierarchies of the University. Any effort by rivals trying to imprint their particular agendas onto the process of change are consequently opposed.

The major opposing view concerning what UDW should look like in the future is generated by COMSA and the SRC. It is important not to conceal differences in emphasis between the various versions of this view, but broadly speaking, it involves a much more rapid process of deracialisation, a move away from traditional methods of control at the University which will allow it to realise its academic and social potential. Part of this vision involves replacing the incumbents of a

number of key posts with sympathisers of liberal and progressive values. A major aspect of this view is that UDW will realise its potential when it is admitted to the ranks of the 'open' universities and in so doing, will completely slough off its second-class status. The path that many think should be followed, involves an emulation of policies implemented at the University of the Western Cape (UWC) which was thereby raised above the level of other 'ethnic' universities, becoming as it did so, the "intellectual home of the left".

A third view, not widely articulated and at odds with the above two, also exists. This is a view which holds that neither the achievement of non-racialism, nor promotion to the ranks of the 'open' universities are sufficient by themselves to bring into being a new, democratic type of institution. This third view argues that power relations have to be changed and that structures of power have to be modified in order for the University to realise its potential. While there is no one model on which to base a strategy of transformation, a number of elements would necessarily be included: the democratisation of key University bodies: Council, Senate and the Faculty Boards (all of which should accommodate substantial, and in the long term, majority, representation from lecturers and students), the reduction in the power wielded by Admin and its redistribution amongst academics, particularly those in the junior levels, where consultation, let alone decision making, rarely takes place. In the train of these changes, would flow a more energetic support of the right to criticise, the right of dissent, the right to be consulted and reported back to. In turn this would have the effect of breaking traditional patterns of knowledge production and of intellectual production.[5]

Power within UDW

UDW like many other Universities in South Africa was the product of a totalitarian plan created by the architects of Apartheid to ensure white racial domination and the perpetuation of capitalism. For this reason it differs markedly from the 'open' universities which evolved under the mantle of old-style segregationary liberalism. Universities like UCT and Wits were therefore more open politically, but nevertheless were racial bodies under the influence of capital rather than the state. The legacy of UDW's origins is still to be seen within the University itself and in its practices. At the inception of the University (1961) legislation mapped out the essential power structures and relations. The result was an undemocratic,

hierarchically organised body. Below I shall devote some time to examining the locus of power at UDW, but before doing so, I want to dwell for a moment on the importance of UDW's power structure. The existing situation poses major constraints on the achievement of the third vision of the future identified above. Even for those attempting to bring into being the second option, the situation is not easy. On the one hand, the structures are so powerful (and filled still by many resolute individuals willing to use that power to thwart their rivals) that they have often been used to block changes. On the other hand, the centralisation of power in these structures does provide the opportunity to become heirs to that power by removing a conservative incumbent and replacing him or her with a progressive. This is a policy which was used effectively at UWC and has been utilised with some success at UDW. There are however limitations to such change because existing structures which enshrine inequality have simply been taken over and the chances are that inequalities will continue to result, even though the direction taken by the institution as a whole is different. This means that particularly for those wanting a more thoroughgoing process of transformation, structural change will have to be effected. For example, Council and Senate will have either to be fundamentally transformed or replaced with more suitable bodies. This would involve alteration to their formal composition and function. At UDW there has been very little progress made in restructuring. Faculty Boards for the most part consist of professors and senior lecturers, with junior staff specifically excluded. Although some departments allow for one junior member to be elected to the Board, this does not alter the fact that lecturer representation is little more than token. At some other universities all academic staff, including temporary staff, are members of Board.[6]

At UDW power is highly centralised and bureaucratised. It is this continuing state of affairs which sets UDW aside from the 'open' universities.[7] In the common usage of the term, UDW is still an ethnic university. The term 'ethnic', 'tribal' or 'bush' all referred not to institutions which limited their student intake to a particular race or national group alone, but to institutions which were characterised by closedness, authoritarianism and hostility to any innovation that did not emanate from the top. Gwala talks of UDW as an 'urban' university, being an "urban version(s) of 'bush' ethnic colleges".[8] While common usage collapses the distinction between questions of racial composition and power relations, it still has some currency. It is

precisely this currency, and the slur of being a 'second class' university that both the adherents of the first and second views are attempting to jettison.

UDW suffers many of the maladies identified by E P Thompson in his analysis of Warwick University in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Thompson described that University as a 'Business University' because its administration was

> "so intimately enmeshed with the upper reaches of consumer capitalist society that they are actively twisting the purposes and procedures of the university away from those normally accepted.... and thus threatening its integrity as a self-governing academic institution." [9]

Clearly UDW is not a Business University, yet it is nevertheless being run along lines which reflect styles of management that are not congruent with university enterprise. For this reason I think one can reasonably call UDW a 'state' university. Styles of management reflect state bureaucracy and University administrators are known to cooperate with the SAP and security policy. UDW is a 'state' university, not because it gets its funds from the central state, but because it embraces the world view of that state.

Administration

Power at UDW is wielded by Admin. As I have already indicated, Admin is not simply a static force. Nor is it any longer dominated by a clique of Broederbonders as it was formerly.[10] It has its own agenda for change but is in a strong position to ensure that its version of change is popularised and enacted. Before examining Admin's strengths, it is necessary to qualify what I mean by Admin. Admin is made up of many tiers: at the top is the Rector, his two assistants (Vice Rectors) and the Registrars. Below that there are various directors and heads of section (the University's middle management), while at the bottom, there are the clerks, messengers and secretaries who are all categorised as Admin staff. In this paper, I shall use Admin to refer primarily to those people in authority who frame policy and take executive decisions. In this sense, I would be talking primarily about senior management, occasionally about middle management but never about the ordinary Admin staff.

