

https://dspace.org/

Raikes, student politics, and the coming of apartheid

Murray, Bruce

1994-02-28
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/9373

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

MURRAY

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND
INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED SOCIAL RESEARCH

Seminar Paper
to be presented in RW 7003 SEMINAR ROOM
AT 4.00pm 28TH FEBRUARY 1994

Title: **Raikes, Student Politics, and the Coming of Apartheid**

by: **Bruce Murray**

No 352

AFRICANA LIBRARY

RAIKES, STUDENT POLITICS, AND THE COMING OF APARTHEID

Introduction

In May 1948, in perhaps the greatest upset in South African electoral history, Dr D.F. Malan's National Party and its allies defeated Smuts' United Party in the first general election since the war. For only the second time in the history of the Union had the governing party been defeated at the polls; for the first time since Union was a purely Afrikaner government formed. The Nationalist campaign had been waged on a platform of apartheid, involving the fuller separation of the races, and once in office the Nationalists proceeded to enact a series of measures designed to promote both greater segregation and greater repression. These included the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act of 1949, and in 1950 the Population Registration Act, the Group Areas Act, and the Suppression of Communism Act. In the field of education, their first major measure was the Bantu Education Act of 1953, which set up an entirely separate schooling system for Africans under the control of Dr Verwoerd's Department of Native Affairs. They dealt next with tertiary education in the Extension of University Education Act of 1959, which established university collleges for 'Non-European' students and prohibited the 'white' universities from registering black students, except with ministerial permission.

With hindsight, Nationalist legislation in the 1950s appeared to unfold with a logical inevitability in accordance with a comprehensively worked out long-term strategy for the construction of an apartheid state. Recent research, however, has emphasised the elements of fluidity in Nationalist policy-making, and higher education was evidently an area in which the Nationalists initially lacked a fixed design to direct them.[1] Nationalist policy on the universities ran into a series of culs de sac before the route that led to the Extension of University Education Act was clearly mapped out.

What was certain from the outset was that the Nationalists strongly objected to the two 'open universities', and the 'social intermingling' they allowed. For the 1948 elections, the Nationalist manifesto included universities in their projected apartheid policy for the country, albeit in rather vague terms. The recommendation of the Sauer Commission, the party's special commission into the 'colour question', was that where necessary provision should be made for higher education for Africans in their own areas.[2]

Once in office the Nationalists proceeded to harrass the 'open universities', with the Prime Minister leading the way. In his first speech in Parliament as Prime Minister, Malan denounced the 'intolerable state of affairs' caused by the presence of black students at 'white' universities, and declared that it was Government policy to create separate university institutions for 'both the Natives and the Coloureds'. Before 1948 was out the Government announced it planned to terminate the state scholarships for African medical students at Wits.[3] In 1949 the Government refused to renew the permit of Eduardo Mondlane, later the first president of FRELIMO, the Front for the Liberation of Mozambique, to continue his studies in the social sciences at Wits; this was followed up in the next year by the decision to prohibit any further 'extra-Union non-European' students from studying at South African educational institutions, ostensibly on the grounds that there were insufficient educational facilities available for the country's own black

population. Implementation of the policy was then suspended for three years so as to allow neighbouring territories time to build up their own educational facilities. In another move, two Natal Indian students, E.A. Lockhat in 1950 and S. Naidoo in 1951, were refused inter-provincial permits to enable them to study at Wits.

From the standpoint of the student leadership at Wits, the design of these initial forays was to prepare the way for a total ban on black students at the 'open universities'. However, there was also evidence to the contrary. At the annual Transvaal Nationalist congress in Pretoria in September 1951 the Minister of Education, Arts and Science, J.H. Viljoen, left the strong impression that the Government would stop short of legislating to exclude blacks from the 'open universities'. Viljoen's political home was the Afrikaner Party, rather than the National Party, and evidently he was not wedded to the notion of enforcing university apartheid; the universities were autonomous bodies, he told the congress, and it would constitute a revolutionary step to interfere with them. In a statement somewhat reminiscent of Jan Hofmeyr, he asserted that public opinion would eventually oblige Wits and UCT to put a stop to 'the mixture of races'. A delegate protested: 'We are getting tired of hearing that universities are autonomous bodies'.[4] In the same year, the Eiselen Commission into 'Native Education' recommended the creation of a new, national scheme for African education 'to meet the needs of Africans as an independent race', and this included 'the eventual founding of an independent Bantu university'. The commission, however, advised that the creation of such a university would depend 'on a well-thought out plan for Bantu development' and would require 'thorough study'.[5] The Nationalists, clearly, had no immediate blueprint at their disposal for developing an apartheid system of higher education, and there was perhaps no certainty that they would seek to legislate against the 'open universities'.

Following the Nationalist victory in the general election of April 1953, in which they secured an increased majority, Malan's Government made its first significant move towards formulating
plans for dealing with the 'open universities' and constructing separate university facilities for blacks. On 11 December 1953 the Prime Minister, addressing a graduation ceremony at Stellenbosch University in his capacity as Chancellor, stated that the mingling of whites and blacks at two of the country's largest universities would have to be eliminated as speedily as possible as it ran directly contrary to the policy of apartheid, and he announced that a commission had been appointed to investigate the matter.[6] The three-man commission of Dr J.E. Holloway, a former Secretary for Finance as chairman, Dr E.G. Malherbe, the former Principal of Natal University, and Professor R. W. Wilcocks, the Rector of Stellenbosch University, was instructed to 'investigate and report on the practicability and financial implications of providing separate training facilities for Non-Europeans at universities'.

The appointment of the Holloway Commission, however, was not the prelude to legislation establishing separate university institutions. The members of the commission, selected by Viljoen, were in no sense apartheid ideologues, and they conducted an essentially independent investigation. While specifically not asked to consider the desirability of providing separate university facilities for blacks, the commissioners nonetheless made it evident in their report, submitted in September 1954, that they viewed the creation of apartheid structures in higher education with some misgivings.

Taking their financial brief seriously, the commissioners did not consider it feasible to proceed with either the creation of separate facilities for blacks at the existing 'open universities' or the creation de novo of a single large university for blacks. According to the commission, the most feasible scheme to promote segregation in higher education would be to concentrate African and Indian students in the parallel classes in Durban and at Fort Hare, but to allow 'Coloured' students to continue non-segregated studies at the universities prepared to admit them, especially the University of Cape Town (UCT).[7] From the standpoint of the South African Bureau of Racial Affairs, the Broederbond research group, the Holloway Commission created the impression that it preferred the present situation in repudiation of Government policy.

The appointment of the Holloway Commission coincided with Raikes' announcement that, after 26 years at the helm, he was retiring from the principalship as a consequence of ill-health. To that point, Raikes' strategy for dealing with Malan's Government had been governed by his own sense that Nationalist policy was still very fluid, and that Wits might retain its 'open' status by following the path of prudence. As perceived by Raikes, Nationalist objections to the 'open universities' were directed primarily against the social 'fraternisation' between the races that they allowed, and at the growing politicisation of their campuses as opposition to the apartheid regime intensified. His views were shared by the large majority on Council. Not at all convinced that the Government was committed to legislating against the 'open universities', Raikes and Council believed that by tightening up on their policy of 'social segregation' on campus, and maintaining the University's political neutrality, Wits might succeed in warding off Government intervention.

