

LuM/010/0006/19

African National Congress

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

22nd August, 1988

Cde H. MARGOTH

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

LUSAKA

Dear Cde HENRY,

Ref: UWC DEBATE

Herewith for your information a copy of an article from DIE SUID-AFRIKAAN of June 1988.

Amandla!

M. TIKLY

Administrative Secretary

Intellectual home of the Left?

Some extracts from the new UWC debate

WITH the advent of Jakes Gerwel as rector in 1987 the University of the Western Cape evidently entered a new era. In his inaugural address the new rector announced the aim of making UWC "the intellectual home of the left". This has become a reference point for a new and critical discussion on the campus in which Gerwel has further articulated his new perspective with different voices also joining in. Such crucial issues as the political tasks of academic work, the meaning of non-sectarianism within the chosen ideological context of the university, the need to rethink the aims and tactics of boycott actions and appropriate ways of transforming academic priorities and structures in order to achieve democratic accountability and participation, have all been raised in what promises to be a vigorous new debate. Here are some extracts from the ongoing discussion.

From Prof Gerwel's inaugural address, June 5 1987

THE University of the Western Cape occupies a very special place in my life.

... I saw, experienced and participated in its growth and development over the years; I was privileged to share in the process of its emancipation — an emancipation from the academic and intellectual deprivation of its origins as an ethnic college to being today intellectually one of the most exciting and charged institutions of higher learning in the country, daringly exploring new spaces and modes of academic and intellectual practice; emancipation from the political and ideological restrictiveness of its apartheid origins to being a place where the examination and pursuit particularly of progressive ideas are not only protected but actively encouraged.

But it is exactly that impulse in a university to be, perhaps, more pronouncedly involved in the social processes of transformation and reordering than is perceived as conventional or traditional that has in recent times given rise in certain quarters to increasing questioning of, disquiet about, hostility and antagonism towards this and some other South African universities. Historical development within national life as well as within the universities have combined to produce a situation where our roles in the social and political life of the country are being foregrounded and highlighted, often overshadowing (if you will pardon the mixed metaphors) in the public and state perception the scholarly and educational activities which unobtrusively still continue to be the bulk of what we are occupying ourselves with at universities. There have in the recent past been threats of closure directed against this university and there is presently again widespread speculation about impending state curbs upon certain universities. It is in a general sense being suggested that the universities concerned are, under the pressures of overt ideological commitments, defaulting their tasks of be-



THE suspicion, and often expressed accusation, is that our emphasis on radical and revolutionary change-seeking relevance has compromised our essential identity as 'disinterested' searchers after truth ...

— Prof Jakes Gerwel



UNIVERSITIES are sites or arenas of class struggle. On this side of liberation they cannot become instruments of liberation, however much individuals and departments within the university approximate such a role.

— Dr Neville Alexander

ing objective and scientific searchers after truth. The suspicion, and often expressed accusation, is that our emphasis on radical and revolutionary change-seeking relevance has compromised our essential identity as 'disinterested' searchers after truth ...

In spite of our genuine commitment to free scholarly discourse and research every South African university has a dominant ideological orientation which describes the context of its operations ... The Afrikaans universities have always stood and still stand firmly within the operative context of Afrikaner nationalism, networking in a complex way into its various correlative institutions, whether it be educational, cultural, religious, economic or political. Equally the English-language universities operate within the context of anglophile liberalism, primarily linking and responding to its institutional expressions as in the English schools, cultural organisations and importantly big business.

The one ideological formation under-represented, or not at all represented in a similar way within the South African university community, is that of the more radical Left. Such political descriptions are not precise, but in essence with the South African Left one is collectively referring to those people and institutions seeking and working for a more fundamental transformation of the old settler-colonial dominated order which is the present South Africa. The major thrust is towards a non-racial and majoritarian democracy, reflecting itself not in the mere form of multi-racial political arrangements but more fundamentally in the social reorganisation of power and privilege. Organisationally this finds political expression now in the extra-parliamentary democratic movements.

