

40th Alfred and Winifred Hoernlé Memorial Lecture

When does a university cease to exist?

Jonathan Jansen

*Fortieth
Alfred and Winifred Hoernlé
Memorial Lecture*

WHEN DOES A
UNIVERSITY
CEASE TO
EXIST ?

by
Professor
Jonathan Jansen



SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTE
OF RACE RELATIONS

WHEN DOES A
UNIVERSITY
CEASE TO
EXIST ?

*Fortieth
Alfred and Winifred Hoernlé
Memorial Lecture*

WHEN DOES A
UNIVERSITY
CEASE TO
EXIST?

*by
Professor Jonathan Jansen*

*17th November 2004
Auden House, Johannesburg*



SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTE
OF RACE RELATIONS
JOHANNESBURG
2005

Published by the
South African Institute of Race Relations
Auden House, 68 De Korte Street
Braamfontein, 2001 South Africa

P O Box 31044, Braamfontein,
Johannesburg, 2017 South Africa

phone: (011) 403-3600

fax: (011) 403-3671

e-mail: sairr@sairr.org.za

website: www.sairr.org.za

© South African Institute of Race Relations

ISBN 0-86982-478-3

PD 5/05

Members of the media are free to reprint or report information, either in whole or in part, contained in this publication on the strict understanding that the South African Institute of Race Relations is acknowledged. Otherwise no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electrical, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Typesetting & layout: Lindsey Morton

Printed by Paarl Print, Paarl

THE ALFRED AND WINIFRED HOERNLÉ MEMORIAL LECTURE

The Hoernlé Memorial Lecture honours Professor R F Alfred Hoernlé, and his wife, Agnes Winifred Hoernlé, both of whom, as presidents, shaped Institute thinking during the organisation's early existence.

Alfred Hoernlé was an internationally recognised philosopher. He was born in Bonn, educated in Saxony and at Oxford, and became a professor of philosophy at the South African College at the age of 28. After teaching in Britain and the United States between 1911 and 1923, he became professor of philosophy at the University of the Witwatersrand. He joined the Institute in 1932, guiding it as president for almost a decade from 1934 to 1943. Alfred Hoernlé is known also for his Phelps-Stokes lectures presented to the University of Cape Town in 1939, and published as *South African Native Policy and the Liberal Spirit*.

Winifred Hoernlé was a senior lecturer in social anthropology at the University of the Witwatersrand. She joined the Institute's executive committee in 1946, and held the position of president three times. In the 1940s, she was a member of the government commission of inquiry into penal and prison reform. Winifred Hoernlé also worked to improve the welfare of children and Asians.

WHEN DOES A UNIVERSITY CEASE TO EXIST?

MY EARLIEST memory of the South African Institute of Race Relations resides in my days as an undergraduate student travelling by four modes of transport (taxi, train, bus and thumb) to get to and from my (presumed) ethnically designated university in Bellville. I had to pass through Mowbray station, from my home in Retreat, to wait for the bus to the Afrikaans-dominant northern areas. Waiting for the 'double-decker' one day, I saw a steady stream of black people enter an old, rickety house on the edge of the bus terminus in this white area. I was curious. I had time on my hands and decided to find out what was going on. I walked over to the house to find a number of white English women behind desks advising African men and women on various matters related to pass laws and domestic rights. I was enormously impressed and encouraged by these rare incidents (in my insular experience) of white-black co-operation against apartheid grievances. But I remember also being disappointed by the didactic and condescending tone of the white English women towards the overly humble, quiet and subdued spirits of the African men and women on the other side. We have come a long way since then; and yet — as Tony Leon's behaviour so unintentionally reminds us — we have a long way to go. I nevertheless wish to pay tribute to the tremendous contribution of the South African Institute of Race Relations and its leadership — the Hoernlés being superb examples — in serving as one of the many beacons of conscience and humanity through much of the previous century, before, during, and after the long years of apartheid.

Is a sign enough?

I recently honoured a longstanding and generous invitation to speak at a rural university in South Africa. Shortly after I drove through the main gates of the institution, I literally tore up my prepared speech and started to think about the content of a 'talk from the heart' to be delivered within one hour of arrival. As the crowd assembled, the chairperson for the event bent over and asked me for the title of the speech. He visibly panicked when I responded with: 'The Case for Closing Down the University of X.' The chair sat down: 'I cannot do this,' he pleaded, 'There will be a riot.' 'Tough,' I replied, 'Either you accept my title or I drive back to Pretoria.' The talk went ahead with the unhappy title.

