

MEETING & DISCUSSION**RE: MERGER UNIVERSITIES DURBAN-WESTVILLE &****NATAL****HELD IN DURBAN ON THE 13TH MARCH 2003**

OPENING ADDRESS BY THE CHAIRPERSON:

I want to welcome all of you to this conversation which will focus on the intellectual challenges in the new University to be formed out of the merger of the Universities of Natal and Durban-Westville, and I hope that you will find it very productive and generative in your own work at this University, and of course for any work that you may have off this University.

It's been of concern I think for a number of people that, although we have been very busy with the merger for a long time, we still need to address this particular academic project, that of, what are our challenges? And how are we going to meet those challenges in the new University?

The new University is a good excuse to think through our challenges and to work them out and maybe to rethink them. As publicly-funded intellectuals, we need to talk about our ideas and our initiatives in all our constituencies, and this is but one conversation in what must be a number of conversations that will occur on this campus and on the other campuses as well as when we get together.

/...

Because the conversation won't end at the debate about our intellectual challenges, and our character won't end, even when the new University is formed. In many ways, that would be an important stage, a new stage in that debate and I hope this conversation that we're going to have today will challenge and inspire us about the contents and direction of our research, our teaching, and our community engagements. As publicly-funded intellectuals, that is the very least that we can do, I think. I would like to introduce our colleagues who have very kindly responded to my call to people to share their ideas about these intellectual challenges that face us.

I wonder if Dr Pearl Sithole has arrived. Is Pearl Sithole here? Okay, if anyone sees her coming in, you might indicate to her when she comes in that she's on pretty soon after she gets in because she has another commitment. I have scheduled her first. But perhaps in place of that it would be Dr [Roy-name unclear] who has indicated that she needs to go as well. These women are very busy today. There's also Dr Jannie Smit who wants to talk about research; Professor Solly Dangor who will also be speaking; Dr Damien Darside; Dr Michael Samuel; Mr [name-unclear] Khan; Dr [name-unclear]; and Mr David Brown, whom I don't see here. He's coming in from the University of Natal and Ms [name-unclear].

Have I missed out anyone who's indicated that they want to speak? I guess so - oh here's Dr Sithole, okay. Well, why don't you join us?

[laughter]

DR SITHOLE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Sure. And you'd be very welcome. And you're not rushing anywhere, are you? If anyone is in a rush, you must tell me early so that we don't leave you out of the conversation because you're leaving early.

[Inaudible-from the floor]

CHAIRPERSON: You are? Okay, so I'll put you on fairly early as well. Maybe number 4 or something. We'll give one of the other people who are gonna be here a bit of a chance in between. Alright, there will be time for anyone else to respond after Professor Mahmood Mamdani has responded and I would particularly like to welcome Professor Mahmood Mamdani to UDW. He has very kindly agreed to act as Respondent. He's probably going to tell you that I twisted his arm, so I'd better admit it upfront.

Professor Mamdani is a Ugandan citizen who has worked at Makerere University - I'm sure he'll pronounce it correctly - from 1980 to 1993. Many of us know him from the time he spent at UDW in the early 1990's and of course from his books that is on the subject and, among others, as well as the more recent: "When Victims become Killers."

He has served as the Director of the Centre for African Studies at the University of Cape Town so he has a good sense of more than one University in South Africa and is currently the Professor of Government in Anthropology and Political Science at Columbia University.

In 2001 he participated at the Nobel Peace Prize Centennial Symposium on an interesting topic for our purposes: "The Conflicts of the 20th Century" and "The Solutions of the 21st Century." Mahmood is in Durban to participate in the annual international festival: "The time of the Writer" which is hosted by the Centre for Creative Art at the University of Natal. The Centre for Creative Art has had an arrangement with UDW for some years now, that some of the guests at their various festivals make presentations on this campus.

Although Mahmood responded in his characteristically modest way when I invited him, I think he's very well-placed to respond to our deliberations at this forum for intellectual creativity. "Time of the Writer" is about intellectual creativity and when I was asked why I wanted to deal with this topic at UDW I explained that intellectuals are very important in the creative development of a society and that we as intellectuals are particularly challenged right now to make both a critical and creative contribution to our institution and to our society.

So, the question of intellectual transformation of the University needs both critical and creative engagement as well

/...

as, of course, a lot of elbow grease - a lot of hard work. I know that across campus many people have been engaging with this issue, perhaps in meeting students, community, regional or national needs or understanding how the University is to be located, both here and in the geo-political context. But many of us have been exhausted by the many phases of restructuring that we've been through and many of us are in danger of falling into transformitis - a stupor induced by the [technicus-unclear] fiddling to which we have been subjected in the past.

But hopefully, this is behind us and we can now go forward energised and with Professor Mamdani to respond to us. Professor Mamdani will come in after the eleven speakers and after that there will be space for the audience to respond as well.

So, if you have any points you wish to raise, please bear them in mind and you should get a chance before 2 o' clock. I thank you.

I'd like to call on Dr Pearl Sithole from the School of Development Studies and more particularly Anthropology to make her five minutes' worth of presentation. I'm afraid I'm gonna have to be a little bit strict about the time so that everyone has a chance to respond.

--- oOo ---

DR PEARL SITHOLE ADDRESSES:

Thank you. Five minutes is a bit of a test, but I'll try. Basically, because of the time and because of the issue, I might

/...

just say that I'm delighted to make this noise and moaning in front of an objective eye. This must be treated only in that spirit. I cannot do more than that in the five minutes.

My submission today is basically about the context of transformation in higher education in South Africa and particularly the challenges for intellectuals. To start off is just to take it off from the national broad parameters, the policies of a higher education and the national slang in particular. The ideas and objectives of the national slang on higher education were, and I'm going to be doing an injustice, gross injustice, to most things today because of the five minutes, were basically about the fact that universities are expected to have a contribution in human resource development, in high-level skills training, in the production and acquisition of applied knowledge as one set of objectives and ideas. And in doing this they have to be mindful of the issues of redressing equity in terms of access, particularly to higher education and to higher education positions and that they need to respond to national development challenges and needs in doing research, in teaching, in community outreach, in promoting learning.

But the main issue that I'm going to raise today is basically the contemporary institutional culture in South Africa. I'm not going to be in detail about higher education, but I'm going to be in detail - oh no, I can't be in detail - about the context within which it happens. The one thing to note and the one thing

that's been prominent, and I have to say I have to talk from the experience that has been lived and filtering through today rather than anything textual, is that there is a high-level in institutional culture or political window-dressing. And this political window-dressing I will define it as a situation in which a good score on transformation is attained on the basis of profile of organisation members and political correctness of policies without much regard for the qualitative changes or implications for all those in the organisation.

And this, if you begin to unpack it - and I won't do much of that today - is basically talking about institutional profiling. And in institutional profiling we're looking at rectifying membership profile without analysing the lived impact of the actions on those affected than those used to profile. Profiling becomes a requirement to fulfil and it trickles down approach if assumed to take care of all the disadvantages that these people are put in place for profiling are supposed to be filling.