THE University of the Western Cape, like the other predominantly black universities, did not in its beginning years have any organic relationship with an ideological context. It was created by and for the purposes of an ideology which was fundamentally antagonistic to the community it was to serve. For reasons and through a process which we need not deal with here tonight the University of the Western Cape, more so, even unlike, any of the other black universities managed to extract itself from the ethos of its creator ideology. Undoubtedly the most important factor in that process was the student body who through its dissent, protest and activism against apartheid, and specifically the apartheid-created and reproducing institution which they were forced to attend, established the counter ethos for the university.

With the renaissance of open extra-parliamentary protest politics in the Black Consciousness movement of the Seventies the student body of this university fully and vitally participated, in fact, representing one of the strong growth points of that movement. Equally with the resurgence of Congress politics, partly flowing from the Black Consciousness movement of the Seventies the student body strongly reflected and continues to reflect the movements and tendencies of national extra-parliamentary politics. Coupled and in response to this formative presence of the students was the Vice-Chancellorship of Prof Richard van der Ross who with his liberal anti-apartheid background gave recognition and space to this counter ethos which the students carried from their community life and experience into the university, and gradually built it into the dominant orientation of the university.

THIS university is therefore historically placed, in fact faces the historical imperative, to respond to the democratic Left, to be an intellectual home for the Left. We are an open but pre-

dominantly black university drawing our students from all the statutorily defined black groupings. It is through our students and the community from which they came that we are presented with the ideological formation with which we interact in the way that I suggested for the historically White universities.

There is therefore an internal imperative for the university to develop a critical alignment with the democratic movement as the dominant ideological orientation describing our operative context. The integration of academic and intellectual life with and the development of it out of the reality of people's social experience and world is essential both for the order of our functioning and, more importantly, for the vitality and quality of our intellectual environment. I remain convinced that without that perceived and experienced nexus with a real and shared-in social world, a university is emasculated and intellectually anaemic.

But, to be quite frank, there is also and importantly an external political imperative for that route. If I plead and work for this university to provide an intellectual home for the Left it is not merely out of managerial expedience thinking that it would be good for the university's orderly functioning. Universities, and education generally, reproduce the social order, but it can, alternatively, educate towards and for a changed society. And I cannot in conscience, in truth, educate, or lead education, towards the reproduction and maintenance of a social order which is undemocratic, discriminatory, exploitative and repressive and stands universally recognised as such. While a university may never have a corporate opinion our university, at least, can never condone or live comfortably with apartheid in any of its mutations. And the democratic Left stands as fundamental opposition to apartheid in all its dehumanising aspects . . .

HOW does one translate this commitment into academic and intellectual practice? And would one in the process be defaulting on your commitment to truth and to science?

The question of translation into practice of these commitments is one which is and has for some years been occupying the minds of academics at this university. This renewal and transformation will be a complex process the nature and content of which shall differ from discipline to discipline. Already much which is new and innovative is being done at this institution. It is recognised that such renewal will involve various levels: what we teach in terms of contents, but also how we teach, within which structural context and towards which goals, what we research and how we disseminate our research results. Also that while teaching, research and community service are the three defined functions of a university we may in our situation have to take that third function of community service even more seriously than is traditionally done at universities. We have to comprehend more deliberately the content and meaning of "community" — what is that community that we wish to serve? — and have our other two functions also been informed by that definition.

While for other universities, relating to more established social order, the content of 'community' may be more of a given, in our orientation we are involved in the creative conceptualisation of a future community beyond the destructiveness of an apartheid order.

And as for the second question, whether one will not perhaps in this process be defaulting on your obligation to truth and science, I would perceive it, grounded as it is in scholarship and discourse, to be exactly the opposite. They are suppressed social realities which through discourse-censorship, and research-resistance as a manifestation of discourse-censorship, are largely unattended to in scientific discourse . . .