The sign proclaiming the name of this university dangled precariously on one nut over the gates. The grass had not been cut for months if not years. The classrooms were dilapidated — in a worse state than I had seen in many township high schools around the country. The few good professors had left years ago. The management of the university, such as it was, did nothing else but try to keep student outrage down and manage constant threats of staffing action. The university vice-chancellor did not enjoy credibility as a scholar or exhibit the basic competencies of a manager. There was constant uncertainty about meeting the payroll demands for each month. The library had not purchased any new books for years, and there was no periodical section to speak of; books were routinely stolen or destroyed. Scholarly publications by academics hardly existed; the few publications appeared in little-known parochial and local publications posing as academic journals. Almost nothing was published in the competitive, peer-reviewed international journals. There was no intellectual life on this campus; no stirring debates about development; no lively seminars on current issues in economics or politics or education; no steady stream of international scholars to lend substance to the academic project; no leading scholarly figures on campus; no idealism about the future or ideas about the complex problems of development. The place, quite frankly, was dead.

WHEN DOES A UNIVERSITY CEASE TO EXIST?

As I pondered the pathetic state of this institution, a question came up in my mind that has been troubling me ever since: when does a university cease to exist?

My contention is that a university's existence is not determined by government decree, such as a gazetted declaration of some final date by which a university shuts down; or when a large institution engulfs and extinguishes the identity of a smaller one; or when new signage goes up declaring an imagined community. As you travel from the University of Venda to what was formerly the Giyani College of Education, there is a bright new sign on the road that says: 'University of Venda: Giyani Campus'. When you get to Giyani there is not a soul in sight and the decay of this once outstanding teacher education facility is obvious. This decaying facility was in fact transferred to the provincial department of education. The sign on the way there insists otherwise.

It would be easy to be fooled by the symbolic functions and routines of university life, and mistake this for a university. Even at this rural site, there were annual graduation ceremonies led by lecturers dressed in full academic regalia with solemn music accompanying the procession. Diplomas and degrees were handed out routinely. Each year there would be a new intake of students, albeit with lower and lower entrance requirements in order to keep the place solvent: the inflated matriculation results — which Umalusi recently conceded were based on examinations that in many key subjects had become 'easier' — provided a temporary lifeline to this and other institutions. The financial squeeze had placed the ubiquitous 'moratorium' on any new academic appointments, but lecturers would generally show up for classes to teach. At the end of the year there would be decisions about who passed and who failed. And then there was graduation again.

Despite these routines of ceremony and administration, this so-called university had long ceased to exist. Quite possibly, it might never have existed as a university in the first place, but I do not wish to rehearse the social origins and identities of South African universities: that has been dealt with elsewhere.

Opportunities lost

What is clear is that in the second term of the ANC-led government, South Africa had a unique opportunity to reverse the damage of apartheid higher education and give to the nation a few excellent universities that could address the national and continental challenges of development and, at the same time, secure a position for African higher education among the best institutions in the world.

It is worth recalling two proposals that sought to achieve this repositioning of higher education. The first proposal of the task team of the Council on Higher Education was to create a tiered system that recognised and affirmed the diverse functions of the higher education system. This was a courageous proposal whose brilliance lay in the fact that it was also a recognition of the on-the-ground capacities of various kinds of institutions. The University of Cape Town was, quite simply, not the University of the North West or Natal Technikon or Giyani Teachers' College. But this proposal was trumped by mindless black nationalist politics that preferred to labour under the serious misconception that (a) the standing of institutions is simply a function of the divisiveness and under-development of apartheid and that (b) with corrective action, all institutions (technikons included) could be like Stellenbosch or Wits. The racial pill was just too bitter to swallow: to concede that there were only five or six serious universities in South Africa, all of them with white origins, would be to concede that black institutions were (again) at the bottom of the pile.

The second and less invasive opportunity was the original proposal for mergers. Under Minister Kader Asmal, one way of regrouping institutions was to take on 'the geopolitical imagination of apartheid planners' and replace this with what Terry Barnes memorably called 'the geopolitical imagination of post-apartheid planners'. For Asmal this meant not creating research institutions (at the upper end) and bedrock institutions (at the lower end), but to merge weak and strong institutions on the one hand (such as the incorporation of Vista Campuses into established universities), and to effectively close or scale down largely dysfunctional institutions

WHEN DOES A UNIVERSITY CEASE TO EXIST?