And thus there is less emphasis on issues like the conditions of employment for as long as these people are there, the type of positions that they are given, those that are front-in positions particularly must be quick positions to be given, a type of support and mentoring, the qualitative staff that regards - that has something to do with what kind of person we are putting in, we are making, in putting in these positions and what kind of support mechanisms are there - less emphasis on that.

The key issues in all this are basically of course the fact that there is an urgency in transforming the landscape of institutions, but also that this thing has to be done in the context of good economic principles and conditions as well, that is cost-effectiveness - and I don't have to stress how many times these things are observed in various sectors, education, health, and all the other institutions and departments, how transformation that is mindful of cost-effectiveness is an issue.

And these things also are done in a culture that standardises consumerism. I can't talk of consumerism as a culture - it is a [unclear]. But it's something that we have inherited from the previous dynamics of subjectivity whereby a superior country - you can look it at country level and you can look it at racial levels and various other levels - whereby the superior groups or parties have had to thrive in the economic searching whereby they produce, and the lower, less dominant parties have had to consume.

So, I'm submitting that in the - [one minute] - in this current phase, in the current institutional culture, there is a lot of consumption of policy at the moment and perhaps we can pride ourselves in saying that the government that we've had has been a leader in policy and has been intellectually doing that. There's a consumption of that and there is a - just like there has been a consumption of [unclear] before. I'm gonna have to wind up, but basically, the main challenges that I'm gonna be putting

/...

forward are that we need a conceptual framework that is mindful, a conceptual framework for transformation that is mindful of the following:

(1) The old problem of capitalism. Karl Marx must be turning in his grave to realise that we are still - we are now bored of talking this way but we haven't found a solution. It is capitalism, it's the refinement of it, it's now globalisation and all the stuff, but it's a conceptual framework that we need in transformation that will take into account the old problems of capitalism that will broaden the scope for institutional performance interpretation to include quality issues. That is where we are lacking and we need a transformation model that is going to be labour-intensive, that is going to induce people to be labour-orientated, to be wanting to unpack the impact, invest on the quality of life and basically trace the market-loops and the pyramids such that - you know the market-loops and the pyramids in the sense that the masses end up - the pyramids that our government is - same as for pyramid schemes for arresting and think critically in that fashion in any case.

What I'm saying is basically that there has been consultation, there has been participation, all in the name of democracy but one thing that we have not been able to be mindful of or have not found a strategy to integrate in everything that we're doing, including transformation in higher education, is

quality control, how quality is to be controlled and from whose perspective is the quality.

Is it from the perspective of the disadvantaged in whose name we are transforming? Are they really featuring in identifying the quality of things that are happening or is it the Constitution or is it the academics or is it the management or is it the government or is it the courts - whatever. What forms the assessment criteria?

And my last statement would be to say that we need a model that stresses the value of lived experience, a current - that says that a current life, life currently, is unique and is as important as a future life and groups in particular. When you talk about blacks, empowerment of blacks, this group of people, that group and empowerment and how you profile with them, is as important as the extension of individual interests, because this is where the quality or the value of what we are doing, lies.

Basically, what I'm saying is, extension of rights is as important as extension of ubuntu - humanity. And that is where I think we still need to extend ourselves.

Thank you.

--- oOo ---

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Pearl. [APPLAUSE] Thank you very much Dr Sithole for that first presentation. I think Dr [name-unclear] Roy has indicated that she wants to go next. Are you in less of a hurry than - okay. I'm going to have to ask the

/...

speakers to self-select. You might know that - because you know what you're going to say and I don't quite know what most of you are going to say. If you think that what you say follows on from Dr Sithole, maybe you would like to follow? Okay Dr Bob, from the Department - well, now we have the director of the [unclear] Administration and also Geography.

--- oOo ---

DR ROY ADDRESSES:

Good day, everyone, and a particular welcome to Professor Mamdani. We always look forward to your visits and your critical eye. I just wanted to quickly raise issues and probably more from a personal perspective than from an academic or intellectual or any other perspective. Like many people in the audience today and certainly the majority of the staff on this campus, many of whom taught me, or are currently, and I think are currently my colleagues, I really think that universities play an important role in shaping our lives and who we are.

And therefore the transformation is not just something that is happening out there, but it is impacting on perhaps how we think of each other, how we think of ourselves and then how we think of the foundations we've created and they may not be building the institutions the way we like, we've thought we struggled for decades ago.

I want to raise very quickly three issues, particularly because I suspect that I know many of the speakers and they're

/...

gonna raise the critical issues anyway, so I thought I will just focus on three aspects and each person as they come along can build and we can really test Professor Mamdani's capacity to address all our concerns.

The first issue is that of realism and what exactly are we creating, what type of higher education system are we creating. There is much criticism in South Africa around the market-driven nature of the systems we produce and I think Pearl spoke clearly on that matter. But also in terms of whether we're educating or we're training. I suspect that being involved in higher education at various levels for the past five years, we're rapidly moving towards training rather than education, educating being ensuring that we train ourselves and our students to think critically and being critical is obviously a very difficult thing, because the likelihood is you're going to get yourself into trouble consistently and you may not end up driving the BMW and the 4x4.

Additionally, I think it is important to talk about, and I would like to have some views on this, when we're creating this higher education system, how are we dealing with power? To me that is the central issue. It's clear that we have a range of power issues that we need to come to terms with and quite rapidly if the transformation is gonna achieve the rhetorical objectives of equity, of realism, of creating institutions that are reflective of South Africa and where we want to be and what we

/...

want to achieve. And the politics and power to me reveals itself in various ways, the most obvious of which is the way in which leadership at universities has evolved.

When Vice-Chancellors I think earn more than the President and many, many corporate executives, I think we're kind of in trouble, because we're packaging what is supposed to be intellectualism and we're putting a price tag on it and it's out there and it can be bought and sold. And I think that, you know, this is a general problem and it is particularly prevalent in institutions going rapid transformation which creates the space for people to start positioning and for those in power to either use it or abuse it as they see fit. Because there's very little accountability and transparency going on and openness in terms of those issues.

Linked to power, of course, is the question of who speaks for whom and how decisions are made. Again, I think there's tremendous evidence that participation can range from tokenism to just being there and giving credibility to actually participating in the decision-making and I'd like to raise the question: what kind of participation is taking place? How are decisions being made? Who speaks for whom? Obviously, personally I know that I'm an African-centered person, I'm a black woman, that's how I define myself, but I have to tell you I feel consistently uneasy when the Organisation for African Unity when they sit and take time and take their photographs and they are all male.

/...

And when we have management structures throughout the country in higher education that are dominantly men. And of course they claim they're sensitive to gender needs and other needs but really I think we've learnt sufficiently that nobody can speak for each another. We must learn to speak for ourselves and if we're interested in true empowerment, we must empower those who we think are not articulate to be able to speak for themselves and I don't think that's going on in higher education.