The response of the student left to the Nationalist threat was very different. Working from the principle that universities could not somehow be divorced from the politics of the wider society, they campaigned not simply to defend the status quo at the 'open universities' but also to combat the denial of social equality to black students on campus and to engage Wits students in the wider political struggle over the future of South Africa. While Raikes and the Council accused the student left of 'rocking the boat', they were in turn accused of following a futile policy of 'appeasement', or worse, of downright 'collaboration', as when the University imposed restrictions on black admissions to its medical school in 1953. With a left/liberal grouping in control of the SRC, the end result was a head-on collision between the SRC on the one side and Raikes and the Council on the other. When Raikes finally retired in February 1954 he was most definitely an ill man, but he had also reached the end of his tether in negotiating the political pressures and conflicts around him.

Students and politics

Without question, the Nationalist victory in 1948 was the great divide in the history of student politics at Wits; student politics thereafter became inevitably and increasingly bound up with the politics of the wider society. With Wits and UCT constituting political targets for the Nationalist Government, the debate that unfolded on campus was over how far along the 'political' route Wits students and student organisations might travel in confronting the Nationalist threat.

While Raikes fully accepted the right of students to protest against the Nationalist infringements of university autonomy, and to hold whatever political views they chose, except Communism once it was declared illegal, he consistently warned that the University itself should not be implicated in student political activity. The University itself, he warned students in regard to their political activities at the beginning of the 1949 academic year, could hold no political views; as a microcosm of every shade of opinion in the community, it had itself to be politically neutral. It was consequently 'improper for students or staff to speak in support of any political party as members of the university'.[8] Raikes fretted about two developments in particular, the highly visible participation by Wits students in the extra-parliamentary opposition that emerged to the Nationalists, notably Torch Commando marches and meetings in 1951 and the Defiance Campaign in 1952, and the entry of the SRC into the 'political' arena. The position reached by the SRC by 1952 that 'the very nature of the problem' confronting universities in South Africa obliged the SRC to deal with 'political matter', and that the SRC was entitled to speak up on behalf of students without in any way representing 'the Higher Educational Institution, which is the University of the Witwatersrand', was not one that endeared itself to Raikes and the Council.[9]

Apart from a handful of Nationalists, all groups on the SRC, from Communists across to conservatives in the United Party, stood committed to the defence of Wits' policy of 'academic non-segregation' against Government infringement, but otherwise substantial differences between them remained evident. The divergences between the left, made up chiefly of Communists and other varieties of Marxists, and the liberals, non-Marxist and anti-racist, sometimes generated controversy, but otherwise they worked closely together in resisting Nationalist attacks on the 'open universities'. The consequent left/liberal alliance, which was organised as a 'ticket' for SRC elections so as not to split the vote, effectively dominated the SRC. The conservative minority viewed what they saw as the undue politicisation of the SRC askance, and as an alternative to the remorseless politics of protest they urged a more constructive engagement with Afrikaner nationalism through a 'reconciliation' between the English- and Afrikaans-medium universities.

In both the SRC, which was presided over by George Clayton, and in the National Union of South African Students (NUSAS), the left was well represented when the Nationalists came to power. Buoyed by the return of some highly politicised ex-volunteers in the Springbok Legion and the Communist Party of South Africa (CPSA), including Clayton himself, Joe Slovo, Mervyn Susser, and Michael Hathorn, and seeking to capitalise on the sense of idealism generated by the war against Fascism, the left at Wits had acquired considerable drive in the immediate aftermath of war. Active, vocal, and well-organised, it exercised an influence in the SRC and NUSAS far beyond that warranted by its actual support base in the wider student society. Through the 'liberal' caucus in the SRC it was able to monopolise the SRC's representation on NUSAS, which it consequently employed to radicalise NUSAS.

With the departure of the ex-volunteers at the end of the decade, the leadership of the left was provided by a coterie of long-standing students who belonged to the Johannesburg West branch of the CPSA, until it dissolved itself in June 1950 on the eve of the passage of the Suppression of Communism Bill. The chief among them was Harold Wolpe, a student in arts and law from 1944 to 1952, who served six terms on the SRC; others included David Holt, a science student between 1947 and 1952, Lionel Forman, who moved from UCT to

Wits in 1949 for his law degree, and Arthur Goldreich, an architecture student. With Wolpe as President of the SRC in 1950/51, and Forman as editor of the Witwatersrand Student from 1949 to 1951, the left sometimes looked as if it was very much in control of the main levers of power and influence in Wits student life.

From the standpoint of the left, the struggle over the 'open universities' simply could not be separated from the wider struggle to determine the future shape of South Africa, and could certainly not be separated from the overall struggle against the Nationalist regime. 'The struggle against university apartheid', Ronald Segal, a UCT student at the time, recalled in his memoirs, 'seemed unreal to us for as long as it was not part of the whole political engagement to reshape South Africa.'[10] Their concern consequently was to engage students in the wider issues and struggles of the society, using the campus as a point of mobilisation.

For their part, the liberals were absolutely implacable in their opposition to university apartheid, but to begin with had definite qualms about venturing beyond the 'legitimate' arena of student involvement. Prominent liberals at Wits included Phillip Tobias, a medical student who served as NUSAS President from 1948 to 1951, and Michael O'Dowd, an arts and law student who became Vice President of NUSAS in 1952, and the experience of the early years of apartheid considerably widened their understanding of how 'political' the SRC and NUSAS might become in contending with the Nationalists.

The conservatives, more akin to Raikes and the Council in their thinking, looked to conciliate Afrikaner nationalism, and in particular sought to reach a modus vivendi with the Afrikaans-medium universities. The left consequently denounced the conservatives as 'Fascists', reckoning that any such modus vivendi could only be achieved at the expense of black students. For Harry Schwarz, a law student who spearheaded the attempt on the SRC to attain a 'reconciliation' between English- and Afrikaans-medium universities, the accusation was particularly hurtful given his record as a navigator in the SAAF in the war against Fascism.[11] Emotions, not surprisingly, ran high when the SRC referred crucial decisions to mass meetings of the student body.

Between 1948 and 1950 the question of a 'reconciliation' with the Afrikaans-medium universities, and with it the future of NUSAS, proved the most divisive issue on campus; once it became evident that no such reconciliation was attainable, and once the SRC and NUSAS had been drawn into the wider 'political' arena by protesting against the Unlawful Organisations Bill of 1950, which became the Suppression of Communism Act, the question of the nature and limits of student involvement in politics dominated debate.

In the immediate wake of the Nationalist victory, the student body found itself badly divided. The SRC elections in August 1948, in which polling was considerably up in all faculties, produced a distinct rightwards reaction; while the left/liberal alliance still held the majority in the SRC formed under John Boyd, an architecture student, it was now faced by a powerful conservative grouping headed by Harry Schwarz. At general meetings of the student body confrontations between the two groups became increasingly heated, with serried ranks of engineers and white-coated medical students hurling abuse at one another across the reaches of the Great Hall. A new atmosphere of intolerance pervaded the campus.