(such as the University of Transkei) under new and more modest missions as training facilities. But the original radical plan for mergers was reversed after intense and vociferous resistance from prominent black vice-chancellors organised under the banner of 'disadvantaged institutions', who made direct representations to the president of South Africa on what Itumeleng Mosala revealingly called 'the Native Question'. Once again, a historic opportunity was lost to create at least some semblance of the university in the higher education landscape.

What was missing in these debates was an honest assessment and open concession of the fact that South Africa did not (at the time) have 21 universities. At best, it had six serious institutions distinguished by the quality of their scholarship and teaching and recognised by the international academy.

The restructuring of higher education provided a unique opportunity to make massive investments in these six universities as the leading centres of intellectual and scholarly life on the continent; as the primary producers of high-level skills for a global economy; and as the primary sites for the generation of new knowledge that could address and redress the serious challenges of development — such as poverty, HIV/AIDS, and education. To be sure, the problem of the racial identities of these institutions, the unequal production of scientists by race and gender, and the still unequal representation of black and women staff in these institutions remain serious concerns. But the way to redress these problems was not to keep 'historically white' and 'historically black' institutions as separate political entities. The governmental task, in my view, should have been to accelerate the deracialisation of these six institutions, *not* pretend that they would be white forever.

Trapped in another's discourse

The dominant discourses in South African universities are completely out of touch with the demographic changes sweeping the former white universities and the demographic realities of this African

WHEN DOES A UNIVERSITY CEASE TO EXIST?

country: we deploy language appropriate to the North American context (where black persons are and will remain a demographic minority) to create defensive institutions (historically black) that simply do not merit distinction in what is effectively a black-majority country.

The University of Pretoria, for example, now has one of the largest populations of black students on its seven campuses, and the largest by far if the distance education students were added to the total registrations. At the same institution, the majority of students now prefers to have instruction in English — not in Afrikaans — with dramatic implications for the future of the Afrikaans language. Among prospective undergraduate students for the 2005 intake, the University of Pretoria now has a majority of black applications in seven of its nine faculties (excluding Education and Veterinary Science). And the number of black academic and administrative staff is increasing steadily — so that within a few years it will be very difficult to still describe these institutions in reference to their racial origins.

However, pretending it is possible for all institutions to become the same thing and equally strong, and trying to achieve this by shifting around increasingly smaller pools of governmental funding among 15 institutions, is the kind of political miscalculation that now threatens the entire system of higher education in South Africa. One of the strangest and costliest mistakes made in this country was to declare technikons as universities (of technology) — this after decades in which the sector made the case for institutional distinctiveness.

The United States of America is an excellent example of how a *differentiated* system of higher education meets both community and development needs, on the one hand, and demands for high-level scientific production and scholarship on the other. But in this context De Anza Community College does not pretend to be Loyola University, which in turn does not pretend to be the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Can all universities be re-created equal?

Central to this pretence that all universities could be re-created equal is the enormous leverage that resides in the new funding formula for higher education. Since all other policy instruments (such as employment equity and qualifications reforms) appear to have had, at best, muted effects on institutions, the one device with most potential for change — whether disruptive or constructive — appears to be financial instruments. The one reality is that there will not be more money from the treasury to capacitate disadvantaged institutions and redress past inequalities: about this fact there is little disagreement. What government is therefore left with is to find means for redistributing the small pool of available resources from the white, privileged institutions (as the case is put) to the black, disadvantaged institutions. At a political level, I have no problem with redistribution. At a strategic level, this is extremely dangerous, for the following reasons.

First, the historically white institutions remain — for the moment at least — the most viable option for creating world class African universities that can compete with leading universities elsewhere and that could deploy their significant resources to resolve urgent problems of development. Systematically to erode this capacity in favour of a racially motivated policy of redistribution is shortsighted in the extreme and will, for sure, drag all institutions down to the lowest common denominator — a situation in which we all lose. Where, I often muse, will cabinet ministers send their children in 20 years' time? At the rate we're going, the answer is: outside of South Africa.