The whole question of perception and power relations, I think, is also important. And finally, because I really think that is, you know, I want to reach the point where Professor Mamdani can help us to resolve some of these issues, how do we become consistent, how do we become open and transparent and who are we accountable to? There's so many stakeholders, the students we serve, the taxpayers who pay our salaries - we're a public institution, the civil society that we are supposed to be embedded in. Who do we serve and how are we accountable and is what we're doing in higher education, especially the way we're transforming, is it open and transparent?

Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

--- oOo ---

CHAIRPERSON: Thanks. It seems as though our sound system is a little bit crazy. Someone is sitting near a mike that is crackling. It sounds like it's fixed. Thank you. And perhaps you'd make sure it stays, you know, is it coming back? Because

/...

sometimes the lights doesn't work but the system might be - oh okay. It generally helps if you switch your system off, although sometimes the lights don't work too well. Thank you. Is there - I would like to - [Name-unclear] would you like to follow?

[NO SOUND ON TAPE]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER ADDRESSES:

Thank you very much. It's just because my comments are in keeping with the previous two speakers that I'd just like to extend on it. Thank you Professor Mamdani, as always, for coming and, you know, allowing us to engage with you.

I'd just like to make two major points that are inter-related about the challenges. Firstly, the idea of intellectual challenges in the new University cannot be seen as independent or isolated from the broader socioeconomic challenges that face our society.

And, secondly, the issue of the curriculum content that we teach at our universities currently and how this needs to be addressed within the new University.

The new University must therefore ultimately locate itself within the context of advancing an agenda that is founded on the basic principles of social justice and equity as was raised by the previous speakers. And such principles of necessity must ideally include the notion of equal access and equal opportunity for all to higher learning. We have, however, seen how such ideals very often become marginalised in the face of the onslaught for

markets that has begun to define the nature of higher education in this country particularly.

And we've also witnessed how our processes of transformation in the tertiary education sector have necessitated the creation of academic programmes that will produce graduates who are prepared for the corporate world, which is a world that only serves to underscore the logic of a new liberal ethos. The new University must therefore be a place that challenges this, and it is in this very context that it faces its biggest intellectual challenge. Well, it should ideally not become co-opted by the demands of a vicious, ruthless globalised world that has no understanding or sympathy for the plight of the indigent masses.

It is again equally at the mercy of such a globalist paradigm. Before it does not adapt to the ever-changing demands of the market-place, it will effectively be churning out graduates who cannot meet such challenges. Secondly, the issue of our curriculum content must be addressed, because I think for far too long our theoretical paradigms, with some exceptions, have been based on ideological constructs that are abstract or not really relevant to our geopolitical strategic interests. In other words, graduates are not necessarily being trained within a Pan-Africanist context, but a globalist paradigm and this is problematic for the following reasons:

Firstly, it often leads to the brain drain phenomenon that we've seen happening because the global village is being made to appear more attractive than remaining in our own context. And, secondly, the whole point that we don't seem to find our own context attractive enough to engage or continue engaging with it.

But I think that all is not lost. We have these challenges, certainly, particularly at UDW, given our own history of social struggle against a tide of political and economic oppression. If we know anything, it is that we have always risen to meet such challenges and we cannot afford to fail to do so now. Our products, that is, our graduates, will only be as good as the ideals that we instill in them and it is this challenge that must remain our core focus. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

--- oOo ---

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you [name-unclear] and thank you for, you know, being so well within time. I think any of our younger members here might be happy to hear that we've always risen to meet our challenges and I hope we're going to continue to do so.

Dr Michael Samuel is indicating that he wants to go next. Speakers must let me know when they want to go. Thanks, Michael.

--- oOo ---

DR MICHAEL SAMUEL ADDRESSES:

Thank you very much for the opportunity of sharing some ideas, rudimentary though they may be. I'd like to have them

/...

challenged and listened to carefully. I think too much creative energy is spent at UDW on what might be called "successor regime talk." Where we're talking about entering into a competitive environment where one regime takes over another regime. And I think in the consequence of that particular kind of talk, we end up talking about who are victors and who are the vanquished.

I think this particular kind of approach to understanding mergers is really to simply enter into that competitive environment which we've been critiquing so often in our debates about globalisation as well. But in much of this successor regime talk you have a replacement of a world of, a kind of a positivistic world, or an empiricist world being replaced by a critical or radical world or, if you might take it on research dimensions, in terms of quantitative research being now replaced by a euphoria of qualitative research. I think these kinds of dichotomies are unuseful.

What we need to be looking is promoting a paradigm proliferation, a proliferation where the principles by which we think about what we are engaging with are more important than the people who are saying it. I think a lot of energies, at UDW particularly, we spend a lot of time thinking about attacking people, individuals, rather than concentrating on what principles we would like our new institution to operate with.

I believe that a University should be a discursive space within which several competing, conflicting, layered views are allowed to flourish. This does not mean that you simply accommodate each of them, but that discursive space is a healthy robust critical environment where principles are put up for debate, for scrutiny, for engagement with. So, in the way in which I see UDW we are extremely strengthened by the history of the experiences that we have had on this campus to take forward that kind of activation of the discursive space. It's unlikely that we will be vanquished. In fact, I believe that we would be victors in being able to bring about this new kind of environment.

I believe strongly that I am who I am because I know I'm dialoguing with you and you're define who I become so in the process I believe like [name-unclear] does that, if we want to, ideas and thought lie at the borderline between oneself and others. The word in language is only half your own - it's half someone else's, too. Language and thoughts are not mutual medium that passes freely and easily into your own private ownership. Instead, it's populated and over-populated with the others whom you engage with.

So, I believe strongly that the other is important to defining who we are. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

[NO SOUND ON TAPE - MIKE NOT SWITCHED ON]

--- oOo ---

/...

DR PATEL ADDRESSES:

I took up the challenge to respond to the topic as an opportunity to reflect about not the structures of universities and higher education, but rather maybe on agency and I try to think about what are the changes that I think I would need to make as an intellectual participating in this merger and to theorise some thoughts around that and I think I thought about - I just want to raise what I consider to be two maybe less spoken qualities of the intellectuals and both of these comes from the experience of the merger process and the events at UDW, but I'm not gonna refer to the events but rather to the process of trying to theorise and understand what they are.

So, let me just start with the first one. I won't name it just yet. My thoughts are that perhaps in retrospect and reflection it is surprising that, given that higher education institutions were important sites for the struggle against apartheid and also, as we know, the sites that provided intellectual support to apartheid, that they have escaped the confessional of the Truth & Reconciliation Commission.

It does seem curious now that there was no call from intellectuals, academics or civil society and maybe that's a question we should ask about why we had judges and business people and lawyers who participated in that process but not academics, especially those of us who know and experienced the history of places like UDW.

So, maybe one of the questions is not only why it did not happen, but perhaps the one more relevant for us in the merger is - could engaging such a process yield any benefit to the project of reconstructing a new institution with a new ethos, a new ethic, new notions of what social responsibility means, what new ethical responsibility means. Could it be useful to confront the pains and prejudices, the perceptions built over time that maybe it's necessary to create spaces for a kind of purging of the past which once presented, could be laid to rest so that new forms of relations and new knowledges could be constructed on actual information and actual relationships. So perhaps the widely held myth of superiority and inferiority, of racial [unclear] and positioning and counter-positioning need to be deconstructed deliberately and actively from within by creating carefully constructed spaces in which all voices can speak and be heard.