The nature of Admin has changed a great deal in the last 8 years. With the creation of the House of Delegates (1984) and UDW

becoming autonomous, space was created for a slow upward movement of Indians into Admin. The fact that UDW now fell under the House of Delegates opened up space for more assertive behaviour on the part of ambitious and competent Indian academics and administrators. It also made possible the movement of Indians into senior positions. There has been some resistance to this policy by white administrators for long entrenched and untouchable, so that none of the top five posts in the University's Admin is yet occupied by an Indian. Nevertheless there are five Indian deputy directors, posts which are only one tier below that of registrar.[11] This new factor has changed the nature of Admin politics, allowing for outside (House of Delegates and Indian Community organisation) involvement. On a number of occasions this type of politics has put Admin on the defensive. In 1986 the House of Delegates appointed the Mall commission to investigate charges of racial discrimination in appointments and promotions.[12] Subsequently the UDW Council established the Booysen committee (1986) to examine further allegations of irregularity in this regard. These challenges to senior management must have played some part in forcing it to move cautiously along the reform path. Admin is not therefore monolithic and members of its middle management have often been at pains to distance themselves from senior management. It has thus been possible for senior and middle members of Admin to take executive positions on the Staff Associations.

In 1986 a program of rationalisation and restructuring was inaugurated at UDW. One of the reasons for this move was to streamline administration and make it more cost-effective. The Vice Chancellor's Newsletter described it as the need for "the employment of management principles applicable to any other organisation of comparable size."[13]

Another was ostensibly to decentralize power. A management expert was brought in who investigated the way in which the University was run and made recommendations accordingly.[14] Not surprisingly, rationalisation did not alter power relations. The most visible change occurred in the top echelons where two Vice Rector positions were created. In general however there has been a mushrooming of administrative structure while the more shadowy organisations which previously existed and where great power is centred, were left untouched. The most powerful of such structures is the Administrative Planning Committee - a constitutionless body

made up of the Rector, Vice Rectors and two other senior Admin members.

Beneath the two vice rectors is a large and growing and strictly hierarchicalised bureaucracy. Notions of scientific management are consistently referred to and implemented to ensure 'higher productivity'. At the beginning of 1988, for example, the weekly half day off traditionally enjoyed by administrative staff (secretaries, technical assistants, etc.) was withdrawn.[15] Similarly there has been a tightening up of lunch hour and everywhere staff have been made aware of their place in the system. Messengers, for example, were monitored more tightly and forced to obey certain dress codes. Notwithstanding these changes, productivity and efficiency at UDW remain at a pedestrian level. Simple administrative tasks take a long time to be attended to and there are many cases of inadequate job description leading to confusion and inefficiency. In one bizarre case, a dispute about dish-washing went all the way to the Rectorate before it was finally sorted out.

At most universities academics allege that Admin should be there to serve academics but that in fact it has arrogated to itself power and concentrates this power in itself. In so doing, they argue, it has subordinated academic interests and influence. Nowhere is this more true than at UDW. The proliferation of posts has entrenched Admin power without making the University more efficient as an intellectual centre. In fact, academics have far less influence yet, ironically, the process under way has been presented as giving academics a greater stake in the running of the University.

Power remains firmly controlled by the Rector, Prof Jaap Greyling. At the end of 1987, amid rumours that his rectorship would not be renewed, Greyling won an important victory by getting his term extended until the end of 1990. Scarcely heeding the public advertising that UDW was a changing institution, and choosing to ignore the fact that he could no longer dictate to a quiescent Council, no longer under his good friend and ally, Gabriel Krog, and also refusing to allow his ailing health to deter him, Greyling has continued to *rule* the University. There are a number of explanations for this. The major one, I would contend, is that power relations had not changed and there was nothing to prevent him from continuing as before. Another consideration was that Dr Yusuf Minty, the new chairperson of Council, appeared to be somewhat in awe of Greyling and initially allowed Greyling virtually to dictate policy in Council.

The political climate also favoured Greyling's *kragdadigheid* and there appears to have been little outside pressure on him to opt for a more liberal line. Finally, the possible structural constraints on his power - specifically the two vice rectors - were not realised. These Vice Rectors actually have control over a number of policy areas. But both choose to defer to the Rector on most contentious issues. Both appeared to be more interested in placating the Rector apparently so as not to jeopardize their positions within the University, than in challenging Greyling's opposition to the limited reform initiatives which were coming from Admin. Occasionally the Vice Rectors do distance themselves from the Rector, for example in August 1988 when police entered campus and embarked on an orgy of violence against students. Smout, Vice Rector (Development) claimed at this point that the Rector was solely determining University policy in this regard.

Despite its professed commitment to academic excellence, UDW's administrators continue to act in ways which may be regarded as violating academic freedom. In general, there is not a tolerance for criticism or a climate conducive of debate. Speakers to campus are still vetted and there have been many instances where Admin has refused speakers the right to speak on campus. Organisers of seminars routinely have to justify to the Rectorate why one or other speaker should be allowed to speak on campus. In a rare show of enterprise the University created a newspaper, *Varsity Voice* and appointed former *Scope* editor, David Mullany as editor (August 1987). He was promised autonomy and editorial freedom. After a brave first issue where he actually questioned certain Admin decisions/views, subsequent editions became more and more tepid. COMSA was less frequently asked for its opinion and the newspaper became little more than a Public Relations mouthpiece.

Despite all of the above, the way in which Admin is presently constituted does allow some room for manoeuvre on the part of those who wish an alternative vision of the University to see light of day. Divisions along ideological and race lines in middle and senior management can, and have been, exploited. The University's avowed commitment to change and academic standards has also proved a convenient way of opening gaps and effecting change. Yet despite all this, Admin is still inescapably a force of reaction. The way it has grown reflects its origins in Bantu Education philosophy. There is a tendency, for example, to militarize the campus with the number of security guards being increased and a Campus Security Centre,

costing an estimated R1 million being constructed. There are many examples of Admin decisions along this line: allowing and indeed on occasion inviting police onto campus, of refusing to condemn Police violence against students and of action against politically active students.[16] The pattern is normally the same: At key moments the avowed lip-service paid to negotiation breaks down and dictate is chosen over consultation. This has resulted in the closing of the University, attempts to impose harsh entrance requirements in student admissions policy, encouraging international sport to be played on campus despite the international sports boycott and student protest and being one of the few universities not to protest the proposed de Klerk state subsidy cuts to crack down on campus dissent.[17]

