

https://dspace.org/

South African history and western civilization

Lewin, Eleanor H.

1963
Johannesburg College of Education
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/25561
Lewin, E. H. (1962/1963). South African history and western civilization. Symposium: A Journal for Education in Southern Africa, pp. 31-37.

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

SOUTH AFRICAN HISTORY
and
WESTERN CIVILIZATION

By ELEANOR H. LEWIN

Eleanor Lewin graduated from the University of Cape Town in Arts and Law, and at present teaches History at Kingsmead in Johannesburg. She has published a number of articles and pamphlets concerned with various aspects of South African problems, and has played a leading role in the work of the National Council of Women and similar public organisations.

The danger of losing contact with Western civilization

THERE has been a good deal of public discussion recently on the teaching of history in our schools. The discussion has centred on the new Transvaal secondary school syllabus, and on certain text-books. It has been claimed that the new syllabus gives too much time to South African history, at the expense of the history of Europe, and that this has the effect of cutting the young white South African off from the roots of his civilization. Further, it has been asserted that certain text-books, notably by Coetsee, Otto, and Roodt; and Havinga, Robbertse, and Roodt, give a distorted view of South African history.

I believe these criticisms of the syllabus and the text-books to be well-founded, and we owe a debt of gratitude to those who have taken the lead in the recent discussions.

But I believe further that if we leave the matter here, we are evading far more fundamental and far-reaching issues, that are affecting the education of our young people, and that have already affected the education of generations of English-speaking South Africans, including ourselves.

This article maintains that South African history is almost universally taught in a biased and inaccurate way in English-medium schools as well as in Afrikaans-medium ones, in private schools as well as in government schools. This is due to the continued survival in text-books writers' minds of frontier attitudes and values which have derived from Theal and his times.

This type of teaching does more to cut the student off from the main values of Western civilization than any reduction of teaching time spent on Greece and Rome, or the Middle Ages, or the Renaissance. The student may learn facts about these periods; but if he does not connect the values we derive from the great thinkers of these periods with the facts of South African history and the methods of studying it, the study of European history has become mere antiquarianism, unrelated to the life of the student's own country and people, in the past and in the present.

Conversely, a student may spend very little time on learning about Greece and the Renaissance and the 18th century, but if he learns to apply the principles of scientific method, and the Biblical teaching to "love thy neighbour as thyself", to the study of South African history, his thinking is that of an intellectual

This article was submitted in manuscript form to Mr. A. N. Boyce for his comments. He expressed surprise to find himself described as a biased writer of history text-books, as he felt that he had always tried to present South African history as impartially as possible. Although fully in agreement with the author's desire to see history presented in an unbiased way, he felt that some of the conclusions drawn in Mrs. Lewin's article were unfair. Mr. Boyce has no desire to reply, at this stage, to the allegations made in the article, except to point out how easy it is for authors of history text-books to create a wrong impression without wishing to do so and without being conscious, at the time of writing, of causing possible offence.

It is easy to find fault with the three sections of South African History discussed in this article, viz. relations between Xhosa and Boers on the frontier, Hottentots, and the South African War. Unfortunately the impression created by this article is that the book under discussion is riddled with examples of prejudice, but no credit is given for the other chapters where history has been presented in a manner fair to all parties.

and moral descendant of Aristotle, Aquinas, Galileo, Locke, Voltaire, Darwin. Which is it better to be? One who *knows* about these people, but uses a pre-scientific tribal kind of thinking about history and human relations in South Africa? Or one who does not know about these people, but uses the kind of thinking and moral standards that they taught us?

The constructiveness and creativeness of Western civilization derives from the search for truth based on scientific method and form, the Biblical injunctions to us to love our fellowmen, and from the modern democratic ideals which stem from the American Declaration of Independence.

We often have too narrow an idea of scientific method. We conceive of it as consisting solely of statistics and test-tubes, dissection and measurement. But many writers have pointed out that this is an inadequate view of science and scientific method. As Miller has said, "Science is not any particular method or set of techniques. It is a way of reasoning. The standards are intellectual rather than procedural." The scientific method, in Bridgman's words, "is doing one's damndest with one's mind." As another Harvard physicist, Holton, puts it, "the great moral which the progress of science teaches its students is: "Faith in the marvellous ability of men to arrive eventually at truths by the free and vigorous exchange of intelligence." *

The pursuit of truth through the study of history

In a series of lectures† given to a conference of history teachers a few years ago, Professor Keppel-Jones discussed the processes involved in the pursuit of truth through the study of history. "One of the central principles of our civilization is the independence of the individual," he said. "On the intellectual plane this means that every man must have access to all information that is available, must be free to form his own opinions on the basis of this, and free also to express them. The intellectual development of the civilized world has been based on respect for these liberties, on the principle of intellectual integrity and on the belief that truth is objective and absolute." He goes on to say that young people should be encouraged to recognize and value these liberties, and be equipped to use them as their minds mature.