Second, the historically black institutions have been so devastated by a combination of apartheid underdevelopment *and* post-apartheid corruption, that any simplistic notion that these entities could be salvaged to become universities is naive at best and, in effect, pernicious, given the long-term development potential of the country. I have studied, taught and led in historically black universities and the one thing that is clear is that massive injections of sustained, multi-year funding would be necessary to build adequate libraries,

WHEN DOES A UNIVERSITY CEASE TO EXIST?

recruit and retain world class professors, attract outstanding graduate students, and develop the kind of intellectual life that distinguishes universities from other kinds of institutions — such as prisons, hospitals, and mental asylums. By which I mean: we deceive students when they feel they are entitled as post-apartheid beneficiaries to pass; we entertain all manner of social illnesses under the guise of promoting the academic project; and the madness of managerialism has displaced the power of the intellectual community as the distinctive feature of university life.

The levels of recurrent funding required to bring all universities to the same or similar levels will simply not materialise; in the same way that all the rhetorical excesses about Further Education and Training colleges will remain just that — since the macroeconomic commitments of government have ruled out any possibility of the transformation of this sector.

The quality of institutional leadership

It is appropriate at this juncture to reflect on the disturbingly poor quality and credibility of higher education leadership *after* apartheid, and how this has further contributed to the demise of the South African university.

In the historically white universities we have a leadership which, with few exceptions, has yet to find ways of *acting credibly* by building a strong and diverse academic and intellectual community of scholars. It is such perceived inaction that exposes these institutions to the political claim of stalling transformation and to the punitive effects of the more coercive instruments of the state. Worse, when such institutions begin to bleed their few visible black scholars, their capacity to thrive intellectually and socially begins to suffer. For at least one of the leading and former white universities of the 1970s and 1980s, it may already be too late to revive its fortunes since poor political and financial management have placed this institution permanently on the defensive and unable to sustain its formidable intellectual prowess of past decades.

WHEN DOES A UNIVERSITY CEASE TO EXIST?

In the historically Afrikaans universities there remains a serious contestation about the ownership of these institutions. Make no mistake, the disgraceful behaviour of reactionary academics on and around the University of Stellenbosch campus has very little to do with the late Braam Fischer and his communist affiliations. It has everything to do with what Jakes Gerwel insightfully called '*besitterskap*', which is, Who owns this public university called Stellenbosch? The reactionaries are careful to frame this debate as Stellenbosch Afrikaners versus the black nationalist state — which then enables them to label the *proposers* of the honorary doctorate as guilt-ridden white Afrikaners sacrificing themselves on the altar of African nationalism. But by framing the debate in such terms, they also betray their own political motives: to draw a laager around Stellenbosch as one of the last institutions in which to publicly assert Afrikaner power and privilege. They believe it is the Stellenbosch Afrikaner who must, at all costs, assert the right to retain Afrikaans as the dominant language at the university, to determine who enjoys rights of access to this Afrikaner institution, and to decide to whom rites of privilege — such as the honorary doctorate — might be awarded. It is a battle for ethnic-dominant if not ethnic-exclusive ownership of a public institution — nothing more, and nothing less. In the process, the broader mission of the university — as the one place that accommodates and is tolerant of the diversity of ideas — is seriously eroded because of the small-mindedness of a collective band of conservative leadership on and around the campus. It should stand to the credit of the Stellenbosch vice-chancellor that he recognises the dangers of retreat to the very survival of the idea of the university.

Having lost power within the state, the public institutions (as opposed to the family) in which conservative Afrikaners now seek to project their power are sport, the school, the church, and the university. The only secure institution for purposes of racial balkanisation in this context is the church, sport having lost face a while ago to an aggressive politics of quotas. For the next decade, schools and universities will be the primary sites of contestation for the assertion

WHEN DOES A UNIVERSITY CEASE TO EXIST?

of racial privilege and power in the conservative Afrikaans community — and language will serve as the most potent flag-bearer of such contestation.

What is equally disturbing is the behaviour of the leadership of historically black institutions. It is worth reminding ourselves that some of these institutions were — resources apart — thriving sites of intellectual production during the anti-apartheid years. It is also worth recalling that several historically black universities had attractive reserves during the 1980s and even the early 1990s. But what happened in the years leading to and since 1994 is a testimony to corrupt and inept leadership — something amply documented in the series of special investigations commissioned by government and easily accessible on the Internet. My contention is that several promising black universities, which at various historical moments stood on the brink of defying their origins to become strong academic entities with unambiguous developmental agendas, were slowly stripped by their leaders of both their material and intellectual assets to become, well, non-universities.