Admin's relations with the other constituents of the University are characterised by the perception, which corresponds to the reality, that it is at the apex of the power pyramid on campus.[18] Campus is ruled by administrative fiat with little room for dissent. In relation to staff, Admin brooks little opposition. Departments are seen as subordinate to Admin and staff are held to be accountable, in the first instance to the Head of Department (HOD), and in the second instance to the Rectorate. The Vice Rector (Administration) visits each department yearly, ostensibly to find out how things are going. In reality the visit is seen as a watchdog function, aimed to remind staff of who is really boss. With regard to the Staff Association, the Rectorate have all too frequently indicated their intolerance of criticism, constructive or destructive, precisely because it threatens to take out of their hands the near total control that they presently exercise. All efforts to make COMSA an integral part of decision-making at the University are resisted and efforts to give COMSA the necessary clout to force Admin to listen are sabotaged. The most common tactic here is to prevent COMSA from communicating with its members by preventing it from holding meetings (Admin zealously controls the use of all lecture theatres) or by disrupting COMSA communication.[19]

The hierarchical structure of Admin has made it possible for COMSA to gain members. Resentment has been produced by the Admin policy of placing all those occupying nodes of power in authority over their subordinates. This means that many junior Admin staff have to ask their heads of section for favours. Heads of section have the power to make life very difficult for his juniors. Not surprisingly, this has produced either submissive or venal behaviour.

Widespread dissatisfaction among junior Admin staff meant that COMSA's Sub Committee for Admin staff was well supported. That Sub Committee has been active in both negotiating for a Union and in taking up issues like victimisation. The most celebrated one was the firing of a campus worker of nearly 20 years standing because he did not have a tractor driving licence. This was a decision taken despite the fact that the individual concerned had been driving a tractor for the University for much of this time! After COMSA intervention, he was reinstated. Such triumphs have given COMSA a reputation as the poor man and woman's protector. This notwithstanding, many Admin staff at the most junior levels have refused to join because they feel they are at risk if they join. Victimisation is that deeply embedded in the institution.

Council

Before 1988 the Council was under Gabriel Krog (former Director of Indian Education with a reputation for taking repressive measures against boycotting students (many of whom eventually found themselves in UDW!)). It was an exceedingly conservative body. A typical decision taken by this Council was the one not to participate actively in politics after a huge gathering of staff had requested Council to do so in August 1986.[20] Similarly in November 1987, Council refused to bow to a Senate, COMSA and SRC request that it condemn the proposed de Klerk subsidy cuts.[21] Council changed its colours in 1988. In an important election, the old guard were for the most part removed and many new, respected individuals took their place on that body. These included Vasu Gounden (former popular SRC president), Zac Yacoob (Leading NIC member) and Paulus Zulu (a researcher at Natal University and the first African to gain election to Council). Council also has a new chairperson, Dr Yusuf Minty, who has served Council for many years. Under his leadership, the new Council has still not shown a willingness to exercise a proactive role in the affairs of the University. While the political hue of Council has undoubtedly become rosier, it still appears to lack the necessary commitment to steer the University away from old practices. It is for the most part not yet prepared to side openly and partisanly with those forces within the University calling for clear change of direction. It has yet to begin the arduous work of democratic restructuring. At this point, for example, there still appears to be some resistance to the modest request from Senate that it double its representation from two

members to four.[22]

At the time of writing, the burning issue facing UDW is who will the next Rector be? This is a question for Council to decide. Progressives on campus who are seeking to follow the UWC model of transformation are fervently hoping that a suitable candidate will be selected to give UDW a Gerwelian character. Those who believe that something more than a new Rector is needed at UDW would probably go along with plans to find such a suitable person, but with the qualification that such a strategy should be in tandem with other measures aimed to distribute power more evenly throughout the University, rather than relying on the benevolence of the man or woman at the top.

There are times at UDW when even the smallest gap available for change and manoeuvre is closed down. In these instances, members of the Rectorate and Council come together to wield power in a naked and quite shameless way. On these occasions UDW regresses back to its origins and the awesome historical reality of its power is brought to bear. One such occasion occurred in late September 1987. The COMSA executive had mandated its chairperson, Professor John Butler-Adam to write a response to a letter which the Vice Rector (Development) Professor Michael Smout had written to the *Financial Mail* claiming that UDW was an open University. When the COMSA reply appeared in the *Financial Mail*, Butler-Adam was summoned to the Rector's office. Expecting an interview with the Rector alone, he was astonished and alarmed to find the Chairperson of Council, another Council member and the secretary of Council (the Administrative Registrar, Mr Malcolm Stewart) also there. He was told that the meeting had been initiated at the request of Smout and took the form of an interrogation despite the fact that COMSA had the right to express itself publicly and notwithstanding the fact that Butler-Adam had not been informed of the nature of the meeting or its true purpose. Here Council, conscious of looming elections and with a wish to crush the upstart Association, and the Rectorate combined in a show of strength, using procedures which were irregular but effective. They attempted to batter into submission the head of a University recognised association. Butler-Adam was told to apologize to Smout[23] and informed that he might have breached his conditions of service. The implication was that disciplinary action might follow and that Butler-Adam's Institute for Social and Economic Research might be prejudiced by his 'irresponsible' behaviour. Despite COMSA's support

it could not withstand such an onslaught. It acceded to the Vice Rector (Development)'s request that all COMSA communication with Admin go through him and a conciliatory letter was also dispatched to Smout. It should be added that the Admin has often resorted to such heavy-handed measures against anybody who has stood up to it. Prof Mick Lloyd, former Chair of the Staff Association, was victimised in a number of ways until basically forced to leave the University, while Dr Kapil Satyapal, one time chair of the Staff Association and Academic Staff Association, was recently involved in a dispute with Admin in which his job was on the line. In both instances, those concerned were in no doubt that their troubles emanated from having dared at one time to defy Admin.