The central issue in the 1948 SRC elections, and the issue round which the major political divisions on campus were played out, was the question of NUSAS and the future relationship between the English-and Afrikaans-medium universities. 'NUSAS will have to revise many of its tenents towards a more realistic acceptance of the present situation,' Boyd, an avowed previous critic of NUSAS, declared in his election manifesto, 'but I feel that it must not be allowed to fall.' There was no ambivalence on the part of liberals and the left, who insisted that the time to stand fast on principle had arrived. 'The idea of compromise is spreading like a horrible disease,' Mervyn Susser complained in his manifesto, 'until men are compromising every principle they ever claimed to hold.'[12]

At the very moment of Nationalist triumph, NUSAS had reached a point of crisis. With the departure of Rhodes, and the notices of secession given by UCT and Natal University College, Durban, it was evident that the left-led revival of NUSAS had outstripped its support base among white English-speaking students. Not only was there a backlash against 'leftist' dominance, but there was the widespread perception that, with Fort Hare as a member, NUSAS itself was a fundamental obstacle to the attainment of English/Afrikaner student unity. When in July 1948 Tobias assumed the presidency of a NUSAS seemingly on the point of disintegration, he went to Jan Hofmeyr, in his capacity as honorary president of NUSAS, for advice, and the now Deputy Leader of the Opposition told him that from the standpoint of persuading the Afrikaans student bodies to return to NUSAS the admission of Fort Hare had been a mistake. However, once that decision had been taken as a matter of principle there could be no going back. 'If the admission of Fort Hare means that the NUSAS ship is going to sink,' Hofmeyr advised Tobias, 'it is your duty as President to maintain that principle and to ensure that even in sinking all the flags are kept flying.'[13] The central threat to NUSAS, and the principles of non-racialism it had come to adopt, lay in the attempt of the conservatives on the English-medium campuses to negotiate a 'reconciliation' with the Afrikaans-medium campuses.

Arguably, the notion of such a reconciliation was a chimera, for it displayed no understanding of the dynamics of Afrikaner nationalism, but it was considerably in vogue on English-medium campuses in the wake of the Nationalist victory. At the end of 1948 UCT made the first attempt to stage a conference of all SRCs, but the Afrikaans SRCs refused point-blank to meet black students. As the Wits delegation reported back, the Afrikaans-medium universities all insisted on 'complete apartheid in all student spheres of activity'.[14]

It was to resolve the consequent impasse, and to attempt to bring the Afrikaans-medium universities back into NUSAS, that Harry Schwarz and Charles Cilliers proposed to the Wits SRC that 'the Non-European Universities in NUSAS agree as a temporary measure to be represented in its Councils by Europeans elected by them, and that the Universities presently not represented on NUSAS be approached to become members of NUSAS on this basis'. The proposal divided the SRC right down the middle, and it was only defeated by 12 votes to 10 after Tobias made an impassioned speech against it.[15]

In February the next year Natal University, Durban, hosted an inter-SRC conference which Wits refused to attend as the black SRCs had been excluded. The formula devised by the conference as a basis for future inter-SRC co-operation was that white delegates would represent the purely white university institutions, black delegates the purely black institutions, and

white delegates the two 'open universities'. Whether or not Wits should accept this formula was put to the annual general meeting of the student body in March 1950, and after a tumultuous series of packed meetings in the Great Hall 'marked by scenes of enthusiasm and rowdyism unequalled at the university for many years', it was rejected. The motion of Sydney Brenner, the new SRC President, and Ivan Stoller that Wits decline to attend 'any inter SRC Conference if conditions of restriction be laid down as to the race, colour, creed, language or sex composition of a delegation from Wits' was carried by 845 votes to 344, after Harry Schwarz's amendment approving the Durban formula had been rejected by 809 votes to 573. For Schwarz and his supporters, the compromise formula reached at the Durban conference presented a 'golden opportunity' to achieve the national co-operation of all South African students that had been lacking since 1933; in the face of it, insistence on the freedom of Wits to send delegates of whatever colour was 'a mere quibble'. For Brenner, who made the vote one of confidence in his SRC, the Durban formula constituted a fundamental attack on 'the principles of academic non-segregation'.[16]

The strength shown by the 'segregationists' at the meetings greatly alarmed the left/liberal alliance, prompting the acknowledgment by the Witwatersrand Student that the right had proved very adept in mobilising its support: 'The segregationists, led apparently by Mr Schwarz, have shown the power of organising their forces before a general meeting. But they have, perhaps, overplayed their hand. Their tactics have alienated many of their supporters. Organised rowdyism is a double-edged sword'.[17]

As UCT, Rhodes, and Fort Hare likewise rejected the Durban formula, it never became operative. The Pietermaritzburg SRC of Natal University thereupon took up the running, and called a conference in August 1950 of the presidents and vice-presidents of all university SRCs. Although the practical effect of this was to exclude any blacks, the Wits SRC agreed to send Brenner and O'Dowd to Pietermaritzburg. There they held firm to the line that Wits opposed the exclusion of blacks from delegations representing the 'open universities' at inter-SRC conferences, and consequently no agreement was reached.[18]

While the conservative-inspired attempts to promote national student unity founded on the rocks of racialism, new life was breathed into NUSAS by the Nationalist threats to university autonomy. At the end of 1948 Tobias, in his first year as NUSAS President, sent to all NUSAS-affiliated SRCs a letter warning of the Government's threat to university autonomy and advising them to remain vigilant.[19] Much to Nationalist chagrin, NUSAS was thereafter to play a central role in co-ordinating the opposition of the English-medium campuses to the whole idea of enforced university apartheid.

Tobias' three-year term as NUSAS President was crucial in determining the organisation's future.[20] A committed liberal, he held NUSAS onto a liberal path while at the same time persuading the more conservative centres to remain in NUSAS, thereby ensuring the organisation's mass base. Rhodes renewed its affiliation in 1948, and both UCT and Durban withdrew their notices of secession. The rallying point for NUSAS was its defence of university autonomy against state interference.

The initial Nationalist infringements of university autonomy all affected Wits directly, and gave a considerable boost to the development on campus of a culture of protest. In immediate response to Malan's parliamentary threat to the 'open universities' in August 1948, the basic

mechanisms for organising protest against the new Government were put in place with the formation of the Students' Liberal Association (SLA) 'to resist attempts from any quarter to introduce racial or political discrimination in the academic sphere' and to engage students in 'the political situation in the country'.[21] In effect the SLA displaced FOPS, which had become far too sectarian for the purposes of organising a broad-based movement of protest, and like FOPS it staged lunch-time meetings and protest rallies from the Great Hall steps. The SRC also became directly involved in organising protest. When Mondlane's study permit was revoked, the SRC called a mass meeting at the swimming pool, where a motion protesting the Government's action was carried by an overwhelming majority, with only four dissentients. To signal that the state also had its mechanisms in place for contending with Wits student protest, the meeting was graced by the presence of the Criminal Investigation Department (CID), an invasion of the University's space that greatly angered Raikes as well as the SRC.[22]