IN summary then: I can with every bit of conscience and honesty declare to this congregation that this university remains true and committed to the values and the vigour of critical scholarship. If opposition to us is based on political and ideological grounds and formulated in those terms, I am happy to face that criticism and to confront it and answer to it as scholar and educational administrator.

We cannot and do not wish to deny that there are deep and serious tensions in and strains upon university life as we recon-

noitre this road of educational renewal. The leisurely contemplation which had been the hallmark of university life until recently is a product and function of a specific political culture. As an increasing number of students not sharing in that political culture, or feeling themselves alienated from that culture, enter the universities the reproduction of that style in university life is inevitably going to become less automatic than it has previously been. The old problem of the connection between theory and practice will be carried as a real problem into universities: students feeling themselves intimately and directly involved by the practice of social and political discrimination will, one can expect, continue to seek to divert their academic and intellectual life to action related to those aspects of their lives. And this does pose problems and challenges to the university.

These are challenges to which some of us at universities have responded in the most constructive and creative way that we find ourselves compelled to as institutions of higher learning. The easy authoritarian reflex is challengeable on a number of grounds. If the university has the broader educative function of transmitting also through example the democratic culture, then authoritarianism, even in the face of provocation, will be a denial of its own character and function.

But we may also, as vice-chancellors and as citizens entrusted with an important civil responsibility, put counter-demands as

AN intellectual setting of the Left is one in which critical diversity is deliberately stimulated and protected.

— Gerwel



demands are placed upon us. The functioning of our institutions and our own functioning are impacted upon by the political situation of the country, something which is not of our making or under our control. I consider that I may rightly ask, or that I have the duty to ask, that those in power attend urgently and fundamentally to the political crises of the nation through the creation of the conditions for legitimate democracy: the abolition of apartheid laws which is at the basis of our social crises and which we in our universities are therefore also continuously called upon to manage; the release of political prisoners to allow them to participate in the democratic reconstruction and healing of the nation; the recognition of organisations like the African National Congress as integral and essential to any solution of the country's problems, and their legal admission to the political processes of the country. If legitimate government by consent is established there will be greater justification for censuring us as university vice-chancellors for not containing adequately the conflicts and tensions in our universities.

A DIFFERENT PLACE

AT the beginning of the academic year of 1988 the Centre for Research on Africa at UWC organised a seminar series on *Political Tasks of Academic Work Today*. The speakers at the first of these seminars on March 9 was Prof Gerwel and Dr Neville Alexander, former director of SACHED in the Cape and a prominent figure in the National Forum. In his paper Prof Gerwel recapitulated the historical background to the new orientation at UWC as well as some of the main themes of his inaugural address. The following is taken from the concluding sections of his paper:

. . . There can be no doubt that UWC in March 1988 is a significantly different place even if only in self perception and self definition. There is a greater corporate sense of mission; there

is clearer recognition of institutional space for the Left. The pertinent and crucial question is whether contrariety (real or perceived) between "politics" and "academic work" has been bridged to a greater extent. The question is: to what extent has the socio-political commitment been translated into academic and intellectual practice? Or put differently: to what extent have we given intellectual content to our socio-political commitment to the Left?

UWC has achieved much of its transformational energy through activism on the part of its students. For the intellectual transformation of the university to be advanced it is equally necessary (i) for there not to be an obsequious genuflection to activism, and (ii) for a theoretical antagonism towards that motive force within the institution's history to be avoided.

There is a particular challenge to progressive academics at UWC to develop a "pedagogy of transformation" in which the unreflexive transposition of inherited discourse categories is studiously avoided. We need to develop strategies for educational quality without falling prey of the ideological baggage of the "academic excellence" discourse. We need to define the "person ideal" of the student we are educating and determine the means of achieving that within the constraints of the tension between commitment and available resources.

An intellectual setting of the Left is one in which critical diversity is deliberately stimulated and protected. Those sharing in and coming from a Left intellectual tradition know it to be the most vital and critical tradition of debate and it is one of the prime political tasks of academic work to promote that tradition, also because it is out of that that new knowledge is generated.