Heads of Department

Admin views the heads of department (HODs) as the logical connection between itself and the general lecturer body. It therefore grants HODs authority and prestige. In the last couple of years professors and heads of department in particular have been given large new areas of responsibility, giving justification to van den Berghe's description of them as 'feudal barons'.[24] In areas such as the departmental budget, for example, HODs now have to go into great detail itemising and making provision for the minutest consideration. Much of this work was previously undertaken by Admin. The shifting of the administrative burden has not resulted in academics gaining more power - their budgetary energies only involve juggling the limited funds available within strictly defined parameters. Senior academics are in fact being sucked into a growing and increasingly Kafkaesque web of bureaucracy, spawned by prevalent notions of scientific management and institutional budgetary constraints and shaped by Admin's desire for control. Surprisingly there has been little resistance from the professors and HODs to this process. I think the reason for this is that many of the professors actually associate themselves with the idea of greater productivity. Many are politically timid and overawed by the face of power at UDW and many relish a process which locks senior staff members into a hierarchy more rigidly and which increasingly defines senior academics as part of the power structure (and thus creates distance between them and junior staff). If fiddling with the departmental budget actually bestows very little power on professors in terms of their financial independence, it does define the professor or HOD as the person responsible for this

important task. It gives him or her the knowledge too of how the system works, a knowledge to which junior staff are not privy. The HOD is thus placed in a powerful position vis à vis junior staff so that he or she may have greater access to conference funds and research monies because the procedure whereby monies are come by are only fully understood by that senior staff member who is the institutional link with the University exchequer. Red tape thus becomes one of the less obvious ways by which academics are either controlled, tied up, rendered relatively powerless or co-opted. Restructuring has meant that there has been a tendency for professors to come closer to Admin, even when some professors are actually in politically antagonistic positions to Admin. An effect of this is also to diminish their ability to lead. Professors are increasingly nothing more than administrators.

> *"They simply follow precedents, obey regulations, and move at the head of the crowd. Such employees lead only in the sense that the carved wooden figurehead leads the ship."*[25]

Professors, and especially HODS, for the most part identify themselves as the most senior and therefore the most knowledgeable sector of the University community. They do so in many ways, two of which will suffice to illustrate the point. They close ranks by reverentially using the title 'professor' at every point, reminding all non-professors of their exclusion from this esteemed position. They are also wont to resist efforts to reduce the social gap between academics and students. In Nigeria, van den Berghe identified the reservation of lavatories for exclusive use by senior staff as a key way of asserting this distance. The same mechanism is used by some HODs at UDW.[26]

UDW progressives have attempted to utilize the concentration of authority in the headship for the purpose of progress. Efforts to get professorships filled with progressives have met with some success. Progressive professors however have found it difficult not to perpetuate essentially unequal structures which in turn entrench rigid hierarchies. While they may have the best of intentions in using the HOD position to open up the University, somewhere along the line, their own academic ambitions come into play and they find it convenient to use existing definitions of power - in this way they close down space in the engine room of the university. So while espousing goals of openness, democracy and non-racialism for the University and society,[27] progressives in positions of power are often unconsciously responsible for entrenching existing power relations at UDW which

are the antithesis of these goals.

As professorships are vested with substantial power these positions are closely watched by Admin so that if at all possible 'radicals' do not slip through the net. (One way of legitimating this procedure is to insist on 'academic criteria' being strictly applied. In this way really promising academics have been kept out of UDW on the grounds of their lack of qualification, even though they have established a national or even international reputation). The University has therefore chosen to appoint where possible very conservative HODs. Amongst the most obvious such appointments are those to the chairs of Electrical Engineering and History in 1987 and 1988 respectively.

Staff
When UDW started, it struggled to get staff. For the most part, those that took up service were people without academic reputations, many of whom were re-treaded teachers or administrators. With few exceptions they fitted into the mould created by the legislation which created the University. This meant that they followed the syllabus set down for them uncritically and paid little attention to developing a tradition of critical discussion. Over time this changed. As the University grew bigger, it began to attract not just more staff, but academics who found it difficult to get jobs in the 'open' universities, either because of their race, or because of the fierce competition for jobs there. In the 1980s student and parent dissatisfaction about 'second-rate' lecturers accelerated this process. Younger, more radical academics, many of whom had undoubted potential to increase the University's research output, to initiate debate and to satisfy student demands for more relevant teaching were employed. For Admin, the sting in the tail of this policy is that many of these people were also prone to questioning and challenging the traditionally accepted ways of doing things at UDW. The University sought to create a balance between bringing in new blood and maintaining the old ethos of the University. One way of doing this was to employ the new young staff members in temporary positions where they were given large workloads and could be dispensed with if they became troublesome.[28]

In general, staff at UDW are politically inert. At important moments in the history of the University, they have voiced their dissatisfaction about the state of affairs, which has often included implicit criticism of the Rectorate. Nevertheless, for the most part,

they appear content to do their jobs without being unduly concerned about the political and bureaucratic context of that work. As indicated above, the Admin encourages staff to act in this way: staff are rarely consulted and normally informed only via bland written statements that would not be out of place in a dour government department. Little effort is made to make staff feel at home, or to build up a staff identity with 'their' institution. There are, however, additional pressures which can have a politically or even academically paralysing effect on staff: becoming involved in bureaucracy serves to tie up staff to an inordinate degree. Library procedures, for example, can lead to hours of fruitless endeavour either when books have to be placed on reserve or withdrawn. And photocopying procedures are amongst the most cumbersome this author has come across - the head of department's signature is needed for each copy or batch of copies and then the work is given over to a person responsible for this task so that it may be weeks before a particular piece of work is completed. Staff in some departments are also tightly monitored by their heads of department, leaving them little leeway to implement any changes which might make their lives easier. All the above alienate staff from their own work processes. In addition there is still clear discrimination against female members of staff. Maternity leave is not provided and there is not a lot of sympathy for the predicament of mothers-to-be. Not long ago, a member of staff who failed to notify the Admin of her confinement was actually prohibited from coming onto campus as punishment for this 'crime'.

Having made some general points about the subordinate place of staff at UDW it is also necessary to point out that various pressures have succeeded in effecting some changes. Whereas the concept of maternity leave simply didn't exist at UDW ten years ago, now there is at least the possibility that women can have children without being fired and that they may use their accumulated academic leave as maternity leave. In addition, COMSA's woman's Sub Committee has managed by negotiation to get the Admin to accept the idea of a campus creche and in all likelihood this will be operating in the near future.

What is the potential of the staff to transform the University? Over ten years ago Geoff Budlender offered the sobering answer to this question.

"Our universities are not as they are because of pressure by the twin evil ogres of the state and big business - they are as they are because the majority of staff and students happen to prefer them that way". [20]

While conditions have changed quite a lot since 1977, there is still a substantial amount of truth in this statement. This is because for many, status in society derives from working at the University and therefore there are good reasons to support the institution as it is. At UDW I would argue that the majority of staff are generally content with the way the University is, and the large minority which is not, are not prepared to challenge it, though are prepared at key moments and on key issues to stand up and be counted.