For the SRC the problematic was whether it should restrict itself to protesting against direct infringements of the University's autonomy, or whether it should broaden its involvement to encompass Nationalist challenges to civil and political liberties more generally. This question was first directly raised in 1950 when the Government produced its Unlawful Organisations Bill, which eventually became the Suppression of Communism Act, outlawing the Communist Party. In protest against the bill, the SLA organised a large-scale petition, but the issue became whether the protest should be taken up by the SRC and endorsed by a general meeting of students. The significance of the issue was that it exposed a fault line between liberals and the left, with the liberals hesitating to have the SRC itself cross into the avowedly 'political' arena. Brenner's SRC, in which the left/liberal alliance otherwise held definite sway, was split down the middle. On the motion of Ivan Stoller, it voted by 8 to 5 to call a general meeting of the student body to express its strong opposition to the Unlawful Organisations Bill.
The minority regarded the matter as outside the jurisdiction of the SRC, but once it was approved by the SRC four of them,
Messrs Getz, Jacobs, O'Dowd, and Blignaut, intimated that they they would support the motion at the general meeting. As Getz explained, while it was not the function of the SRC to express political opinions, the sense that the sweeping terms of this particularly 'pernicious' piece of legislation affected 'every SRC democrat and liberal' and possibly posed a threat to the SRC itself and NUSAS required that 'even the SRC should take a strong stand on this issue'.[23]

The conservatives proved less malleable. At another crowded general meeting in the Great Hall, on 16 May 1950, E.J. Zimmerman put forward his amendment that Wits students 'should not associate themselves in any way, in the name of the University, with any political party or organisation, or with any controversial political measure such as the Unlawful Organisations Bill'. As he explained, 'the intereference in political issues by university students' was being fomented
by a group that leant 'very heavily to the left'. His amendment was lost by 188 to 568, and the motion carried by 580 to 42.[24]

In the lifespan of the next SRC, under the presidency of Harold Wolpe, the political fractures within Wits showed up even more distinctly. Wolpe, as an acknowledged member of the erstwhile Communist Party, served as a ligthning

rod for opposition not only from the conservative grouping in the SRC, marshalled by Richard Lyons and Eyvind Finsen, but also from liberal quarters outside the SRC, chiefly through the person of Michael O'Dowd. Throughout his term as President Wolpe was hounded by motions of censure and no-confidence.

First of all, Wolpe's very election as President was challenged. The SRC elections themselves, in August 1950, were
the first to be contested in terms of the new constitution, largely the handiwork of Michael O'Dowd, which provided for a much enlarged SRC. As before, the SRC was elected on a faculty basis, but with one representative for each faculty for every 160 students or major part thereof, as against 250 students previously. For the 1950 elections Medicine, as by far the largest faculty, was entitled to 7 representatives, Engineering, the most conservative faculty, to 5, Arts 4, Dentistry, Commerce, and Architecture 2 each, and Science and Law 1 each. In addition, the Johannesburg Teachers Training College, the Cultural Societies, the All Sports Council, and each of the four residences, possessed a representative, making for an SRC of 31 members, the largest ever. There were two potential candidates for President, Wolpe, elected to his fifth term on the SRC, and Godfrey Getz, a liberal from the medical school. After assessing the situation, Getz withdrew; even though assured of victory, it would be with right-wing support, and that he declined. Wolpe was consequently endorsed by the 'liberal caucus' and elected President unopposed.[25] His election was thereupon immediately challenged by the conservative grouping, which complained of improper caucussing. The Lyons/Finsen motion condemning the practice of 'arranging of Executive elections and other matters of Councils' business at meetings outside of Council' was lost by 18 votes to 11. When Wolpe refused to entertain another motion complaining about irregularities at the SRC elections, Finsen moved a vote of no-confidence, but this was lost 19 to 3.

At the packed annual general meeting of the student body in March 1951 the attack on Wolpe was taken up by O'Dowd, who moved a vote of censure in the President for a 'flagrant violation' of the constitution. Wolpe, apparently, had not fully understood the constitution crafted by O'Dowd, but the motion of censure was defeated and a counter motion of confidence in the SRC and its President carried by an overwhelming majority. Through this personality and ideological infighting two major issues surfaced.
The first was whether NUSAS should follow most other western non-communist student organisations and withdraw from the International Union of Students (IUS). The second was whether the SRC and NUSAS should become avowedly 'political' in contending with the Nationalist Government.

At a series of poorly attended general meetings in the Great Hall in June 1951, in the midst of the examination period, to mandate the Wits delegates to NUSAS, the SRC recommendation that NUSAS remain in the IUS as 'the only potential instrument for world student unity' was carried by 128 to 101 against the opposition led by O'Dowd, who contended that the IUS had simply ceased to be 'a democratic organisation'.[26] The significance of the IUS issue, which remained on the agenda until NUSAS finally disaffiliated in 1955, was that it exposed some of the fractures in the left/liberal alliance, bringing out the powerful anti-communism of several liberals, notably O'Dowd himself. The second issue on which the SRC required a mandate for the NUSAS Assembly was on the Fort Hare proposal that NUSAS include in its objects clause the statement that it stood 'for political and social equality for all men in South Africa'. While the left sympathised with the proposal, they

generally recognised it was impractical. The liberals, for their part, saw it as wandering far beyond the legitimate area of activity for a student organisation, and feared that it would drive the vast majority of whites out of NUSAS. The motion to support Fort Hare was lost 47 to 70.[27] At the July 1951 Assembly NUSAS duly decided to remain in the IUS and rejected the Fort Hare amendment to its constitution.[28] In the next year, Fort Hare disaffiliated from NUSAS.

On the central question of the relationship of student organisations to politics and conditions in the wider society, the 1951 NUSAS Assembly ultimately adopted a compromise resoltion, proposed by Getz of Wits and D.D. Peter of Fort Hare, that:

> This Assembly declares that, since NUSAS is required, in terms of its constitution, to work for the educational and democratic rights of students, therefore NUSAS is bound to concern itself with the conditions of society and, particularly, with all forms of discrimination and inequality both inside the university, and, where they affect our educational system, our universities or our students as students, outside the universities.

This was to remain NUSAS policy for the next six years. While it was conservatively applied by the NUSAS executive, it was employed by the left at Wits to underline its organic view that the universities could no longer be seen in isolation from 'the total political, economic and social enviroment'. In August 1951, in reporting to the Wits student body on the NUSAS Assembly and his tenure as SRC president, Wolpe stressed that the time was past 'when we could restrict our attention to matters rigidly within the four walls of the University'.[29] As there was no quorum for the general meeting in the Great Hall to receive Wolpe's report, with only a handful of students attending, it had to be taken as read.[30]

On leaving the presidency, Wolpe continued to play an active role in seeking to politicise the student body, both as a member of the SRC and as chairman of the SLA, which had initially been founded under the chairmanship of Michael O'Dowd. It was the SLA that served as the main mechanism for involving white students at Wits in activist political campaigns in the wider society; it organised mass meetings on the Great Hall steps in protest against the Unlawful Organisations Bill, provided the Torch Commando with a forum on campus, and in 1952 helped to engage students in the Defiance Campaign, the campaign of civil disobedience organised jointly by the African National Congress and the South African Indian Council in defiance of 'unjust laws', including the pass laws and more recent apartheid legislation.