We often speak of and claim our autonomy within the university. That autonomy derives from considerations of philosophy of science. Universities, through its researchers, are generators of new knowledge. These scholars command the frontiers of science and can therefore philosophically not be subject to "higher authority" and historically, the scientist's autonomy from gods and politicians, from church and state, had to be defended. It is in our respect for diversity that we are also defending that autonomy and protecting the right to the production of new knowledge.

UWC has committed itself through spokespersons — and there seems to be acceptance of that as the institution's dominant direction — to working towards a united non-racial and democratic society, and to do that through its teaching, research and outreach activities. Those three concepts of unity, non-racialism and democracy are historically imbued with meaning when specifically set against the apartheid order: the quest for human unity in an apartheid divided society; non-racialist against the racism of apartheid; and democracy in historical contrast to settler-colonial minority rule of apartheid. Academic work cannot be expected to have constant direct and localised "relevance" but those are the social values ultimately informing the political task of academic work. It is often easier to demonstrate how a body of intellectual activity sustains a status quo than it is to ascertain the transformational aspect thereof.

AAINST that background of the quest for a united, non-racial democracy, and of UWC's consequent, broad alignment with what is called the democratic movement, there is constantly the call from progressive academics for a non-sectarian approach in academic and educational affairs. This is in line with previous reference to the stimulation and protection of critical diversity on the Left. A university should be non-sectarian, if only for reasons of its own capacity to advance knowledge and science in that way.

As with all of these concepts one also needs to historicise "non-sectarianism" to adequately comprehend its meaning in our situation. Of the various manifestations of the democratic movement, that which is broadly known as the Congress tradition is the one that has for historical reasons assumed a certain dominant position. Within this particular historical situation "non-sectarian" has then quite often assumed a meaning of "outside of/other than Congress". When in assessing the political task of academic work one rightfully stresses the need for a

non-sectarianism it is instructive to distinguish the historical semantics of a "sectarian" from a really "non-sectarian" non-sectarianism.

Why I raised this latter point is merely to emphasise, if it at all need emphasis in a discourse of the Left, that our discussion on the political substantiation of our academic work has to place itself historically.

ALEXANDER'S RESPONSE

FROM Dr Neville Alexander's response to the paper by Prof Gerwel at the seminar discussion on The Political Tasks of Academic Work Today:

THE input paper attempts to refine the definition of the identity of UWC as a university in an apartheid society. It carries further an ongoing process which is fuelled by both academic debates and political activism.

It posits as a goal the idea that UWC should become "the intellectual home of the Left". It posits as a fact the commitment of the university to the struggle for a non-racial democratic society.

THERE are both possibilities and limitations to what can be done in promoting an anti-establishment, anti-capitalist project at any university in South Africa.

— Alexander



On what we may call the purely professional level, it appeals to all who are at the university to realise that "academic pursuits" and "politics" are not separate spheres. Hence our academic work has to be informed by our socio-political commitment to the non-racial democratic ethos.

Quite logically, therefore, the paper addresses briefly the question of academic work and party politics. It connects the concept of university autonomy (in its terms a *sine qua non* for the production of "new knowledge") and non-sectarianism. However, it does not seem to be able to arrive at an unequivocal position on this very important question. The very last (somewhat encoded) paragraph of the paper seems to suggest the "non-sectarian" should be understood as meaning "within the (African National) Congress tradition" . . .