We need to move beyond the understandable disgust that I hope every citizen of this country felt when the *Mail and Guardian* last week published the salaries of the heads of our universities. There are other questions that need to be addressed. First, what does this say about the leadership represented in university councils who hire and pay vice-chancellors? This has governance implications. Second, how does a vice-chancellor earning two to three million rand turn away indigent students who cannot afford to study at his institution? This has ethical implications. Third, what damage does such behaviour do to the argument for greater autonomy of institutions when such corrupt behaviour is allowed to fester within the public sector? This has political implications.

The role of leadership in the demise of institutions of course has its correlate in the business world. At a recent national conference on Black Economic Empowerment, I made the point that the small but highly visible group of BEE millionnaires were the worst possible

WHEN DOES A UNIVERSITY CEASE TO EXIST?

advertisement for those of us who seek to tap into the idealism of our youth and reinvigorate it for public service and for work in the helping professions. The notion that success means outrageous financial enrichment of the individual stands in the way of building strong universities founded historically on idealism and service. I spend much of my time these days in schools attempting to convey the message that success is not purpose, and that career should not be confused with calling.

But the future existence of the university is not only threatened by lack of resources or the credibility of leadership; it is also undermined by the growing corporatisation of the university. I made this point at the 2004 T B Davie Memorial Lecture at the University of Cape Town:

You may recognise another university in which the entire place has been transformed into a commercial centre, the departments called 'cost-centres' and the students called 'clients'; in which every 'management' meeting is consumed with balancing the budget in the light of impending subsidy cuts; in which the response to external intervention is one of compliance and consent; in which the accumulation of larger and larger numbers of accredited publications is pursued with relentless vigour; in which teaching is equated with technology; and the mechanics of research confused with the elegance of scholarship. Just about everyone in such a place is in the business of [ac]counting. Here, too, the university has long ceased to exist.

I continued by arguing that a university ceases to exist when the intellectual project no longer defines its identity, infuses its curriculum, energises its scholars, and inspires its students. It ceases to exist when state control and interference close down the space within which academic discourse and imagination can flourish without constraint. The university ceases to exist when it imposes on itself narrowing views of the future based on ethnic or linguistic chauvinism, and denies the multiplicity of voices and visions that grant institutions their distinctive character. And the university ceases

WHEN DOES A UNIVERSITY CEASE TO EXIST?

to exist when it represents nothing other than an empty shell of racial representivity at the cost of academic substance and intellectual imagination.

Whether South Africa has *any* universities (in the ways imagined) in the next 30 years will depend crucially on the decisions made today. The most critical and realistic scenario is to create a two-tier university system consisting of (a) a small group of high-powered research universities targeted to enjoy a substantially increased investment in research infrastructure and *postgraduate* education; and (b) a larger group of high-quality teaching universities targeted to create opportunities for a broad base of students within a programme that has strong academic development thinking infused into the undergraduate curriculum.

The first group should have an unambiguous mission of creating world-class research and scholarship focused on and deriving from the pressing problems of African development; the second group would have an equally unambiguous mission of offering high calibre teaching to large masses of undergraduate students. The second group should provide clear and well-funded channels of progression for the best students in these teaching universities to proceed to postgraduate studies and research in the first group, that is, the research universities. It could be argued of course that such differentiation is already taking place — this is correct; the problem is that without policy directive and planning impetus, such ‘natural differentiation’ comes at enormous cost, socially and materially, with inestimable levels of wastage for a third world country.

But new institutional configurations are not enough. What will also be required is a new generation of higher education leaders selected not because of political expediency and racial preference but on the basis of leadership credibility; in the 21st century, capability is simply not enough — as George Bush is busy finding out.

The greatest danger facing the post-apartheid university is that second-generation South Africans fail to find a compelling moral purpose in higher education beyond crass materialism and individual

WHEN DOES A UNIVERSITY CEASE TO EXIST?

self-enrichment. It will require credible leadership to sustain the idea of the university through a restored idealism among students and teachers, an idealism that places our common humanity at the centre of institutional endeavour in a very dangerous world.

Failing such leadership endeavour, it is not only universities that will cease to exist.