What Raikes objected to particularly about the left at Wits was its links with the wider movement of political protest in South Africa, culminating in the Defiance Campaign of 1952. Raikes' abiding phobia was that the University would get embroiled in political controversy, and he was consequently extremely apprehensive about the political involvements of both staff and students. The added dimension in 1952 was that certain radical students were openly 'fraternising' with blacks at political meetings. 'Outside the University', Raikes complained in a letter of 1 July 1952 to several members of Senate, 'the problem is that meetings of Non-Europeans are becoming much more frequent to make protests about all sorts of things, and certain students are making a point of attending such meetings and fraternising in public with the Non-Europeans present at the meetings'.[31]

Raikes' plan in mid-1952 was to meet with a range of student leaders and organisations to discuss his concerns with them, but
before he could organise the meeting his nightmare became a reality with a highly publicised Wits involvement in the Defiance Campaign. On 14 August two black medical students, Deliza Mji, the president of the African National Congress Youth League, and Harrison Motlana, the secretary of the League, were arrested on campus as part of a major police swoop to break the Defiance Campaign. On 26 August they and 18 other Defiance Campaign leaders were charged in the Johannesburg Magistrate's Court under the Suppression of Communism Act, occasioning a major demonstration outside the court by over 3 000 people, mostly black. As part of the demonstration about 250 Wits students, organised by the SLA and led by Wolpe, marched from the University gates on Jan Smuts Avenue to the Magistrate's Court at Marshall Square. According to newspaper accounts, about half the students were white, and many of them were wearing University blazers, a feature that outraged their student opponents, who scuffled with the demonstrators at the outset of the march.[32] On the SRC J.A. Wassenaar, one of the few Nationalists to enter its ranks, sought to censure the SLA for identifying their march with the student body as a whole, but instead the SRC approved the motion of George Bizos that the SRC President, Godfrey Getz, had made it clear to the press that the SLA 'were responsible for the demonstration and that they were entitled as an association to do so'. The SRC also endorsed a statement protesting not only against the arrest of the two Wits students but also against the Suppression of Communism Act, in terms of which they were arrested.[33]

One impact of the march was to trigger a new round of Nationalist attacks on the 'open universities', and Wits in particular. The Transvaler contended in a leader article that the demonstration again threw a spotlight on the undesirable fraternisation between white and black, and 'especially between European women and Native men', that was taking place at Wits, and Tom Naude, the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, launched a series of scathing attacks on the University. In speeches at Potgietersrust and Pretoria East in early September, he alleged there was no social segregation at Wits, that white girls went about with 'kafirs', and, in a reflection of growing Nationaliist concern at the political involvement of students at the 'open universities', he attacked Wits students for their participation in the Defiance Campaign.[34]

This was precisely the kind of onslaught that Raikes had been anxious to avert, and after it he held his meeting with the SRC, the Students' Medical Council, the Students' Dental Council, and the Engineering Council to explain the 'position of the University in relation to politics and the duties of students and student societies in relation thereto and to the University'. In his prepared statement, which was released to the press, Raikes told the student leaders that neither he nor the Council was prepared to tolerate attempts to involve the University in politics. Individual students were free to become politically active, but they were not free to suggest that their political views in any way received the support of the University, nor were they at liberty to damage the University's reputation by anything they said or did. The University itself, he insisted, must respect the rule of law. On all counts the student participation in the demonstration at the Magistrate's Court was 'wrong and deserving of censure': 'Any demonstration against the operation of the duly established laws of the country is wrong, but demonstrating in University blazers and in close association with Non-Europeans makes things worse--it brings the University into contempt'. He

concluded with a direct attack on the SRC. He questioned whether it was truly representative of the student body, warned it against entering the national political arena, as when it attacked the Suppression of Communism Act, and instructed it to desist from interfering with the University's policy of social segregation. In all, the SRC should cease its 'undue interest in attempting to interfere in matters of University policy that are the prerogative of the Council'.[35]

The latter onslaught related to the SRC's challenge to the University's policy of social segregation, which together with the whole question of student political activity produced a massive estrangement between Raikes and Getz's SRC by the end of 1952.

Social segregation

As SRC President in 1951/2 and 1952/3, the first President to serve two terms since Ken Weinbren at the end of World War II, Godfrey Getz possessed a formidable reputation among students for his integrity and committed liberalism.

The question of social segregation on campus was taken up by Getz's SRC in response to the summons of the 1951 NUSAS Assembly
to tackle all forms of discrimination and inequality within the university sphere; the 'pious fraud', as Ronald Segal called it, whereby a university permitted integration in the class rooms and outlawed it from the campus dance, was to be challenged.[36] After undertaking a comprehensive review of discrimination on campus, securing returns from the administration, and the different faculties, student societies and student clubs, the SRC concluded that the only discrimination of any 'ascertainable importance' related to black students, and that it applied mainly to social activities and sports. The forms of segregation imposed by the University itself were detailed by the Registrar, Glyn Thomas, in a letter of 6 May 1952, and these entailed the exclusion of black students from University sports and dances, the provision of segregated seating in the Great Hall for all University functions where tickets were bookable by the general public, and a prohibition against blacks appearing in stage productions in the Great Hall unless the cast was entirely black. In their returns, none of the cultural societies gave evidence of any discrimination, but the All Sports Council made it abundantly clear that it opposed black participation in University sports clubs.[37]

The policy the SRC thereupon adopted was designed to begin the process of rolling back segregation on campus. The motion adopted by the SRC on 13 May 1952, proposed by Wolpe and carried by 16 votes to 3, declared outright that no student club or society that imposed discrimination against any student on the basis of race, colour or creed would be recognised by the SRC or allowed to function on campus. However, the problem in the first instance lay not with the student clubs and societies themselves but with the prohibitions laid down by the Principal and Council, and the motion consequently urged that the SRC could no longer 'agree to or passively accept the restrictions placed by the University authorities on the full participation of Non-European students in the above mentioned activities'. Where discriminatory restrictions had been imposed by the University authorities, rather than by the clubs or students themselves, the SRC would not interfere with the continuation of

these activities, but it would not tolerate the extension of segregationist practices to other spheres of University life, and pledged itself to strive for the removal of existing restrictions.[38]

Raikes took this challenge of the SRC to the system of social segregation on campus sufficiently seriously to seek the advice of a number of senior members of Senate, more specifically on his proposal that he should meet with student leaders and organisations to explain the University's position to them. 'I am myself', he wrote to Professors MacCrone, Watt, Underwood, and Doke, 'very anxious about the position which is arising both inside and outside the University in connection with fraternisation between European and non-European students and demands made by the SRC for fuller recognition of the so-called social rights of Non-European students.' The responses he received indicated a high level of hostility not only to the notion of allowing social integration on campus, but to the radical students who were seeking to promote such integration. As I.D. MacCrone, one of the leading liberals on Senate and a future Principal of the University, wrote back, 'Communist or crypto-Communist sources' within the student body, including Wolpe and Getz, were deliberately seeking to embarrass the University: 'Nothing would please these people more than to expose what they consider the hypocrisy and pretensions of a so-called liberal University and by so doing bring liberalism and its works into disrepute among the non-European intellectuals while at the same time enhancing the appeal of Communism'. He consequently urged that while the University authorities should 'unequivocally resist' attempts by the SRC to change the policy of academic non-segregation and social segregation, they should nonetheless proceed with 'the greatest caution' and not allow themselves to be manoeuvred into 'a false position' where they would seem to be siding 'with the forces of racial reaction'.[39]

Raikess' own position, as he advised the SRC and other student leaders when he met with them on 9 October 1952, was that social segregation was the necessary price for academic non-segregation. 'Some persons hold that this policy is impossible of implementation, and must lead to social mixing,' he told the students. 'If they are right, then the only thing to do in the best interests of all parties is to stop the admission of non-European students.'