The fundamental inadequacy and weakness of the paper consists in an attempt to reconcile irreconcilable phenomena. This is determined by the systematic location of an institution such as UWC in a society such as ours. While there is an acknowledgment in words that "the new society and the intellectual activity and content consume (sic) with it will be born out of the struggle", the whole thrust of the paper is to place the university above and outside the arena of class struggle. It is an attempt, *de facto*, to institutionalise and thus to co-opt the militancy of many students and some staff and the radical challenges to the university itself. This is the only meaning which an "intellectual home of the Left" can have within an apartheid society. It is a kind of allocation of radicalism to its own political-philosophical Bantustan for the pursuit and maintenance of which a certain distance from the real arena of class struggle is essential. In other words, there is an assumption of a relatively static situation in which various intellectual homelands vie with one another for pre-eminence and predominance. (The last emperor expels the eunuchs from the Forbidden City.)

WHAT is the alternative? Without going into detail, I believe that for the realisation of a *pedagogy of liberation*, we need to accept the following assumptions: All universities as

at present constituted are intended and financed by the state to reinforce the *status quo*.

As with most other institutions in our society, because they are located within and constitute stakes in the class struggle (between essentially the black working class and its allies on the one hand, and the ruling class and its allies on the other hand), they become sites or arenas of class struggle. On this side of liberation, they cannot in fact become *qua* institutions instruments of liberation, however much individuals or even departments or institutes within the university can for shorter or longer periods approximate such a role. The most recent (and yet to be realised) threat of the De Klerk subsidy conditions is ample proof of what I was asserting here. Following from (this), therefore, we have to adopt the approach that there are both possibilities and limitations to what can be done in promoting an anti-establishment, anti-capitalist project at any university in South Africa. Some of the universities may lend themselves more, others less, to such a radicalising project at one time or another.

In doing so (and here I think there is a large measure of agreement), we are establishing one more corner of the firm base which all the progressive organisations of the people are busy establishing in all spheres of life, on which the non-racial, democratic socialist future will arise. To do so, it is our main

It cannot simply be assumed that unity is the automatic result of oppression, and that those who have not been won over are to be treated as enemies.

— UWCADE

purpose to sharpen rather than to reconcile contradiction. How to do this without getting the university closed down by the reactionary custodians of state power ought to be one of the main questions that should preoccupy students, lecturers and those in the administration who are genuinely committed to the new society we are all trying to discern in the distance.

WAY FORWARD

THE discussion was continued and broadened in a discussion paper prepared by a group of UWC staff members at the end of March under the title Which Way Forward for UWC? The following are some extracts from the document first discussed in UWCADE (University of the Western Cape Association for Democratic Educators), a progressive staff association:

THE University of the Western Cape has committed itself to working for a non-racial democratic South Africa. That commitment is itself the outcome of struggles waged by students at UWC, almost since its first establishment. More fundamentally still, that commitment is the outcome of the larger struggles waged by the oppressed masses in SA, particularly in the years since 1976, for the right to take their destinies into their own hands.

The democratic struggle, with which we need fully to identify ourselves, has recently had severe blows inflicted upon it by the state. At the same time, the state finds itself in crisis, and is devoid of a policy with which to address the questions of the day. As its crisis deepens, so too it will intensify its attack on the liberation movement, and on the oppressed people of South Africa. The illusions of "reform" have been shattered.

As the character and demands of the struggle change, so we need to gain the utmost clarity on the major questions facing us at UWC. There are three such questions — crucial to the future direction of UWC — which we wish to raise here:

- (i) how can the unity of progressive forces be built and extended at UWC in the new conditions created by the

onslaught of the state? More specifically, how will the tactic of boycott affect attempts to build such unity?

- (ii) how can we resist the state's attacks on UWC — in the first place, in the form of the De Klerk subsidy conditions — while at the same time contributing to the broader struggle of the oppressed?
- (iii) how will the future direction of UWC as an academic institution be decided, and how will students play a role in the transformation of its teaching and research?

The question of unity and the tactic of boycott

IN order for UWC to contribute to the struggle for a non-racial democratic South Africa, it is essential that as many students and staff as possible be united behind a clear understanding of their goals and the appropriate strategies for pursuing them. That unity can only be built politically, by constantly winning over the uncertain and uncommitted to those goals and demonstrating the necessity of those strategies. It cannot simply be assumed that unity is the automatic result of oppression, and that those who have not been won over are to be treated as enemies.