So that brings me to: do we need to become, do I need to become, a more forgiving, compassionate, less angry intellectual?

So that's perhaps the first quality of an intellectual, intellectualism that we need to maybe begin to discover too fine to define. And that brings me then to a second thought around discussions of intellectualism and what it means to be an intellectual. I find that the dominant form of intellectualism that is often espoused, here certainly, is the critical intellectual in which speaking out and acting against is valued, but critique and being critical I think needs to be rescued and reconstructed

from its apartheid meaning, form and function. Where to be critical meant to deconstruct, to destabilise, to destroy, in this it's rested on an axiom of them and us. It's rested on setting up boundaries, opposition, dichotomies and polarities. You are one of us or you are one of them. It's not possible to be both or to move between these. This I find in our young new developing democracy singularly unhelpful. In a country like South Africa with the distances between State, society and science, because that is our business, are smaller and the connections between these are still live-wired. So there are spaces. We are part of them and they are part of us. As academics and intellectuals we are simultaneously called on to participate in the development and implementation of new policies and processes which we know get played out through the conflicts and alliances of power, but then we are also expected and have another obligation and responsibility to stand apart and to critique the very policies in which we participate.

So, to enact in intellectualism that embraces bold as opposite and complimentary is what is needed for what I want to call another important quality we need to develop, which is a generative intellectualism. When I'm an academic, intellectual, teacher or researcher, I'm also mother, friend, woman, citizen. Some get foregrounded, some recede at any one time, but all are always present in how I act and how I think. So, what I'm

asking for perhaps of myself mostly is an intellectually honest intellectualism that recognises it and engages it in real terms.

So, what does it mean to be generative? To be generative means to take risks, to be brave and to be courageous, to put out ideas and then to take the criticisms that come with it. Why is it, especially for those of us who participate in senate and other key places, why is it that those who are most critical are often those who are least likely to put up an idea for being different or for doing something differently?

I think what we need to learn is how to take criticism as much as how to give it and that we in the doing of that, that we respect the dignity of each other, no matter how much we differ.

How else will the fragility of our apartheid-damaged intellectualism survive, heal and become creative? And so, that is the key thing. How do we find these creative spaces to enact creativity together with criticalness? A generative intellectual can only survive and find expression if all thoughts are thinkable and sayable and there is no political correctness, when all challenges can be posed and positions taken, but also positions can be changed. The commitment and the privilege to speak must come with the obligation to listen, to try to understand, even if we do not agree. A generative intellectualism is the means to counter the rampant importation and consumerism of knowledge, theories, research and practice, largely traded from the North.

A generativity legitimates our own thoughts, our own ways of doing, acting and being. It's about finding the courage to create alternatives, even if these very alternatives live or die in the politics of knowledge production. So, to be generative and to enact a generative intellectualism, is to actively create space for creativity. Only then will we create new curricula, create new social, political and ethically responsible professionals, researchers and knowledge producers and find new ways of connecting the social, political, economic and technological realities in which we all have to live each day.

[APPLAUSE]

CHAIRPERSON: There is so much inspirational material coming through. It makes me very proud to be here and Jannie Smit would like to be next.

[END TAPE 1A]

[TAPE 1B]

DR SMIT ADDRESSES:

The conditions of impossibility derived from the double standards practiced at universities in South Africa. This practice requires certain forms of excellence from white and more advanced students and applies a different set of criteria in the assessment of black or previously disadvantaged students. This latter set of criteria allows students to pass without applying the same stringent criteria to their work. Another reason for the

/...

need for this change comes from the fact that the same academics who allow this practice to continue, are also the academics who do not wish to put in the required time for enskilling students to optimally function within the learning-based system.

I believe that these two issues need to be addressed urgently, especially during the time of the merger, by each and every academic. Some of the issues that need our attention are the abolishing of all root-learning, the prescribing of academic articles and books and the abolishing of so-called notes and the Unisa-type study guides where students only study these to pass without engaging scholarly material.

The enskilling of students in the critical and analytical reading and discussion and interaction and dialogue of academic publications, the requiring of academic writing in the form of essays and assignments from the first level and I know of many academics, many senior academics, who have never engaged this activity. The requirement that all students write in an acceptable English throughout the University system.

The training of students: maybe I can say on that level that we find that students come into masters and doctoral levels without these basis skills. The training of students and staff in research design, the planning of the research process and in research proposal writing. I believe we need to set up a basic system through which staff members in need of such training can be accommodated in this new University. Such training is also

/...

needed in the seventh place for students where the universities in our country, including our own, have allowed to graduate without acquiring these and similar skills, because up to about 2 or 3 or 4 years ago, these were not part of the University system and many people left University without these skills. Mechanisms and systems in the University should be created to welcome these students back into academia and skill them and empower them to become intellectuals in their own right. We need to facilitate in the eighth and last place processes through which students and staff become critical African intellectuals in their own right and one of these processes would be through the developing of existing peer refereeing systems and incorporating more staff and students.

If every academic adheres to at least these requirements, we shall be in a position to start to develop research capacity and address the realities of academic under-development under which many are still suffering. That is where I want to conclude, but I think what we need to interrogate is this notion of conditions of impossibility. We still determine systems, especially our

University and also this new University, where we will have to look at the conditions of possibility on all levels of academia.

Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

--- oOo ---

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Dr Smit. I think it follows very well from Dr Patel's focus on the challenges of acting in

/...

community, the focus on research. Who would like to follow Dr Smit? Okay, Professor Tony from the - he's the Dean of Research. It actually follows very well. Thank you.

PROF TONY ADDRESSES :

Thank you. I want to start off with making a few confessions. Firstly, I want to say that I was inspired by yesterday's talk and discussion with [unclear] to the extent that I felt it would be necessary to also confess that I have been pro-merger. And this confession is deep-seated, because I truly believe that in this process of merging the two institutions, we would be able to create what I think is a truly South African institution for the first time in our history.

However, having said that, and in understanding what is happening, not only globally but even within South Africa in terms of transformation, I have some concerns. And these are basic concerns of transformation. With reference to the transformation of the higher education sector and the need to transform our institutions, I am concerned about the important stakeholders: (1) The role of the State. They have the will, and they have the commitment, but they don't know how. With reference to the managers, I think if you look at the status quo, most managers are concerned about keeping their own institutions alive and viable.

With reference to the workers, there's anxiety about their future and whether they will keep their jobs. With reference to

/...

students, and here is the real transformatory issue, they're concerned about access and the question of equity.

With reference to the general public, there seems to be apathy and they are really confused. I want to frame my concern now within an old theoretical debate which I know Mahmood has been involved in. It's about the potency of social movements. Mahmood, taking you back to the 1990's, and perhaps even earlier than that, theoretical debates about social movements were framed within the ambit of whether they have the necessary potency to bring about transformatory change, basis structural change. Even Manuel Costello felt that, for the first time in that period, that there was a need to begin to understand social movements and their role in bringing about real transformatory change, especially given what had happened to production-based movements such as unions.