In the event, the SRC backed down from its general challenge to social segregation on campus to focus on a single issue, seating in the Great Hall. From the standpoint of the SRC, the restrictions on seating in the Great Hall that Glyn Thomas had detailed in response to the inquiry into dicrimination on campus, constituted an innovation, not a tradition, and ran counter to the established principle of academic non-segregation in so far as they applied to 'cultural' events. At its meeting of 8 October, the day before Raikes was due to meet the various student councils to explain University policy, the SRC voted by 20 to 1 to call upon the Principal to withdraw the provisions for segregated seating in the Great Hall. The motion it proposed to put before a general meeting of the student body stated that if the provisions were not withdrawn, 'the student body shall decline to make any further use of the Great Hall for any function at which the authorities impose a colour bar'.[40]

This marked the beginning of a prolonged and polarising tussle between the SRC and the University authorities over seating in the Great Hall. Relations between the SRC and the University authorities were further estranged at the beginning of 1953 when the SRC challenged the University's restriction on black admissions to the second year of medicine. With the opening in the

previous year of a medical school for blacks at Natal University, it seemed to the SRC as if Wits was now collaborating with the Government in its plans to promote apartheid in higher education.

The fact of the matter was that Raikes, Senate and the Faculty of Medicine were all determined to maintain the mixed character of the medical school. In negotiating with the Smuts Government over the future of medical training for blacks, Raikes had threatened that if it gave the go-ahead for Durban to become the primary centre for training black doctors, Wits would require the Government to pass legislation prohibiting blacks from attending its medical school, but once the Nationalist Government established in Durban a medical school exclusively for blacks it became for Raikes a matter of 'principle' to maintain black admissions to the Wits medical school.[41] When in 1949 the Government confirmed that it was terminating the state medical scholarships for Africans at Wits, Raikes insisted that the medical school continue to reserve places in second year for Africans awarded the remaining official scholarships offered by the Transkei, Ciskei, the High Commission Territories, and the City of Johannesburg. 'The Principal appreciates the embarrassment which will be caused to the clinical departments by their having to provide for, possibly, only a very few Non-European students,' the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine was advised, 'but he considers the principle involved to be so important that the University must continue to reserve places for African scholars entering the second year, and to select to the first year without regard to race, until the Government may direct otherwise.'[42]

To help ensure that Africans would continue to be able to come to the Wits medical school, students at Wits agreed at a series of general meetings in the Great Hall in May 1949 to set up an African Medical Scholarship fund managed by the SRC. On the motion of Brenner and Tobias, the meeting of 13 May voted to add 10 shillings to the SRC levy for all students except those who specifically opted out of the scheme. Raikes, furthermore, agreed to allow the SRC to embark on a public fund-raising campaign 'as long as they do not involve the Council or the University staff in a conflict with the Government'.[43]

The development within the medical school that led to a resort to restrictions on black admissions was experimentation with its admission procedures, which produced an increased black enrolment. In 1950 the decision was taken to abandon the selection of medical students for the first year, and to introduce instead selection for admission to the second year. Thus in 1951, and again in 1952, all applicants with the minimum qualification were admitted to the Faculty of Science for the first year; it was for the admission of about 95 students into the second year of medicine that the selection process operated. The furore that arose at the beginning of 1953 was due to the fact that the selection of students for the second year was determined along racial lines. All the white students who had passed the first year were admitted, but only 6 of the 23 'Non-Europeans' who had passed were allowed to proceed, even though most the remainder qualified on academic grounds. As Raikes conceded in a memorandum for Council, 'Most, though not all, the Non-Europeans who failed to gain admission to the second year in 1953 would have been selected on a strictly competitive basis'.

In addition to the 23 blacks who had passed the first year of medicine at Wits, out of an initial enrolment of 56, repeats, BSc graduates, and the six official scholarship holders at Fort Hare, including the recipients of awards from the African Medical Scholarship Trust Fund, had to be taken into account,

and it was this that 'caused alarm' in the medical school. The number of blacks in the second year of medicine was normally around twenty, but there was now the prospect of having to cater for well over thirty in the class. The medical school contended that it could not handle such an influx, chiefly because of inadequate 'Non-European maternity material in the clinical years'. The selection committee of the Faculty of Medicine consequently proposed to limit the 'Non-European' enrolment in the second year to twelve, but with prodding from Raikes this figure was raised to twenty. The twenty was to be made up of 6 scholarship holders, 2 BSc graduates, 4 repeats, 2 who had passed second year science, and 6 of the 23 who had passed the first year.[44]

When this information became public there was an immediate outcry from the Students' Medical Council (SMC), the SRC, NUSAS, and Convocation as well as from the excluded students, who threatened the University with legal action. The University's bona fides in the matter were brought seriously into question, chiefly on the grounds that white students in the clinical years were given considerable access to the obstetric facilities in black hospitals and yet no limit had been placed on white students proceeding to the second year. When the medical school reopened in February, the students carried a SMC motion supporting legal action against the University authorities, and in early March the SRC resolved on the motion of George Bizos to call a one-day protest strike of all students. At its meeting of 3 March the SRC also agreed to put before a general meeting of all students a motion protesting against the Principal's threat to take disciplinary action against those students who had participated in the Defiance Campaign during the vacation, and it instructed the student newspaper, Witwatersrand Student, to bring out a special one-page issue containing Getz's presidential address for 1953.[45]

Under the banner-headline 'Crisis at Wits', Getz's address represented a sustained and systematic attack on the policies adopted by Raikes and the Council. As a counter-blast to Raikes' statement on the University and politics, Getz urged that the
very nature of South African society made it impossible for the University to remain politically neutral. While the University should certainly never be political in the party partisan sense, it was nonetheless caught up in the political arena by its own policies and the nature of South African political issues. Given the Government's policy of apartheid in education, the University's own policy of admitting black students was 'decidedly a political issue', and given the Government's invasion of the fundamental liberties of freedom of speech, expression, and organisation, any true university had ipso facto a duty to stand firm in defence of those liberties wherever and whenever they were infringed. The SRC executive, he continued, anyhow believed that the University had a positive duty to the wider community, particularly with regard to the improvement of race relations. As regards the political activities of individual students, Getz firmly defended their rights to act on their own consciences, and to choose their own companions, friends and fellow demonstrators, regardless of their colour, so long as they did not seek to represent the University as such, and he held that the University's threat of disciplinary action against those students who participated in the Defiance Campaign constituted in itself a 'political action'. In taking the challenge to Raikes and the University authorities, Getz accused them of failing in their basic duty to protect the independence of the University. Instead, they were capitulating to Government pressure, as was evident in the introduction of segregated seating in the Great Hall and in the restrictions imposed at the

beginning of 1953 on black admissions to the medical school. While the University was failing in its duty, he urged in conclusion, 'let the same never be said about its students'.[46]