In this context, we need to assess carefully the tactic of boycott at UWC. We would certainly not oppose the use of the boycott as a weapon of struggle. There can be no doubt that it has

contributed fundamentally to major advances in the struggle in the past — e.g. during the school boycotts of 1980, when UWC students were active in mobilising and organising in both rural and urban areas. In the present situation, in which the state is on the offensive against workers and students, the boycott remains an essential weapon of struggle, provided that it contributes to building the unity of progressive forces at UWC, and ultimately the unity of the liberation movement.

But it must also be recognised that the boycott becomes divisive when clear goals are not set and a conscious effort cannot then be made to win people over to those goals. The conditions prevailing at UWC make it possible for a boycott to be called without having to persuade students politically of the importance of the cause in which it is used. It has become unnecessary in practice to mobilise seriously and raise the political level of students in order to bring them out on boycott. This results in definite political shortcomings in the way the boycotts are run, in the character of the demands raised during the boycott, and the degree of control over the boycott exercised by the mass of students. If these dangers are not consciously avoided, the tactic of boycott becomes divisive and depoliticising.

A boycott directed against an aspect of the system — such as late payment of bursaries — can only provide a basis for drawing increasing numbers of students and staff into the struggle if they are actively mobilised and involved in the broader political issues surrounding the specific demands of the boycott. What is needed is a clear political programme of aims which can be struggled for at UWC — aims which can be spelled out long before the specific issues arise which might precipitate a boycott, and to which these more specific issues can constantly be related as they arise.

The crisis of the apartheid state and the funding of university education

ANY viable programme would have to respond to the specific needs and conditions of UWC. But it must at the same time contribute to the broader struggle for democracy and challenge the real enemy in that struggle — the apartheid state and

the bosses. For the apartheid state has already made clear its intentions of carrying its attack on the oppressed into the field of university education as well — primarily by cutting back on expenditure on subsidies and bursaries.

The De Klerk measures have been halted for the moment by the courts, but this has not prevented massive cut-backs taking place in state expenditure on university education. This year subsidies at some universities have been cut by as much as 30%.

In this context, the need for a campaign to increase the funding given by the state to universities serving oppressed communities can clearly be seen. At UWC we have a first-year failure rate almost as high as the more established universities' pass-rates. This is an unacceptable situation. The solution for it does not lie in cutting back student numbers or lowering standards. Rather, the solution lies in making proper provision for overcoming the deficiencies which result from an inadequate and crisis-ridden school system and extending the resources of the university itself. In a context such as ours, the staff-student ratio should be higher than at the established universities, not lower; there is more pressing need for a suitably designed academic support system, capable of addressing the language problems which lie at the heart of our academic difficulties; more and better facilities and buildings are needed. And all of this can only be provided if millions of extra subsidy rands are made available. Without an active campaign to change the basis on which funds are allocated, we will find ourselves simply reacting to ever more frequent outbursts of legitimate anger at the state's attack.

Of course, such a campaign will not come from nowhere. It would have to be built by patiently explaining and winning over increasing numbers of students, staff, and the community to its cause. But this is precisely what we argued: that it is only by consciously winning people over to a clearly-defined cause — rather than reacting to sporadic anger — that true and lasting unity can be built.

The transformation of UWC as an academic institution

A CAMPAIGN to increase the scale of funding for universities serving oppressed communities could articulate the specific needs of students at UWC, provide a basis for winning over to the struggle many who are not yet politicised, and at the same time expose the inability of the apartheid state to meet the legitimate demands of the oppressed. But it will only be possible to build campaigns around such issues if we have clear goals for the transformation of our universities as academic institutions. We need to know what major problems we face within the university if we are to convince people that it is worth campaigning for the funds to solve them. We need to know how the teaching of the university, in particular — but also its research, for this can make a great difference to its teaching — is going to be transformed if we are to convince people that these institutions are worth transforming. And such clarity will not fall from the sky! Rather, we can become clear about these goals only if we find a way of actively involving students in the transformation of the courses they are studying.