And having heard [name-unclear] yesterday, it brought me to question the role of the various stakeholders. Do we, within the important stakeholders which I have mentioned earlier, have the potential to bring about real transformatory change in our new University? And I think this is linked to the many

questions that have been raised by Veluka [phonetic spelling], by Michael, by Ulmila [phonetic] and by other colleagues earlier.

Should we be concerned about the narrow, pedantic issues about who said what or should we be concerned about how we transform ourselves into a truly South African institution.

/...

Those debates have not begun. They are related, I would think, also to our classroom situations in terms of curriculum development likewise, where we debate about issues of who said what and why rather than saying: can we deal with the basic principles of real transformatory change?

Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

--- oOo ---

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Professor Tony. Can I have an indication of who wishes to - okay Dr [name-inaudible]

There is a mike.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER ADDRESSES:

[POOR SOUND QUALITY] very short - not 5 minutes. I just want to get back to the issue that you raised in your e-mail at the outset. The issue of our new, and I think you used the word [inaudible] I think Pearl raised the question of whose idea of quality do we realise and I've heard [inaudible] raise issues of reconstructing power and to voice the need for intellectual -

[NO SOUND ON TAPE]

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you Dr [Darside-unclear]. I don't know that we have any other - oh Professor Dangor there's still you. Professor Dangor from the School of Religion and Culture. Before I introduce you, I don't think David Brown from Natal University is here - I don't see him. Damien's point actually ties in with the point that he wanted to raise about the fact that we are too hierarchical in our intellectual structures and how we

/...

need to be, you know, more egalitarian in our intellectual structure so that we can achieve more. And I think it ties into something that Professor Tony and Michael and a whole range of people have been raising here. Our last speaker for today before Professor Mamdani responds and everyone else gets a chance, Professor Solly Dangor from Religion and Culture.

PROF DANGOR ADDRESSES:

Thanks for the opportunity. I actually have forgotten that I was supposed to say something. [laughs] There are three issues that I want to raise here, I think. One relates to the right balance, I don't know if I can use the word, between theoretical and applied research. Now, we know that in the last few years there's been a great deal of emphasis in applied research and I think rightly so. Academics have always been accused of living in ivory towers and not really knowing what was going on on the ground and being concerned with what was happening in communities.

So I think in that sense I would support the shift towards more applied research. Of course, the State would definitely want to push that particular position, because after all, they are the ones who finance the universities and institutions. So they want some returns for their money. But apart from that, I think we also have a moral obligation to be involved with communities, to be able to serve the student community as well as the community out there.

But, at the same time, I think we also have to be wary that we not extend ourselves to the extent that, if we only concentrate on applied research, I'm not sure that that can really happen because I think there are always people doing theoretical research, but if you really push it, is it not possible that knowledge becomes utilitarian in character? In other words, we are only going to do things which have and apply - you know which could be applied and so we really stop thinking about theories and so on. Is this a question? The second one I'm not sure whether I should raise it now, but it is being debated in close circles and I'm sure in future its going to be raised. It's the issue of transformation, and surely of course we do need transformation, but I think there's still this whole debate between transformation and reservation of quality. Now, I'm not suggesting that we should use the quality argument to bar or to obstruct transformation. Certainly that should not be the case, but I think there are people who are concerned that sometimes in the rush for transformation we may seriously compromise quality and standards and I think something needs to be said about that argument.

I think we should really be looking at providing the type of skills and information and so on to what you may call lift students and academics to a level and not be going down to a level. I think that that's where this whole debate is. A related issue is what should our benchmark be for Africa? You know,

/...

should we be, say for instance, in terms of economic development, should we be aiming high, for instance, we want to become another Germany or Japan and, of course, what's the possibility that we're creating a small elite who will be enjoying the benefits of that type of economic configuration, or should we be looking maybe aiming lower in Africa because we don't have the resources, at least for the time being, to ensure that the resources are more widely spread. I think this is something we need to think about.

And the third issue is relating to - about contradiction. Yesterday [name-unclear] Roy spoke about contradictions in the Indian society. We also have our own contradictions and I think the one is the tendency for most academics and students to passively accept the approach to knowledge and its application in its current configuration - the way we find it at institutions.

On the other hand, we have intellectuals, academics and scholars and so on who are talking about the development of an African knowledge system. Now, how do the two things relate to each other? You know, there are people of course who - you know, I just get a sense that there are many academics who feel, even maybe students, that the drive towards Africanisation will somehow stall progress and development. I think this is quite a dilemma and maybe this is one of the issues that we need to resolve.

Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

--- oOo ---

CHAIRPERSON: I should explain that Professor Mamdani flew in last night and this is his first forum. He thought he would come to some cricket and instead he's fielding all these questions so it's a pretty tough order, although I've seen the way he's responded on previous occasions so I have every confidence in, you know, we're in for quite an interesting time. Professor Mamdani.

PROFESSOR MAMDANI ADDRESSES:

Thank you. When I was first invited to come and speak here on the question of the merger, I said that I thought I was singularly unqualified to speak on this question, simply because I am not part of the process and I didn't think I should be so presumptuous as to come and talk about it. So, I said I'd be willing to come and listen to a discussion on the merger and to the extent I have a response, I shall give a response.

Well, so those are the terms. In other words, my response is shaped by your comments, not the other way round. Let me say first of all, my first surprise at listening to the discussions here, and I'm being completely sort of frank here and tell me if you think I'm wrong, but I don't think most of what I've heard is about questions of merger. I think this discussion would have taken place without a merger in the offing.

This is a discussion about the University and what the University should be about. So, I am completely perplexed. I

/...

must conclude either that you have nothing to do with the merger that is actually happening, that you're as much in the dark as I am, [laughter] and I could have said these things without merger being on the agenda. All you are supremely confident and the issues have been resolved. I'm struck by - a discussion recently, it was some months ago in Port Elizabeth, I had been invited to give a talk at the South African Sociological Association and I was listening in on one of the sessions which was on motives, and papers had been written and there was a very animated discussion. I must say that most of those discussing were black intellectuals from what you call historically black universities. And, almost without exception, they were extremely upset. Almost without exception, they wanted to - they wished that strategies could be devised which would reverse the process, which would maintain their institutions. And I was really surprised and I made a very unpopular contribution, which I insist on repeating. [laughs]

And I said that look I don't understand - you fought the system and you more or less succeeded - more or less - and on the moral of that victory, when you have the opportunity of putting something new in its place, you want to return to that in which you were imprisoned and all I'm hearing is romantic talk about how good the old system was. So I begin with the presumption that of course one has to be pro-merger, I mean not any particular merger, you know not any particular merger, but

/...

there has to be some kind of a change which transcends the institutional legacy of the old system. But if the old system is not going to reproduce itself then the starting point has to be transcending its institutional legacy.