Getz's onslaught, unprecedented in the history of Wits, immediately provoked an angry backlash within the student body. When he attempted to deliver his address before a general meeting of students in the Great Hall on Monday 9 March, he was systematically howled down. According to the report in the Rand Daily Mail, about 1 500 students packed into the Great Hall, with a loud phalanx at the back making it virtually impossible for Getz to be heard; a combination of bells, whistles, howls, war cries and constant heckling drowned him out. At the continuation meeting on Friday the presidential address was taken as read, and a motion of no confidence was moved in the SRC by one of its own members, Colin Didcott, on the grounds that its heavy involvement in 'leftist politics' had transformed the University from a place of learning into a political battlefield. Two adjournments later, and after what the minutes described as 'lengthy and rowdy discussion', the motion of no-confidence was lost by the narrow margin of 693 votes to 725. When the meeting reconvened for the fourth time on Wednesday 18 March it was unanimously agreed that the motion of no confidence should be put to a referendum. Amidst 'uproar, booing and shouts of "resign"', Getz resumed the chairmanship of the meeting, which had been taken over by Michael O'Dowd for the no-confidence debate. The uproar continued as Bizos moved his motion protesting the exclusion of suitably qualified blacks from the second year of medicine. After 'noisy discussion', and a further adjournment, the motion was carried on 25 March by an overwhelming majority, but the idea of a one-day strike was quietly dropped.[47]

The subsequent referendum on 30 March reflected the deep divide in the student body in response to the overt politicisation of the SRC and its denunciation of the University authorities. In a poll in which eighty per cent of all students paying their SRC fees participated, 1 314 votes of no-confidence were cast in the SRC as against 1 035 votes of confidence.[48] In the elections in late April, most of the former SRC were nonetheless again returned, and Getz resumed his presidency.

Aftermath

Sobered by the challenge to their own authority from within the student body, Getz's SRC thereafter abandoned its confrontational stance towards the University authorities. Raikes, for his part, was likewise anxious to end 'the estrangement between the SRC and myself', and the two were consequently able to work out a compromise arrangement over seating in the Great Hall for the 1953 Arts Festival.[49] The compromise allowed for booking in price-blocks, rather than individual seats, thereby permitting people to sit next to whom they chose.

The controversy that continued to smoulder was over black admissions to the medical school. With the decision of the medical school to revert to selection for the first year, the thrust in the Faculty of Medicine and Senate was to work out a permanent quota system for black admissions to the medical school 'in accordance with the clinical facilities available'. The recommendation made by the Board of the Faculty of Medicine, and adopted by

Senate, was that a maximum of 8 blacks should be admitted to the first year, with another 12 places available in the second year for holders of recognised scholarships and BSc graduates.[50] This formula was accepted by Council at its meeting on 4 December 1953. When the SRC protested against the University's adoption of a racial quota system, the new Principal, W.G. Sutton, bluntly asserted that 'The University could not face a situation, under present conditions, where a considerable number of European applicants of desirable quality would have to be turned away, to allow of places being allotted to an increasing number of Non-Europeans'.[51] Ironically, the quota system was thereafter to operate for some time in favour of African applicants to the Wits medical school.

In the midst of the furore over the medical school, and the Prime Minister's warning at the end of 1952 that the dual policy of 'academic non-segregation and social segregation' had become untenable, the Council decided to review its overall policy on black admissions. Raikes suddenly found himself having to do battle within the University to preserve the 'open' character of Wits. The fact of the matter was that important members of Council, led by the chairman, P.M. Anderson, had themselves become uneasy about the 'influx' of black students into Wits. In 1952 there had been a thirty per cent increase in the first year enrolment of 'Non-White' students, from 70 to 101, and for Anderson this was a disturbing development. Chairman of Council since 1939, and managing director of the Union Corporation, Anderson feared that the 'white' character of Wits might one day be endangered unless an overall quota system was installed. As he told Raikes in February 1953, he was alarmed by evidence which suggested that there was a steady increase in the ratio of 'Non-Europeans to the total enrolment', and he saw this as being 'entirely due to Asiatics'. He consequently wanted to prohibit Indians from outside the Transvaal from attending Wits, and to impose a quota of fifty from within the province.[52] The idea of establishing separate universities for blacks seems to have caused him few qualms. At the end of 1952 his response to Malan's attack on 'open' admissions to Wits was that the University was providing a necessary service which would have to continue until the Government made adequate provision for blacks elsewhere.[53]

In early 1953 a Council committee, under Anderson's chairmanship, was set up to review the University's admissions policy, and it finally met on 20 November, after the Minister of Education, Arts and Science, J.H. Viljoen, had told the House of Assembly that the Cabinet would soon be looking into the question of separate universities for blacks.[54] In addition to Anderson, the committee comprised of Raikes, Sutton, MacCrone, and Dr Winifred Hoernlé, all members of Senate, A.J. Limebeer, who represented the constituency of past students and donors, and W. van Heerden, a state appointee dating from the Hertzog era. The main document before the committee was a memorandum prepared by Raikes, in which the Principal recommended no change in the general policy of the University and the continued admission of blacks to the medical school, though with the imposition of a strict quota as determined by the Faculty of Medicine and Senate. As was clear, Raikes submitted, the demand among blacks for a medical training was greater than could be met by Natal University, and Wits should therefore continue to train a certain number of blacks.[55]

This formula for the medical school was accepted by the committee, but there was no unanimity that the current policy on black admissions should remain 'a permanent feature' of the University. Van Heerden's proposal was that the University's policy be regarded instead 'as a temporary one until

such time as the Council is satisfied that sufficient facilities have been established for Bantu university education on a separate basis, and that thereafter admission of Bantu students to this University be limited to advanced study', but the minutes record that this proposal 'was not acceptable to all members of the committee, some of whom rejected the proviso in principle'. The outcome was a compromise in which the committee recommended that Council should retain but not consider itself bound to the existing arrangements, and allow for changes in accordance with changing circumstances. One such circumstance would be 'any appreciable increase in the number of Non-European students'.[56] At its meeting of 4 December 1953 Council adopted these recommendations.

The Raikes Legacy

As Principal since 1928 Raikes had presided over the 'opening' of Wits to black students. As something of a Tory paternalist, he was genuinely committed to the notion of black educational advancement, but while he had been in the forefront of the campaign to open up Wits to blacks he was adamant that he would not challenge the social customs of the country. To his mind, challenges to the social 'colour-bar' would only prove counter-productive, and would endanger any progress attained in the academic sphere. It was a philiosophy he never deviated from, despite the periodic attempts of students to persuade him to do so.