It has been argued that teachers adjust to their environment in different ways.[30] At UDW the most common response is to accept prevailing conditions and eventually to see them as correct. As Gwala has argued, many academics at ethnic universities (particularly before the new wave of young radicals began taking jobs at these universities) fall into exactly this mould.[31] These staff members do not see Admin as irrefutably aligned with 'the system', they do not see themselves as 'we' nor Admin as the 'they'. They are unlikely to become critical of the University at this point because most enjoy permanent tenure (and the perks which go with it). Academic salaries have also been regularly topped up at a time when the recession is biting deep and alternative jobs in both the public and private sectors are becoming increasingly difficult to get. Furthermore the House of Delegates continues to receive their support. The Anti-tricameral campaigns of 1984 had widespread success but did not destroy petty bourgeois support. Despite the outrageous antics within the House of Delegates (for example over the contested findings of the James Commission [1988] and the expulsion of Rajbansi from Parliament [1989]) the body probably has increased its credibility because it is clear that it will not disappear and there is no clear alternative on the horizon particularly as the State of Emergency has succeeded in terminating the push for 'alternative structures'. Another obvious reason for its continuing support is that the House is a conduit for power and money which serious politicians and the petty bourgeoisie are unlikely to ignore. The above is not meant to suggest that staff in this category are immutably bonded to roles of subservience. There is a recognition among progressive staff that these staff members should and can be moved into a more progressive camp. At various moments in the recent past, for example the mass meeting to protest the 'paralysis' of the Admin in August 1988 when students were 'dispersed' by police on campus, large turnouts of staff (in this case nearly 600) indicated their displeasure and their willingness to

condemn. But such peaks are invariably followed by staff sinking back into the old UDW ways where Admin practices are accepted as the right way of doing things.

A less common response amongst staff can be termed strategic redefinition. This challenges existing views and prevailing definitions and attempts to engineer changes in the way things operate within the institution. E P Thompson offers a description of what I take to be the typical strategic redefiner: Those belonging to a

> *"shabby sub-Establishment, part literary, part academic, part Dissent, part poaching, which has been watching that Establishment.... resisting its pretensions, throwing back its encroachments".* [32]

Such a sub-Establishment has only a small presence at UDW and therefore a limited capacity for change. So deeply ingrained are various authoritarian or bureaucratic practices that this group cannot hope to monitor or change them. While numerically there may not be a huge number of strategic redefiners, there are a growing number. Yet they operate in a hostile environment where the big axe is never far from the neck. It is possibly for this reason that staff politics have centred on the creation of a 'progressive identity' and not on challenging for power. An effect of this situation is that an espoused commitment to change is often not translated into a challenge for power. Those (the few) who are in the vanguard of the struggle for a more equitable and democratic distribution of power at UDW are backed, only at the level of rhetoric, by their progressive colleagues. There is no tradition of 'an injury to one is an injury to all', of collective action and collective responsibility for that action. When victimisation against those vigorously engaged in the struggle for power occurs, the victim is left, bar a few notable and laudable exceptions, to feel the full weight of UDW authoritarianism. Efforts to challenge what may widely be seen as straight victimisation are limited to pronouncements of outrage. Unfortunately these are, in the context of UDW's power relations, insufficient to protect the victim. A more dismal effect of such events is that while they excite the imagination of staff for a moment, they soon evapourate. Things return to normal and organisations which might have been involved in taking up the issue have little to show for their efforts other than worsened relations with Admin. Staff who had the courage, for example, to sign petitions and attend meetings, at the end only have

the awesome power of the Admin and the relative weakness of the Staff Association to mull over.

COMSA
The organisation acknowledged to be the flag bearer of progressive staff values on campus is the Combined Staff Association (COMSA). Before 1987 when its constitution was finally accepted and it became a recognised part of the University's structures, two staff associations had existed: the Academic Staff Association and the Staff Association. The former was a small body created to promote the interests of academics, the latter was a body to which all staff belonged because it administered the group life assurance scheme. Neither body was recognised as representing staff interests by the Admin. Nevertheless executive members met not infrequently with senior members of Admin on various issues. Admin tended to accept advice or views proffered, only when it suited them. When disagreement occurred, Admin simply ignored staff representation and even refused to meet Association representatives. This led to an intolerable situation and in April 1986, when Admin refused to recognise the right of the Associations to represent staff on the issue of maternity leave, the Associations registered their objection by dissolving themselves. An Interim Committee was established late in May with a mandate to bring COMSA into being which it duly did. Part of its success was due to the gaps already opening up in Council because it was the Booysen Council Committee which recommended the acceptance of the COMSA constitution. This was a very important development because it gave COMSA the right to operate on campus and to be heard. (These were rights which had been mere privileges for COMSA's predecessors.)

COMSA consists of a central executive with five standing sub-committees and two ad hoc sub committees all comprising of about 10 members each. It has access to the governing body of the University (the Council) via the Council-COMSA Liaison committee.

COMSA's structures are not empty shells. At times of crisis, COMSA committees met up to 5 times a week, while at other times the executive met routinely every week or fortnight. Alarmed by this dynamism, the rector on one occasion wanted to know how much time executive members spent doing COMSA work with the implied threat that the body was too active and that its office-bearers were therefore neglecting their official tasks. Further evidence of his animosity and suspicion was his vetoing of COMSA's request for secretarial

assistance - an ironically inconsistent decision![33]

COMSA's effectiveness however was severely proscribed by becoming entangled in the horrendous web of UDW officialdom. While UDW generally operates in a very bureaucratic fashion, COMSA has been forced, or has conceded to operating in an grotesquely exaggerated bureaucratic fashion in its dealings with Admin. In late 1987 the Rectorate expressed displeasure at various COMSA activities. It consequently implemented a communication process which must rank amongst the most cumbersome in operation at any University. All communication between COMSA and the Admin has to pass through the Office of the Vice Rector (Development). Here is an example of what this leads to: A member of a COMSA sub committee wishes to know what maternity benefits are offered at the University. He/she must communicate this wish to the Chairperson of COMSA who then, on behalf of the Sub Committee member addresses the request for information to the Vice Rector. (The COMSA chairperson is the only accredited communication channel with Admin.) The Vice Rector will then act as a gatekeeper to decide whether the person responsible for such matters in Admin might release the information. If he decides in favour, the request is then directed to the Admin member concerned, whose reply must be directed back through the Vice Rector's office to the COMSA chairperson for attention by the Sub Committee member. Apart from being ponderous, prone to political intervention and time-consuming, this process generates a huge amount of work for COMSA personnel which may yet cripple the organisation or make it so inefficient that it cannot properly serve its members.