PREVIOUS HOERNLÉ LECTURES

- J H Hofmeyr, *Christian principles and race problems* (1945)
- E G Malherbe, *Race attitudes and education* (1946)
- I D MacCrone, *Group conflicts and race prejudice* (1947)
- Winifred Hoernlé, *Penal reform and race relations* (1948)
- W M Macmillan, *Africa beyond the Union* (1949)
- Edgar Brookes, *We come of age* (1950)
- H J van Eck, *Some aspects of the South African industrial revolution* (1951)
- S Herbert Frankel, *Some reflections on civilisation in Africa* (1952)
- A R Radcliffe Brown, *Outlook for Africa* (1953)
- Emory Ross, *Colour and Christian community* (1954)
- T B Davie, *Education and race relations in South Africa* (1955)
- Gordon W Allport, *Prejudice in modern perspective* (1956)
- B B Keet, *The ethics of apartheid* (1957)
- David Thomson, *The government of divided communities* (1958)
- Simon Biesheuvel, *Race, culture and personality* (1959)
- C W de Kiewiet, *Can Africa come of age?* (1960)
- Dennis Cowen, *Liberty, equality, fraternity — today* (1961)
- Denis E Hurley, *Apartheid: Crisis of the Christian conscience* (1964)
- Gwendolen M Carter, *Separate development: The challenge of the Transkei* (1966)
- Keith Hancock, *Are there South Africans?* (1966)
- Meyer Fortes, *The plural society in Africa* (1968)
- D Hobart Houghton, *Enlightened self-interest and the liberal spirit* (1970)
- Tony Mathews, *Freedom and state security in the South African plural society* (1971)
- Philip Mayer, *Urban Africans and the bantustans* (1972)
- Alan Pifer, *The higher education of blacks in the United States* (1973)

- M G Buthelezi, *White and black nationalism, ethnicity and the future of the homelands* (1974)
- Monica Wilson, '*...So truth be in the field...*' (1975)
- Marshall W Murphree, *Education, development and change in Africa* (1976)
- G R Bozzoli, *Education is the key to change in South Africa* (1977)
- Hugh Ashton, *Moral suasion* (1978)
- Alan Paton, *Towards racial justice: Will there be a change of heart?* (1979)
- Leon Sullivan, *The role of multinational corporations in South Africa* (1980)
- Alan Paton, *Federation or desolation* (1985)
- Charles Simkins, *Liberalism and the problem of power* (1986)
- M M Corbett, *Guaranteeing fundamental freedoms in a new South Africa* (1990)
- Richard Goldstone, *Do judges speak out?* (1993)
- Lionel Abrahams, *The democratic chorus and individual choice* (1995)
- Michael O'Dowd, *Ideas have consequences* (2000)
- Carl Gershman, *Aiding Democracy Around the World: The challenges after September 11* (2003)

VOTE OF THANKS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE INSTITUTE, PROFESSOR ELWYN JENKINS

The South African Institute of Race Relations has always taken a close interest in education. The Hoernlé Lecture this evening has links with this long history. Professor Jansen mentioned that he recently gave the T B Davie Memorial Lecture at the University of Cape Town: Professor Davie, Vice-Chancellor of UCT, gave a Hoernlé Lecture at the Institute in 1955 on the subject of 'Education and Race Relations in South Africa'.

We have been following recent developments in higher education, and are grateful to Professor Jansen for giving us an up-to-the-minute assessment of the situation which at the same time was based on his immense knowledge of the subject and was an impassioned personal interpretation of where we are and what is needed.

One of the most striking points Prof Jansen has made is that the current model for higher education was not inevitable in a post-apartheid South Africa, and that it was not even rationally chosen as one out of several available models. Instead it is made up of last-minute compromises resulting from lobbying and bargaining based on political, sectional and personal interests.

We had an illustration of this when we had Mr Saki Macazoma to address us in this hall two years ago. He was chair of the Working Group that the Minister of Education, Kader Asmal, appointed to advise on the fate of higher education institutions once the government had accepted the National Plan for Higher Education in 2001. In his address, Mr Macazoma strongly condemned the apartheid government for establishing universities in remote places such as Mmabatho and a rural site north of Pietersburg. Nevertheless, his Group recommended keeping them going. It also disregarded several recommendations of the National Plan regarding the closure or merger of specific institutions after well publicised lobbying by interest groups.

Now Professor Jansen tells us what we all really know — that the historically black universities are incapable of being saved without the

VOTE OF THANKS

injection of huge amounts of capital that the country does not have. They always received more favourable funding than white universities during the apartheid years; yet they have reached this point bearing crippling debts.