How can this be done? At least three steps are necessary in the context of UWC:

- (i) promoting departmental accountability to the stated goals of the university;
- (ii) creating structures and forums of students to assess the work of academic departments, and to contribute to giving direction to the courses the departments offer; and
- (iii) actively opposing and dismantling the excessive orientation towards exams and consequent rote-learning which has been instilled by years of apartheid's gutter education.

If we are serious about UWC's role in the struggle for a non-racial democratic South Africa, then we cannot avoid the question of how its academic work can be made to contribute to that struggle. And if we are serious about transforming UWC as an academic institution in such a way that it actively equips its students for that struggle, then we must ask how students themselves are to participate in that transformation. They cannot do so for as long as departments can simply tell students what the contents of their courses are without having to give any account

of the broader purposes served by doing the specific work required for that course.

It is necessary, in other words, that academic departments at UWC should be required to provide comprehensive accounts of the goals of their teaching and research and the way in which these goals are reflected in each of the courses they teach. These should be available to students and to the staff of other departments, in order to provide a basis for discussion and assessment of the work of academic departments in the light of UWC's stated commitment to work towards a non-racial democratic South Africa.

It is essential, in other words, that an active effort must be made to move away from the UWC's present orientation towards exams towards a system of evaluation requiring students to work consistently throughout the year. In this context, it can clearly be seen that courses evaluated on the basis of work done throughout the year, rather than in a final exam, are an essential precondition for the transformation of the university. If there is no year-mark, then courses automatically orientate themselves towards the exam — and become tests of memory rather than skill, preparing students for subordination not for liberation.

Which way forward for UWC?

IN the previous three sections, we have argued:

- (i) that unity among students and between students and staff at UWC must consciously and constantly be built on the basis of clear programmes and goals, and that the tactic of boycott should only be used in such a way as to create a progressive basis for building that unity;
- (ii) that, for this to be done, we must consider ways of not simply responding sporadically to the state's attacks on the university and its students, but of linking our response to these attacks to a broader campaign for increased funding for such universities, which can articulate the interests of oppressed communities;
- (iii) that such a campaign will only be feasible once the process of transforming UWC as an academic institution is started, and definite structures are created for students to participate in that process.

What we wish to point out, in conclusion, is that these issues are inextricably tied up with one another. To address any one of them effectively, we need also to address the others. And should we decide to neglect any of these issues, it will become more difficult to address the others at all effectively. How these questions are to be addressed is a matter for further discussion, and the arguments set out here are intended to provide a basis for such discussion. In the end, these issues need to be clarified in order to enable us to face up to the question: which way forward for UWC?

We do not wish to pretend that there is an easy way forward. All of us know that we have to move forward in the face of a formidable enemy — the apartheid state, which draws its strength and resources precisely from the labour of the oppressed masses of South Africa. The whole historical project of extracting wealth from the labour of the people of the sub-continent for the benefit of a tiny minority defined by a political system of racial domination will not easily be brought to an end. That project has sunk mines into the earth and raised buildings up to the sky, while seeking always to smash every attempt by those who work the mines or build the skyscrapers to gain control of their own lives. It has built schools, colleges and universities, and in the process distorted and mutilated almost every conceivable intellectual or moral value we might uphold. It is for that reason that we, as a university, must strain every nerve for the overthrow of the social order which it has produced and the construction of a non-racial democracy in South Africa. It is for that reason that we must face up to the historic question: which way forward for UWC?

Thomas Auf der Heyde, Department of Chemistry; Richard Bertelsmann, Department of German; David Bunn, Department of English; Rhoda Kadalie, Department of Anthropology; Jack Lewis, Department of Economics; Andrew Nash, Department of Philosophy; Jane Taylor, Department of English — 28 March 1988