COMSA's effectivity in terms of contesting the predominant power relations on campus is clearly damaged by Admin hostility. On at least two occasions, notices of meeting and other COMSA publications were held up (the Vice Rector (Development) claims the right to vet all COMSA publications and the Rector is provided with all 'contentious' COMSA documents submitted for reproduction to the printing unit) forcing COMSA to print the documents off campus. But COMSA's impact has also been impaired by taking up a large number of issues which did not challenge power relations but were broadly justified as bringing COMSA into line with other 'progressive' bodies. An additional, though not unproblematic consideration, was the perception that by becoming a high profile progressive body, COMSA would attract members.[34] Here I refer to the diligent way in which

COMSA became involved in considering the academic boycott, in framing a mission statement[35] and in assisting to launch the national progressive staff association, UDUSA.[36]

Despite these reservations, COMSA has achieved a great deal in its short period of existence. The commitment and energy exhibited by its members must surely be some kind of model for other staff associations. None witnessing the personal risks taken by the chairperson of COMSA in confronting armed police, and by the Vice chairperson in standing up to the Rector on more than one occasion can doubt this. Apart from responding to crises, office bearers and Executive members skillfully used lacunae in the existing power structure to effect changes. The shape of Council was affected and efforts were made to get appropriate applicants to apply for professorial posts which had hitherto been shunned by academics from the 'open' universities. The general progress in developing an independent staff identity was reflected in convincing Senate at various critical junctures, to make decisions which were not simple reflexes of Admin thinking. Yet I think that in two ways its political goals might not be realised (for personal commitment was never a guarantee of success). I think that COMSA does not have a clearly thought-out theory of transformation. Although it has not, to my knowledge, been expressed in this way, there is a belief amongst progessives at UDW that power will be realised according to a two stage, top-down theory of transition. First the University will become non-racial, and then in the second phase there will be major democratic changes, generated by the newly created non-racial ethos of the institution. Intertwined with this view is a heavy emphasis on the power of ideology (explained in Gramscian terms by those influenced by Marxist theory amongst the progressives) and the necessity of changing the way the University is perceived by itself and the wider community. Apart from this problem, there has not developed within the staff associations a tradition of resistance (for want of a better phrase) or a commitment to seizing power to match the now frequent expressions of a commitment to a non-racial future. While pronouncements of non-racial goals is an important part in attempting to achieve non-racialism on campus, the emphasis given to this tends to conceal the equally (if nor more) important task of redistributing power on campus. The 'creation of a non-racial identity' at UDW is only half the task, the other part consists in utilizing spaces in the existing power structure (a development which is

already underway) *and* confronting those aspects of the power relations at UDW which are impervious to ideological pressure or subvention.[37] In addition it is unwise to place as much reliance on the power of senior academics as COMSA does. As I have indicated above professors are part of the power structure and while many are dedicated to changing the University this does not mean that they will necessarily manifest a corresponding commitment to democracy in their own departments. It is vital that structures which place limits on the exercise of power, which demand consultation, participation and accountability be an essential adjunct to the policy of inserting progressives into power. For the moment it may be sufficient, for example, to try and liberalize Senate. But in the longer term serious debate has to be conducted on the status of Senate itself. Does a democratic University really require that a body of professors make all academic decisions? COMSA should begin to rely on its organisational strength rather than the accident of having senior academics in its ranks. It therefore has a duty to activate its membership and break down the barriers of passivity which presently characterize the majority.

Students

Ever since the inception of the University, Students have been challenging the nature of the University and those in authority. In the 1980s, as the national political climate changed and UDW student militancy became more intense, students won an important place within the University's political operations. A continuous policy of unbending negotiation and confrontation have won the students a right to be heard. And when crises beset campus these days, it is axiomatic that SRC members will be consulted about possible solutions. As with staff gains, these are not irrevocable. Admin has tried to break SRC power on a number of occasions. Possibly the most notorious was it willingness in 1986/7 to cooperate with the police in framing public violence charges against seven UDW students including SRC executive members, President, Vasu Gounden, Arnold Hansrajh, Michael Singh and Max Moodley. In 1988 and 1989 when violent disagreement broke student unity and created two hostile political positions around SANSCO and AZASM, the Admin appeared to exploit the situation by denying that the SRC was any longer worth dealing with as it could not control the student body. Other measures which the Admin appear to have applauded, if not at least condoned,

was the detention of student leadership under the state of emergency regulations - the Presidents, Ashraf Adam and Kovin Naidoo, and two other senior SRC executive members, Dennis Nkosi and Abin Badal. The lack of leadership during the crucial second half of 1988 (and before that, many of these leaders had been underground and unable to lead the student body as before) assisted Admin to deal piecemeal with student grievances and to take action against 'troublemakers'. The major gains made during this period by Admin, was the clearing of militants from the residences. In August 1988, the residences were the targets for police action and in May 1989, with the SRC clearly unable to control the residences, the Rector has seized the opportunity to close the University, having expelled two residence students beforehand.

Despite their best efforts, the SRC has not yet procured representation on Senate, Council or even the Faculty Boards. One reason is that much of their energy is still directed outwards into national politics, another is unthinking adherence to a boycottist line where any entry into the University's power structures is seen as collaboration.