But I haven't heard that discussion, which is not to say that the discussion that is taking place is not interesting. It's hugely interesting, but it's as relevant to universities anywhere in the world. It is relevant. It is more or less context-free. It really is, I mean to the extent that its contextualisation, maybe it's African. It's the kinds of questions that would be raised - could be raised, could be at [inaudible] but there's nothing here which really, I mean, except for a couple of questions which suggests to me coming to grips with the particular institutional legacy of apartheid South Africa and the challenge of coming to grips with it. And only you can explain to me why. Why? Why hasn't that discussion taken place?

So maybe what I would say is a couple of things not in response to the discussion I expected but in response to the discussion that has happened, because I don't want to be in the position of ignoring the discussion that actually happened.

Well, there's a lot of impatience with transformation talk. I sense that. That's one thing I sense different between now and the last time I was here and we talked about universities. There's a lot of impatience with transformation talk. There is a sense that maybe all that's happening is transformation talk and

/...

maybe the kind of posturing it might lead us into may not be exactly productive of the type of change that is necessary.

There are also some questions raised about the oppositional culture, intellectual culture, the presumption that intellectual culture is necessarily oppositional culture and I hear some comments which say that this is, you know, this was okay in the context in which it made sense but now we are beyond apartheid.

But also more than that, I think, some comments which sort of draw, make a distinction between a critical as opposed to an adversarial, raise the possibility that, you know, you may turn the world upside down, but fail to change it. That the whole point, if the whole point is to arrive at a creative moment, at an alternative, then oppositional and understanding intellectual culture as oppositional culture will not be enough.

And then I hear not much of a discussion but as continuity, equity, access, relevance, research. And maybe I want to peg some of my comments on this. I think we have to be cognisant that, whether it's apartheid here or whether it's the more formal colonial experience outside, there's something common, one thing common between these experiences, is that we all come out of a historical experience where the intellectual function was not particularly privileged. A colonial society is a society where the native is not supposed to think. The colonial society is a society in which it's not really a native working class, but a native intelligentsia is hardly present.

The real subversive group from the point of view of the colonial power is the native intellectual - that group. And so it's not surprising at all that - and I think this was particularly true of sort of 20th Century colonialism in Africa. Not as true, it was kind of a lesson derived from 19th Century colonialism in Asia, in Southern, Northern Africa. If you read [Nugard-name-unclear] on the Dual Mandate, very interesting, Nugard writes the Dual Mandate at the beginning of the 20th century and says we must avoid the Indian disease in Africa. And what's the Indian disease? The Indian disease is the intellectual - the Indian disease is the intellectual, the native intellectual, because the native intellectual is the one who is going to be his springboard for critique.

And it's not surprising that in all the lands that Britain conquered on this continent in the 20th Century, there were a handful of universities - a few, not many. And it's not surprising that every nationalist movement that came to power, one of its first priorities was higher education. I mean, it was as compulsory as a flag and a national anthem. If you didn't create a University, by God, the people did not believe you'd become independent. It was as simple as that. Now, of course, South Africa has this specificity - it has this specificity that that particular part of the South African population, which was a Settler population at one historical moment, has been able to achieve a transition where it has shed its legal privilege which

/...

caused a [unclear] being settlers, and therefore is now involved in a historical process of participating in a common citizenship with all its problems and whatever.

But this in many ways - because it didn't shed this in Zimbabwe. Part of the problem was Zimbabwe. It's precisely that the white population maintained its veto and is paying for it.

And the positive difference in South Africa is that it didn't [unclear] which I think is a big part of the explanation. It doesn't solve everything. The question of privilege remains, but still the question - I was talking to a reporter this morning who was asking me about my experience here and I was saying you know when I was teaching at UCT, and I would read in the newspapers accounts of students from UWC in large numbers being expelled because they couldn't pay fees or in Transkei or in some places and I was saying this would have been unthinkable in Uganda of 1962.

In the first five, ten years after becoming independent, it would have been unthinkable that people on whom the door had been shut yesterday, the door would be shut again today because you couldn't pay the fees. Well, just the first moment, the colonial moment. There's a second moment. The second moment is and I think you need to be cognisant of this. The second moment is that emphasis on equity and access no longer distinguish us from them. The entire talk of globalisation, World Bank restructuring, etc. is demagogically incorporating

/...

talk of equity and access. Precisely in order to restructure universities in ways whereby universities will cease to be research institutions and become nothing but teaching factories.

That's what's happening at Makerere - this is what happened at Makerere and from the World Bank's point of view the great attraction of Makerere is that it was a homegrown experience in the face of adversity, in the face of structural adjustment, no diminishing state-funding for education, the universities found a solution by - a simple solution. Makerere used to have 5000 students. It quadrupled its number of students. It's now 22 000 - in nine years. It didn't increase the staff by even one percent - the academic staff. Same numbers of Professors teach five times as many students.

What it did was, it added an evening school and for the evening school the entrance requirements were different and you had to pay fees. The day school you had government bursaries. Evening school you paid fees and you could come in with less admission. That's great - you could be admitted. And the Professors were given a choice - they were told you teach in the evening exactly what you're teaching in the morning and your salary will be tripled. And faculties were given choices that you admit students who will pay fees, you will give 30% of the fees to the Central University Fund, but the rest of the fees will be at your own disposal to do whatever you want to do with it. You want to build a new building et cetera. Now that's the reform. If

/...

it should not be successful in the short run, but its cost was that there's no research. Research has come to a standstill. Nobody has time for research. Quality has gone down. Students expect when a teacher walks in a classroom, they expect the teacher to dictate notes to them. Departments which cannot offer courses which are marketable have to fold - Pure Mathematics. The Department of Religion offers a course in Development Studies, because that's where the demand is, but by professors who don't have a degree in Development Studies. No curriculum control, nothing. A whole set of problems. And this is being turned into a model if you read the latest World Bank literature. This is the model that they want to foist upon. But all I'm saying is, be careful. Access and equity are the slogans behind which the World Bank is now packaging a devaluation of universities around this continent, the presumption being that research happens in the North and its results will be transferred here, that research is universal, teaching is contextual - but research is contextual.

I mean, the thing about African knowledge systems is not hi-tech. It's not that there are ready-made African knowledge systems which you can go and buy from a bookshop. The thing is that those need to be constructed by institutions which think that knowledge is context specific in which "Africans" means those who share that context called Africa. Well, how will we run these institutions? What kind of hierarchy - I must say, you

/...

know I spent the last four years teaching in an American University and you know a couple of things struck me. I mean, the first thing that struck me is that I had spent my whole life outside of being a student as a professor. I'd always taught in a regional University. I taught 6 years in the University of Dar Es Salaam, 13 years at Makerere University, 5/6 years research, UDW 6 months, I was at UCT 3 years. All these are regional universities and everybody works on the region or they work on the West. The rest of the world is accessed through newspapers and libraries. But people don't specialise. So, Columbia University is the first imperial University that I've been at, you know - the whole world. The people who studied everything, so this was the first amazingly liberating moment that actually you could really do comparative work. You could really take the themes and issues you were interested in and understand them in multiple contexts and realise that your problem was not just specific to you. That was one.