The National Plan for Higher Education said that the government would achieve its aims through a two-pronged approach: (i) an interactive and consultative process of persuading the institutions to plan and manage for themselves, and (ii) targeted subsidies and rewards.

Now Professor Jansen tells us there is no evidence that centralised planning initiatives, such as employment and qualifications reforms, have achieved any transformation goals, and that without more funding all our institutions are going to be reduced to the lowest common denominator. In other words, neither of the government's proposed strategies for reforming higher education has a hope of working. Mr Macazoma conceded, in answer to a question that I put to him in this hall, that it would take many years to implement the proposed reforms. Already there are dramatic signs of the collapse of the National Plan. The government's recent announcement that it is capping student enrolments is a complete reversal of the pledge in the Plan to increase student enrolments.

Another important point that Professor Jansen has made is that our institutions are also having to come to terms with the managerialism and corporatisation that are a consequence of globalisation. We have already seen several cases of very unpleasant disruptions in our universities arising from clashes between the old culture of collegiality and the new approaches to university management; and South Africa is actually exporting university managers to the UK to teach the British the new style.

Professor Jansen takes a different approach to that of the National Plan in considering the transformation of the historically white universities. The Plan, and Professor Asmal's follow-up to it, were all threat and brute force. Professor Jansen's call for leadership in our universities comes from the heart, and is, I hope, one that those in leadership positions in the universities will be more inclined to respond to.

We thank Professor Jansen for his trenchant address.

Professor Jonathan D Jansen, dean of education at the University of Pretoria, posed the question *When does a university cease to exist?* in the 40th Hoernlé Memorial Lecture, which he delivered at the South African Institute of Race Relations on 17th November 2004.

Defining a university as a place where academic discourse and imagination can flourish, Professor Jansen warns that South Africa's universities are threatened by state interference, growing corporatisation, a pervasive new managerialism, and inept and corrupt leadership. He warns that 'a university ceases to exist when it represents nothing other than an empty shell of racial representivity'.

He warns against policies intended to restructure higher education that will drag all institutions down to the lowest common denominator, and recommends that the six better established universities should be rapidly deracialised and appropriately equipped to become African universities with world-class standards of scholarship and research. A larger group of tertiary institutions, with a strong development component, could then be tasked with providing opportunities for a broader base of students. We need, Professor Jansen stresses, 'a new generation of higher education leaders selected not because of political expediency and racial preference but on the basis of leadership credibility'.

* * * * *

Professor Jansen's initial training was in science education (BSc, UWC; MS, Cornell) and later in international development education (PhD, Stanford). He remains an active teacher, teaching both first-year students (on race, identity and education) and doctoral students (on education policy implementation). He also leads three major research programmes with teams comprising doctoral students and new academics. He serves on the editorial boards of several international journals and on international academic councils such as the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies. His most recent books are *Education Policy Implementation* (2001) and *Mergers in Higher Education* (2002).



0 - 8 6 9 8 2 - 4 7 8 - 3



The Hoernlé Memorial Lectures

The IRR is republishing the text of the Hoernlé Memorial Lectures, a series of talks which started in 1945. The original introductory note to the lecture series reads as follows:

A lecture, entitled the Hoernlé Memorial Lecture (in memory of the late Professor R. F. Alfred Hoernle), President of the Institute from 1934—1943), will be delivered once a year under the auspices of the South African Institute of Race Relations. An invitation to deliver the lecture will be extended each year to some person having special knowledge and experience of racial problems in Africa or elsewhere.

It is hoped that the Hoernlé Memorial Lecture will provide a platform for constructive and helpful contributions to thought and action. While the lecturers will be entirely free to express their own views, which may not be those of the Institute as expressed in its formal decisions, it is hoped that lecturers will be guided by the Institute's declaration of policy that "scientific study and research must be allied with the fullest recognition of the human reactions to changing racial situations; that respectful regard must be paid to the traditions and usages of the various national, racial and tribal groups which comprise the population; and that due account must be taken of opposing views earnestly held."

About the IRR

Since 1929, the Institute of Race Relations has advocated for a free, fair, and prospering South Africa. At the heart of this vision lie the fundamental principles of liberty of the individual and equality before the law guaranteeing the freedom of all citizens. The IRR stands for the right of all people to make decisions about their lives without undue political or bureaucratic interference.