The picture of student achievement and failure is a complicated one. The success in creating the SRC and making it a central part of UDW politics and in demonstrating that students can be united on particular issues to make forceful challenges to the Admin's vision of the future are really significant advances. Yet latterly, leadership disputes, internecine political strife, allegations of corruption and favouritism, the changing nature of the student body, have all rendered the SRC a less effective body. Effort was made by AZASM to wrest control of student politics away from the SANSCO students who controlled the SRC. More worryingly, despite the change in national politics where questions of participation as opposed to boycott have been debated, at UDW the boycott tradition has been unquestioningly maintained despite, on a number of occasions, the better judgement of SRC members. It is difficult to locate exactly where student policy is now generated but in the residences there are students many of whom feel alienated from the oppidan students, who have their own particular grievances and traditions of operation and do not neccessarily accept the SRC as their representative. The situation is made more complex by the fact that many Indian students have moved away from the anti-tricameral radicalism of the mid 1980s and are now well aware of the crisis of employment in the House of Delegates Education department. Many Indian students are

understandably more concerned with finding a job than with political activism. They reflect changing political and economic realities - a deep recession and political retreat. This phenomenon is likely to widen rifts in the student ranks because many African students are still in touch with and involved in simmering township politics yet their prospects of a teaching job are far better given the skills shortages in DET and KwaZulu schools.[38]

The huge increase in the number of African students is obviously a very important development. There can be little doubt that levels of militancy have been fueled by their increased presence and styles of political activity have likewise been affected.[39] During the period under discussion, close (as opposed to merely formal) links with COSAS and SANSCO was an effect of their presence, while many students were also involved in local township youth congresses which gave the student body added linkages to wider struggles in the area.

The racial composition of the student body is itself a site of struggle. The Admin, the Hurt Commission (set up at the end of 1988 to investigate campus violence) and the authors Oosthuizen et al[40] all see African students as a threat. Some COMSA members see them as the bearers of a new dawn, while others still, adhere to libertarian notions of freedom of entry. The result is that on the one hand, COMSA has established a Bursary scheme for student in financial need (conceived of as primarily African students)[41] while on the other, Admin has tried to limit in numerous ways the intake of African students - by manipulating entrance and by tightening up residence requirements. Admin has already moved to a more sophisticated strategy to deal with the accompanying militancy of African students: It has used a variety of measures to prevent older, male African students (those most likely to be 'radical') from entry to the University. The response of staff is unclear, not least because race has often been seen as the key factor, and consequently the differentiation of the student body in terms of age, sex and political orientation has been overlooked. Trapped in their own rhetoric of non-racialism, the progressive staff are not able easily to respond to changes of tack by Admin.

But there is an additional problem which has yet to be tackled by either students or staff: as UDW becomes a non-racial university, much greater attention will have to be given to the inclusion of African staff members. At the moment it is only in the African Language departments that permanent African academic staff are to be found.

Trade Unions

The changing racial composition of UDW has had important implications for the types of political organisation deemed to be appropriate for employees. The movement of Indians into senior positions within Admin has tended to break down political appeals based on Indian-ness. Indian workers in the lowest paid jobs in the University do not identify with those Indians who now occupy senior positions and are therefore in direct authority over them. This has allowed for forms of class organisation to emerge among University workers. In 1988 efforts were made to unionize campus workers. A confusing situation arose where three unions were involved in this process: CCAWUSA (for the workers employed by private contractors in the canteens), NEHAWU (for campus workers) and TGWU. A debate about which union should undertake the major task of organising occurred. Some felt that TGWU was the more appropriate union, having already successfully organised on the Durban campus of Natal University and being an old and experienced union with skilled negotiators and organisers. Others argued that COSATU's general ruling that all employees at universities should come under NEHAWU should determine the position. Despite the fact that the TGWU Natal University shop steward was closely associated with the unionisation drive, it was NEHAWU which prevailed. The fears of sceptics that this was an unfortunate choice were rapidly realised. While many workers joined, little was achieved. After a month subscriptions were no longer being collected. The NEHAWU organisers visited campus most infrequently and failed to set up recognition talks with Admin and were not skilled or experienced enough to deal with the University's time-wasting hostility to the whole enterprise. (Like all big employers, UDW tried to discourage workers from joining with implied threats of victimisation and the like.) Recognition talks are critical, because until NEHAWU is recognised, it will effectively lie outside the power structure of the University. Previous staff associations experienced the result of this status - being ignored and not taken seriously. It may be looking too far into the future, but surely one of the long-term goals of the Union must be representation on the Council.[42]

Conclusion

UDW can with some justification claim to be a non-racial university. A look at the composition of the student body will bear this out and despite efforts to reverse the process of racial blending, it would seem

that financial and political imperatives will prevent a return to the 'old days'. But UDW remains an ethnic university in its mode of operation. 'Ethnic' never meant simply that a University was designated for one racial or national group. The description also referred to the type of University the institution actually was. In the case of UDW I have argued that it remains characterized by unequal relations of power and control which although altered in important ways, are vulnerable to counter-attack and weak on the offensive. While it is true that some of the agents occupying the structures of power have changed this is not an unproblematic way of securing vision three. Benevolent dictatorship was never as good as bottom up, thorough going democracy. And surely this is what UDW's progressives should be aiming for? The progress which has been won, painstakingly and at some cost, will best be secured by broadening out COMSA, inserting it as far as possible into the decision-making process of the University and ensuring that those senior staff members of progressive bent who are in positions of power are constantly reminded of the greater tasks that lie before them.

Footnotes

1. In 1989 over a third of UDW students are African.
2. This goal is to be found in the motto of the COMSA, "committed to a non-racial, non-sexist and democratic University and Society".
3. See J Greyling, "UDW in Perspective", **The Year at UDW, 1987**, p4.
4. **Council Decisions**, 6 October, 1986, point 6.
5. See I Evans, *"Intellectual production and the production of intellectuals in the South African racial order"*, Unpublished paper to Conference on Economic Change, Social Conflict and Education in Contemporary South Africa, University of Essex, March, 1989. The thrust of this paper is that black intellectuals need to be produced and that knowledge production must more accurately reflect the racial demography of the country.

6. The distinction I make here is drawn from the theoretical debate about agency and structure. See EP Thompson, **The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays**, Merlin, London, 1978 and G A Cohen, **Karl Marx's Theory of History A Defence**, Clarendon, Oxford, 1978, p35-7.

7. This should not be taken as reverence for or idolisation of the 'open' universities. Across the world, university freedoms are being eroded and the situation in SA is no different.

8. N Gwala, *"State Control, Student Politics and the Crisis in Black Universities"* in W Cobbett and R Cohen (eds), **Popular Struggles in South Africa**, ROAPE/James Currey, London and Sheffield, 1988, p167.