But two was this amazing - the notion that's being talked about without the word being used of a liberal University or a liberal University where there is academic freedom and where academics run their own affairs, where the administration makes the financial decisions - this is true. The administration makes the financial decisions - that's the constraints, but within that the academics decide. I mean, where - it's unthinkable that a University could have taken a decision like UCT did when I was

there for my last year, changing the whole system. I mean, by one administrative feat that, you know, curricula must be market-responsive and it will not be departments, but it will be I don't know what did they call them. Not schools, but these packages whereby programmes were run. I mean, suddenly changing the face of academia in a way. Well, anyway I want to, you know, agree with you that these are important questions.

I want to re-register my surprise that merger is not discussed here and I hopefully I will let you know sooner or later. I don't know what time it is.

CHAIRPERSON: Just past two.

PROFESSOR MAMDANI: Oh, it's just past. Fine, okay - we're alright. But I'll stop there.

--- oOo ---

CHAIRPERSON: Do you want to respond, Solly?

REPLY BY PROF DANGOR: Ja. Maybe the problem was created by the title itself. We were talking about the challenges in the new University. Let's assume that we're already in a new institution. There's no question about a challenge going to merger. I think most people assume we are talking about a new institution. What do we think? The challenges? So maybe [inaudible].

CHAIRPERSON: Maybe I should - okay, you first.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thanks Professor Mamdani. Let me firstly welcome your address and maybe perhaps not actually

/...

to confine myself to your address, but because there's been a [unclear] speakers who has come before you. Let me firstly also try to register my disappointment to some of the speakers that has presented their argument before us, but I will comment on just a few. The likes of Professor Tony and [name-unclear] and the lady that was sitting there. CHAIRPERSON: Dr Sithole.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Dr Sithole. Actually, when I heard about this gathering I was [inaudible- very poor sound quality] because I work for the Centre for Higher Education and Restructuring as a full-time [unclear]. Basically, some of the things that intellectuals or academics are saying here they are correct. But there is a danger that what you are doing is that, when the process of higher education and restructuring was begun in 1997, there's been a number of documents that has been [unclear] by the National Department for stakeholders who made their input, for example, we had [unclear] in there to tell them the very same University was given a chance to make its response.

The National Plan on Higher Education, the same University was given a chance to make response. When it comes to the new University, I haven't heard anything from these speakers reflecting on the mission statement of this University, how the new institution is going to have an impact to the current setup. Again, I'm aware that if you are an academic, you are being employed. But at the same time, as Professor Solly has correctly

/...

outlined, we are going to create a new institution that is going to reflect the democratic order that we are in, because the [unclear] was Professor who was sitting there correctly outlined that the institution that we are in they had the legacy of capitalism and then we have to redress and work around in eradicating [unclear].

Therefore, I want to submit my question to the house and also Professor Mamdani, that the National Plan on Higher Education clearly indicates that these new institutions they are going to enhance the level of - the maximum level of refreshed output in terms of qualitative and quantitative. And what is it that we at UDW we have done in ensuring that the new institution must become our strong point. To say that we at UDW have been proven beyond a reasonable doubt that we are doing very well in [unclear] therefore in a new institution that [unclear] that we have must - we have to maintain it in this delivery site because the UDW is not going to be closed at the delivery site of the new institution. That has - no-one has said that. Again, when we look at the issue of - [interruption]

CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Can you round it up?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Okay. When we look at the [unclear] just because there are many things I would like to touch. If we look at the issue of stakeholders, of course we've got students who are meant to be represented by the SRC or should I believe that this number of [unclear] called by the

/...

Centre for Higher Education, transformation to get them and to give them some input. I mean, they are [unclear] their input. Although they do not agree. Locally, yes. I was meant to believe that the same process was initiated for academics again. If Matthews who has a representative in the form of your union and then academic, that does not possess a national character. That is local. The new institution is not going to have that. We'll need a national character represented in the new democratic order.

So therefore I will like Professor Mamdani to give us a means - the challenge must become a challenge of the new institution that you are going to have in a [unclear] context because we are going to have more students coming in from the regions and then not come and approach [unclear] bearing in mind that our curricula we need to do something, start re-training and also student development capacity, because, I mean, we are going to have a new institution, of which I'm not too sure what we are going to have, a comprehensive institution or not. Thank you.

END TAPE 1B

TAPE 2A

CHAIRPERSON: ...interesting on the merger in terms of them there, us here and all the petty details of what it means to connect and to be treated as a Third World University and to be dismissed. It seems to me important to think through the intellectual agenda because I wasn't sure that that was happening

/...

at the other campus, either, and in fact it was borne out by raising it with the Centre of Creative Arts which is a University of Natal organisation. It's based at the University of Natal.

I serve as a UDW representative there and when I raised this as an issue to be addressed at the Elizabeth [unclear] obviously a big Durban audience, people from the University of Natal, who are the majority of representatives on the committee, did not see the value the need offered. And it struck me then that that actually was a real challenge in our society that we weren't focusing on our challenges as intellectuals and yet there were assumptions around that. So, perhaps I should have, you know, moved on my own presentation of that, you know, initially because that may have offered a context for that, given that particular choice. I thought we were just too fixed to the issue of us and them unto that dichotomy and several speakers referred to the binaries within which we're locked, either inadvertently or perhaps because we don't make choices that transcend those binaries. I did not think from my own reading of the presentations of many of the speakers that there was anything Utopian about the way they were constituted where we were going to.

So I have a different reading from you and I want to register that difference. There are other people in this audience who I think will also want to respond. I think we'll start with [name-unclear] and then Dr Govender.

/...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER ADDRESSES:

Well, let me thank you to give me this opportunity to talk, particularly on the merger. You see here, we're in an institution of higher learning - each and every one has a right to his own opinion. As you find it sometimes, that person derides it. You see me on the question of the merger - I always have the question: do we need it? Why? Because I believe that in an institution you transform it. And there was a point of doubt some time ago - be careful of the politicians. After independence in South Africa they were talking of integrating the South Africa National Defence Force and other statutory forces, but what happened after that? We found the statutory forces being swallowed to the South African Defence Force.

Now again, the same politician comes with another concept - merger. Right. That's why what's supposed to be in this institution is supposed to be an intellectual scepticism, because it's likely that you'll find this institution being swallowed by the Natal University. There's a case I happened to experience in Nigeria where you find an African University behave like a Western University. It should be remembered during the imperial pirates African Universities were created as factories for the worst. Right, so you can see this process is still continuing. [Unclear] intelligence. Scepticism. Universities have to only transform. Transform, stop this tendency of treating students as children and faculties as babies. That's the way we should go.

/...

Well, I don't want to take so much, but [unclear] scepticism for this merger. Thank you.

--- oOo ---

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. I found the discussion varied and interesting and I think that the reason why there was a great deal spoken about what is the nature of a University and, indeed, we've been having that kind of discussion over the decades at UDW and I think this is a new moment. Perhaps the archivists could look at the kinds of debates we've been having about what is a University. I think that it underlies an anxiety that we at UDW feel as we are poised for the merger that we need to reclaim that intellectual position that we had in fighting apartheid and somehow over the years for various reasons that was being eroded from different quarters and I think that's what I hear.