A man of 'the middle way', Raikes was convinced, as he advised Professor J.M. Watt in 1952, that the 'middle course' the University had adopted of 'academic non-segregation, coupled with social segregation' was the best way it could help the white race 'maintain the ascendancy while the Non-European is encouraged to follow at such a pace as he can attain'.[57] But as a man of the middle, Raikes found himself increasingly caught in the middle after the Nationalists had come to power. The Prime Minister, Dr D.F. Malan, positively ridiculed the whole notion of 'academic non-segregation and social segregation'; it was a contradiction collapsing under its own weight. For Malan, Wits had either to accept apartheid in the academic sphere as well as the social, or else do away with racial discrimination in both spheres. The Wits SRC agreed with Malan's diagnosis, but whereas his remedy was apartheid, it recommended an end to the policy of social segregation. One way or the other, Raikes' dream of a 'middle road' was simply not deemed a viable proposition over the longer term. Nor did the student leadership at Wits regard his notion of maintaining the University's political neutrality viable in a situation where Wits had itself become a major political target of the Government. As put by the Witwatersrand Student, when edited by Charles Bloomberg, 'the attitude of student isolation from politics and of keeping the university's name out of politics is unrealistic'.[58]

Raikes fully accepted that the University itself would have to enter the 'political' arena whenever the Government sought to impose university apartheid, but he hoped that through a policy of prudence such an eventuality might be avoided. Politically timid, and positively frightened by political radicalism, he remained disinclined to say or do anything which 'might precipitate action by the Government'.[59] Once it became evident that the Raikes strategy had not worked, and that the Government was determined to make university apartheid a reality, the University closed ranks in protest against the Government's measures, but not before the University authorities had moved

to break the political power on campus of the left. For Sutton, Raikes' successor as Principal, an important part of the legacy he inherited was a student leadership that had got quite out of hand, attacking the authority of the Principal, the Council, and the University as a whole. As Sutton perceived it, his duty was to crack down on the 'leftists' in control of student politics, and his assumption of office consequently produced a new bout of confrontation between the University authorities and the SRC, culminating in the imposition of a new constitution on the SRC in 1955 and an end to the era of left-wing hegemony.

Notes

---

1. See D. Posel, The Making of Apartheid, 1948-1961 (Oxford, 1991), and M.A. Beale, 'Apartheid and University Education, 1948-1959' (unpublished MA thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1994).

2. Verslag van die Kleurvraagstuk-Kommissie van die Herenigde Nasionale Party, 1947, 13.

3. House of Assembly Debates, 16 August 1948, vol 64, 219.

4. Star, 19 September 1951.

5. Commission on Native Education 1949-1951 (UG53 of 1951), 959-961.

6. Star, 11 December 1953.

7. Report of the Commission of Enquiry on Separate Training Facilities for Non-Europeans at Universities 1953-1954.

8. Star, 28 February 1949.

9. Statement issued by the executive of the SRC arising out of the Principal's statement on the position of the University and the duties of students and student societies in relation thereto and to the University, 9 October 1952, SRC minutes.

10. Ronald Segal, Into Exile (London, 1963), 86.

11. Interview with Charles Cilliers, January 1994.

12. Witwatersrand Student, 26 August 1948.

13. Tobias interview, November 1993.

14. Report on inter-SRC conference held in Cape Town in December 1948, delivered to SRC meeting 1 March 1949, SRC minutes.

15. SRC minutes, 3 May 1949; Tobias interview.

16. Star, 27 March 1950; Witwatersrand Student, 20 March 1950.

17. Ibid., 19 April 1950.

18. SRC minutes, 8 August and 6 September 1950.

19. For details of the campaign launched by NUSAS see Tobias' President's Report, 25th annual NUSAS Assembly, Cape Town, July 1949, University of Cape Town Library Archives BC 586.

20. For an assessment of Tobias' contribution to NUSAS see Martin Legassick, The National Union of South African Students: Ethnic cleavage and ethnic integration in the universities (Los Angeles, 1967), 18-19.

21. Witwatersrand Student, 6 October 1948.

22. Witwatersrand Student, October 1949.

23. Witwatersrand Student, 17 May 1950.

24. SRC minutes, 16 May 1950; Witwatersrand Student, 17 May 1950.

25. See profile on Getz in Witwatersrand Student, May 1951.

26. SRC minutes, 25 and 28 June 1951; Witwatersrand Student, 25 June 1951.

27. SRC minutes of special general meeting, 28 June 1951.

28. On the motion of Wolpe and Getz of Wits, the NUSAS Assembly voted by 18-14 to remain in the IUS; the Fort Hare motion was defeated by 19-2. Minutes of 27th Annual NUSAS Student Assembly, 4-14 July 1951, UCT Library Archives BC 586.

29. President's report on the activities of the SRC, August 1951, SRC minutes.

30. SRC minutes, 27 and 28 August 1951.

31. Raikes to MacCrone et al, 1 July 1952, Registry Subfile 2 to P12/8.

32. Star, 26 August 1952; Rand Daily Mail, 27 August 1952.

33. SRC minutes, 6 September 1952.

34. Rand Daily Mail, 1 September 1952; Pretoria News, 4 September 1952.

35. 'Position of the University in relation to politics and the duties of students and student societies in relation thereto and to the University', 8

October 1952, Registry File P12/8.

36. Segal, Into Exile, 86.

37. Thomas to SRC correspondence secretary, 6 May 1952, Subfile 2 to P12/8. What the ASC was prepared to accept was black membership of University clubs without participation in league sport, and the use of the University grounds by blacks when they were not being used by whites, but even these concessions were to be subject to the law of the land and municipal regulations, the parent bodies of the individual clubs, the decision of the University Council, and "the conventions of our land". Report of SRC executive to SRC meeting, 6 May 1952, SRC Minutes.

38. SRC minutes, 13 May 1952.

39. Raikes to MacCrone et al, 1 July 1952, and MacCrone to Raikes, 26 July 1952, Registry Subfile 2 to P12/8.

40. SRC Minutes, 8 October 1952.

41. For Raikes and the Smuts Government see B.K. Murray, 'Wits as an "Open" University 1939-1959: Black Admissions to the University of the Witwatersrand', Journal of Southern African Studies, vol 16 no 4 (December 1990), 664.

42. Glyn Thomas to A.D. Stammers, 24 October 1949, Registry N5.

43. Raikes to the SRC President, 12 October 1949, Registry N5.

44. "Memorandum for committee on admission of non-Europeans", H.R. Raikes, May 1953, Misc C/82/53.

45. SRC minutes, 3 March 1954.

46. Wits Student, 6 March 1953.

47. SRC minutes, 3-25 March 1953; Wits Student, 6 & 30 March 1953; Rand Daily Mail, 10, 14 & 18 March 1953.

48. Rand Daily Mail, 31 March 1953.

49. Raikes to the SRC correspondence secretary, 11 June 1952 and 7 June 1953, Subfile 2 to P12/8.

50. "Memorandum on selection of medical students for first year and second year courses in and after 1954", 16 September 1953, Misc. FMS 152A/53.

51. Sutton to SRC President, 8 March 1954, Registry File B19/3.

52. Anderson to Raikes, 4 February 1953, Registry File B19/3.

53. Star, 12 December 1952.

54. For Viljoen's statement see the Star, 1 September 1953.

55. Memorandum for committee on admission of Non-Europeans, 2 May 1953, Misc C/82/53.

56. Draft report of the committee appointed by the Council to consider the Council's policy in respect of the admission of Non-Europeans to the University, 20 November 1953 Misc C/215/53.

57. Raikes to Watt, 15 September 1952, Registry Subfile 2 to P12/8.

58. Witwatersrand Student, 6 June 1952.

59. Glyn Thomas to A.D. Stammers, 24 October 1949, Registry File N5.