9. E P Thompson, **Writing by Candlelight**, Merlin, London, 1980, p13.
   10. R Singh, *"The University of Durban-Westville: The struggle for a progressive identity"*, unpublished paper, 1989, p6-7.

11. The Vice Chancellor's Newsletter, 6, 1, April 1987.

12. **The Vice Chancellor's Newsletter**, 5, 2, April 1986.

13. **Vice Chancellor's Newsletter**, 5, 3, September, 1986, p2.

14. This is an extraordinary case of historical mimicry. In 1968 Warwick University engaged a firm of 'industrial consultants' to investigate administrative efficiency. These consultants recommended increased attention to economies, increased student/staff ratios, a senior assistant for the principal, more power for the principal, a reduction in power of academic committees and "nurturing its reputation for high academic achievement!" Thompson, **Candlelight**, 1980, p22-3.

15. **Varsity Voice, 1, 2, Feb 1988.**

16. A SANSCO activist and former Unizul student, Jabi Sikhosana, had to go to the Supreme Court to get his registration reinstated after a period in detention was deemed to have nullified his duly performed certificate.

17. See **Varsity Voice**, November 1987, p1.

18. In a book which is rich in parallels, Pierre van den Berghe describes the arrogance of administrators at the Nigerian University of Ilosho in similar terms. "Although the senior staff is regularly under attack from below, it knows that its position is secure. As the apex of the country's education pyramid, its skills are indispensable, or at least thought to be so." **Power and Privilege at an African University**, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1973, p80.

19. For example, in November 1987, Greyling prevented COMSA from issuing its COMSA NEWS on the spurious grounds that this publication might infringe the de Klerk regulations! (Minutes of a COMSA Executive Meeting, 9 November 1987.)

20. **The Vice-Chancellor's Newsletter**, 5, 3, September, 1986, p5.

21. **Varsity Voice**, Nov 1987, p4.

22. **Varsity Voice**, Nov 1987, p6.

23. Minutes of a COMSA Executive Meeting, 5 October 1987.

24. van den Berghe, **Power and Privilege**, p129.

25. Peter (1969), quoted in P N G Beard, *"Heads of departments as leaders"*, in **South African Journal of Higher Education**, Vol 2, No 2, 1988, p48.
26. van den Bergh, **Power and Privilege,** p73.
27. COMSA has for example been very active in placing newspaper advertisements calling for the release of detainees, condemning the de Klerk proposals etc.
28. UDW has a policy of keeping 30% of its academic staff in temporary positions, ostensibly to give it financial flexibility. In fact this policy has powerful political usages - ensuring quiescent behaviour by staff anxious to have their contracts renewed or getting rid of those who openly challenge the Administration. The author was himself the victim of this policy losing his job after lecturing in the History Department for four years. **The Vice Chancellor's Newsletter**, 5, 3, Sept 1986 p5; **The Vice-Chancellor's Newsletter**, 6, 2, May 1987.
29. G Budlender, *"The Conservative Bias of South African Universities"*, in H W van der Merwe and D Welsh (eds), **The Future of the University in Southern Africa**, David Philip, Cape Town, 1977, p264.
30. Lacey has argued that there are three basic responses: internalised adjustment, strategic compliance or strategic redefinition. P Robinson, **Perspectives on the Sociology of Education**, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1981, p106.
31. N Gwala, *"State Control, Student Politics and the Crisis in Black Universities"*, in W Cobbett and R Cohen (eds), **Popular Struggles in South Africa**, ROAPE/James Currey, London/Sheffield, 1988, p170-2.
32. Thompson, **Candlelight**, p36.
33. Minutes of a COMSA executive meeting, 28 September 1987.
34. See for example, discussion of the Academic boycott in **Comsa News**, No 1, October 1987.
35. Culminating in a COMSA Workshop on 9 November 1987.
36. COMSA hosted both the initial workshop which paved the way for the creation of UDUSA (on 24/25 October 1987) and the launch itself.
37. It is important to remember tha Universities elsewhere in Africa are staffed predominantly by Africans, yet this has not made them democratic. As van den Berghe notes for the University of Ilosho, Nigerian staff members were actually more conservative than the expatriates. **Power and Privilege**, p72, 80.
38. See R Morrell, *"Educational Struggles. Teachers and School Committees in KwaZulu/Natal"*, **Transformation**, 7, 1988.
39. This was a conclusion arrived at by the Hurt Commission which was set up in 1988 to investigate violence on campus, and which issued its report in 1989.
40. G C Oosthuizen, A A Clifford-Vaughan, A L Behr and G A Rauche, **Challenge to a South African University: The University of Durban-Westville**, Oxford University Press, Cape Town, 1981.

41. The fund was begun in late 1988 after long negotiations with Admin. Admin attempted to make the bursary a merit only award in the hope of gaining financial advantage via SAPSE (enrolling post-graduate students) and when COMSA refused to accede to this, withdrew their offer of financial assistance. The fund derives its monies from staff contributions.

42. A Bird, Address to the Conference organised by UTUSA, University of the Witwatersrand, September, 1986.

PUBLIC CULTURE

Volume 3 , Number 2

Transforming Heroes: Hollywood and the Demonization of Women
   Elizabeth G. Traube

The Averted Gaze in Iranian Postrevolutionary Cinema
   Hamid Naficy

Imaging Terra Incognita: The Disciplinary Gaze of Empire
   Ella Shohat

Shopping for Identities: "A Nation of Nations"
and the Weak Ethnicity of Objects
   Susan Hegeman

Fashion, Gender and the Bengali Middle Class
   Dulali Nag

War Talk
Two Days before the War: *Bruce Robbins*
Nine Days into the War: *Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and
   Lila Abu-Lughod*
Twenty Days into the War: *Jean Adelman, Kris Hardin, Michèle
   Richman, Serena S. Skwersky, Susan Stewart, Peter van der Veer*
Twenty-nine Days into the War: *Steven Feld*
Trooping the Colors on TV
   Carolyn Marvin

I enclosed $10 for a 1 year subscription to **PUBLIC CULTURE.** ☐
(Outside U.S.A. add $4.00 for postage)

Name _____

Address _____

City, State, Zip _____

Mail to: **PUBLIC CULTURE**
The University Museum, U of P, 33rd & Spruce Streets, Philadelphia, PA. 19104-6324;
or call in your VISA or MasterCard order: (215) 898-4054.