And it's a new moment as well and so much has changed compared to the kinds of strident voices we did have when we were for instance fighting the De Klerkdom. My other concern, and it's linked to the discussion we've had, is how we can move from being academics and all the negative connotations that that has, to be true intellectuals and I feel that in our institutional life by its very nature, as we were critiquing the state by very nature yesterday, something about our institutional life as much as it liberates, tends to hamper and hinder and we get caught up in the

cul-de-sac of academic work which doesn't translate into being the true intellectuals that we are yearning to be.

And if I might quote the extreme example of the [unclear] and the Edward Saids and indeed our own Professor Mamdani who have used their academic work and a very strong academic base to translate that to being the true intellectual to bring the people from the centre to the margin who begin to provide the lens, very critical lens to the world. And I think that's what UDW can reclaim because we were that - to use the old cliché - that home of intellectual left and that's what we need to reclaim as we move to the merger.

--- oOo ---

PROF MAMDANI IN REPLY: I thought of a study I read of Harlem - a sort of social history of Harlem in New York City. One of the most interesting conclusions in the study was that Harlem didn't become a ghetto until integration happened. In other words, under segregation, Harlem was a rich, vibrant community, a multi-class with its own intellectuals, it's own middle-class, it's own institutions, it's own Harlem renaissance. But Harlem became a ghetto, meaning an impoverished community, with integration, because the middle-class left, the intellectuals left, the talent left.

Those who had opportunity were no longer constrained - they could now move. And Harlem here is - can be a metaphor for the various homes of the left in historically black universities.

/...

Now, what would the Harlems of today do? Okay, is there an option of returning to the Harlem of segregation? It isn't - it's not an option, it's a non-option. Okay, Harlem cannot become self-enclosed. It has to re-constitute itself on a different basis. So, my first response is that it is imperative that in the discussion about alternatives it is not the remarks of the past. I'm here for a short time so I have to use the words which will have maximum impact. But real alternatives, given a changed context in a changed situation. That's one. Two - what was the strength of the historically black University and what was its weakness? At least, I'll tell you from my six months here and my three years at UCT, I had kind of a unique opportunity to be based sort of historically black, historically white - two universities. And the thing which struck me about UDW - I was here in '93 - is the incredible sensitivity the University had to events in the community at large, the militancy of the place. Something would happen in Bisho, whatever, and this place would be on strike, you know, in one day, whatever.

And it was that - I think maybe UWC is very similar. And of course the downside was, there were important intellectuals and researchers here but they worked on their own. They created their own niche. There wasn't an intellectual culture of support for research, support which to some extent existed in UCT, but it existed in a very artificial context. I told them that UCT reminded me of potted plants and greenhouses, you know, and I

/...

worried for them that what if the top was lifted one day and they'd have to deal with the elements. How many of the potted plants would survive? I wasn't so sure. They said I should leave the greenhouse.

But so, does the merger - would the merger offer an opportunity? I don't know what the terms of the merger are. I don't know whether they intend to treat this as a secondary poor relative kind of, where they would send the castaways or whether this is going to be equal. Just a different location but within a single university system. I don't know whether the terms and conditions of service would be exactly the same - whether the student body will be a single body, whether all the departments and structure will be duplicated in both places or whether certain departments would be here, other departments would be there, so that all the students who studied those things would move to this location and all who studied the other stuff move to the other location.

I mean, there are different ways of thinking of the merger. So, it's - I mean, do they intend the University of California metaphor of this being a second layer of an institution from where the good students go there? I have no answers to these questions, but I think.... And if that is the case, it will not answer your dilemma. It will not create the culture of - the institutional support for the cultural research because that's ... it

isn't that bright people who are not here, but it's the institutional support for that kind of culture. Thank you.

CHAIR: Would anyone like to respond? Okay. Michael Samuel?

DR SAMUEL IN REPLY: I think the - probably the climate has changed a lot since 1993 in terms of how particular institutions, particular departments or schools within the institution position themselves. And I can only talk from the perspective of education studies. The irony is that Natal University, if we talk about the merger's nitty-gritty, realise that we are probably the more powerful institution in terms of the research output, in terms of the productivity of the staff, in terms of being able to address the issues as pertains to secondary and primary schooling.

So I think the context is slightly different - that the partners that we're engaging with in educational studies, happen to be people who are looking to the models that we've developed to address issues of access and equity and really those models are becoming the kinds of models for post-graduate studies in other institutions this moment. So, as a consequence, perhaps that's the kind of degree of confidence that particular schools are engaging with it.

But that is not necessarily understood unfortunately by the senior management of the University. The way in which it's being engaged with is in a kind of blanket understanding of the

/...

institution's positioning. So I think each part of this institution will need to campaign very strongly in making public what its mission, its goal, its productivity has currently been, which will change the nature of the dialogues that happen.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Michael. I think you come from a school which has worked particularly hard to develop community -you know around research and around activism for the things you believe in and it's part of what - I think by way of answering Mahmood, what we're trying to do on this campus. A lot is still in the making.

Government and the managers don't have any clear idea of the form that this merger is going to take and we're going to have to struggle for what we want. And that seems to be the state of play. And we're going to have to argue over the dispensations that are offered to us and to negotiate over them. I mean, the fact that the World Bank is dictating the form that public education should take, was an important factor in UDW's decision not to accept that it remains an independent entity, because then we were heading to be the service university, the one that does the teaching and no research.

That was clearly the direction in which we were heading and that is what formed a very clear-cut decision from this university to choose to be part of that merger and then to re-work the distribution of resources within that institution. So - but that was not sufficient, because nobody has a clue and in many ways

/...

we're the first institution in the university sector, the first institutions within the university sector that are going to merge.

So it is these struggles that will be particularly important for the way in which the rest of the merger occurs and we may actually get more space than any other institution will get after us, because perhaps Government would be a bit reluctant to quell any foment and challenge around the issues and struggle around the issues. So, in some ways it is not bad to be the leaders. In the issue, there may be more space for activism and this is particularly why it is of concern to a number of people on this campus that we're not engaging more actively.

We learnt from the 1980's and even the 1970's that activism goes a long way in a third world context where resources are few and ideas are even scarcer and this could make the difference in, you know, in producing the agendas and the outcomes that we want. But don't let me pre-empt you. We're almost to the end of our session and Professor Mamdani has to leave. We could continue this discussion if the house wishes.

Prosecutor Mamdani has transport and he has another - he has a big engagement this evening that he has to go and prepare for. He's on at the Elizabeth [unclear]. I'm afraid tickets are sold out so it's you know, you are going to be on tomorrow night as well, are you?

PROF MAMDANI: Yes. At HSRC.

CHAIRPERSON: Oh, the HSRC function tomorrow at 4 o'clock - between 4 and 6 o'clock at the Elizabeth [unclear]. Professor Mamdani will be talking about the State and Research. If you wish to catch that, it's called "Critique or consultancy - State and research in South Africa." Shall I take it that we want to terminate this discussion now? Okay and please do continue with it in another forum, in your constituencies. This is an important debate that we need to engage in. It's, you know, very critical to the future of our University. Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]