How can these principles be worked out in terms of the study and teaching of history? Truth may be absolute, but human knowledge of it is relative and limited. "We know in part, we see as in a glass, darkly. But that does not prevent us from striving towards a perfection which we can approach, though not attain," says Keppel-Jones. He suggests that a true, or relatively true, account of a situation, whether past or present, attempts to describe the situation from a detached standpoint; or better, from the standpoint of all the various participants at the same time, as well perhaps as from the vantage point of the complete outsider, say a Martian visitor, who has absolutely no personal interest in the matter. Such an account is, within the limits of human powers, an objective one.

I would suggest that there is another important element in the study of history that we should recognize, and of which we should take account. That is the element of evaluation of human behaviour. Consider the standpoint of the outsider with no *personal* interest in the matter. He may have no personal interest, but the mere fact that he is endeavouring to judge objectively represents an acceptance of the ethical and scientific principles described above. Thus the writer or teacher of history who endeavours to put into operation these principles is applying a standard of value to his own behaviour; and the chances are that he is applying the same standard of value to the behaviour of the human beings whose individual and social actions he is studying, whether in the present or in the past.

It is significant of the state of history writing and teaching in South Africa that Professor J. S. Marais, in the preface to his classic work, "The Cape Coloured People, 1653—1937", finds it necessary to say, "While I have done my utmost to avoid bias in the presentation of the facts, I have approached the study of them (as every historian must do) from a definite standpoint. But I believe that standpoint will be difficult to assail. It is this: that justice, which has rightly been represented as blindfold, does not allow the use of two measures, one for ourselves and our own people, and another for those who differ from us in nationality, or race, or the colour of their skins." *

In schools, where young people are being led through adolescence to maturity, the element of ethical evaluation of human behaviour, whether individual or political or social, is well in the forefront of the minds of both students and teachers. To ignore this element results inevitably in leaving it to operate with great force in the obscurity of half-conscious confusion, ignorance and prejudice. To recognize it, to bring it out to the light of open day, to discuss it, makes it possible for both students and teachers to bring intellectual integrity and scien-

* Quoted in Ashley Montague, "The Direction of Human Development," p. 8.

† Unpublished lectures: "Bias in Presentation of S. African History."

* See page 36.

tific method into a close and fruitful relationship with ethical values, to the immense benefit of the personality of the individual and to the benefit of his relationships with other individuals and social groups.

Shortcomings of South African history text-books

When South African history text-books are tested by these standards, how do they emerge? Not very well.

The father of South African history writing was Theal, who collected records and wrote historical accounts in the last years of last century and the early years of this. At that time the standards of historical objectivity had not been discussed or worked out to nearly the extent that they have today; a great deal of history written in any country at that time carried with it more than a shred of the earlier function of history, namely to be a loyal or devout chronicle of the great deeds of a king, or a church, or a country. And Theal had no formal training even in what there was of scientific historical thinking in his day: he was a very gifted layman. But his work has been reproduced in nearly all text-books, has held the attention of many generations of students, and has acquired a wide authority over the public mind. The modern writer of a text-book has been so schooled in this version that it naturally determines, or at least powerfully influences, the form of his own work. Then those who set examination papers have to bear in mind what the candidates will have learned in their text-books, and the teachers in turn must be guided by what the examiners expect. So there is a vicious circle from which it is difficult to escape.

So strong is this influence deriving from Theal that even when a writer goes through the motions of taking account of later and sounder historians, such as Walker, Macmillan, Marais, and De Kiewiet, the effect on the reader is often negligible, since it has not been allowed to affect the totality of attitudes and assumptions existing in the writer's mind.*

University history departments usually postpone a study of South African history and of historiography to the third year of a history major. The result is that there are a large number of teachers of history in high schools, as well as almost all teachers in primary schools, who have never had the biased history that they learned in school corrected.

Types of biased writing

There are many features of this type of writing and teaching. A very common one consists of tendentious selection and omission of material; another is biased presentation of material, which leads the reader to draw wrong conclusions from facts, even when they are correctly stated. Closely related to this last is the use of emotive language, which enlists the reader's sympathies on one side, without presenting any arguments which could give a rational basis to the conclusions. Another way of doing this is to present only one side of a case, and to quote opinions held by supporters of the one side as if they were the final word that could be said.

A significant historical period

The period 1775 to 1835 is a significant one in our history. It was the period when ideas about the relations between racial groups first became the subject of conscious debate and action. Questions of frontier policy, of the position of Hottentots in the Cape Colony, of the policies of the British government and the British missionaries, and their impact on the varying groups of people in the Colony, all arise in this period. Our present judgment of later historical periods and issues is largely influenced, and even determined, by our judgment of controversies in this earlier period.

How are these issues dealt with in the text-books most commonly used?

Keppel-Jones made a critical survey of Fowler and Smit and of Howes and Mandelbrote. It is useful to apply the same tests to a new book, "History for South African High Schools", by A. N. Boyce. It is then clear from the whole tone of Boyce's discussion that he follows the earlier Theal tradition, which has influenced so many generations of South African students (possibly including Mr. Boyce himself), through the text-books of Howes and Mandelbrote, Fowler and Smit, and others.

The frontier wars

In discussions of the frontier wars it is assumed by these writers that the Xhosas had no right to be in the Suurveld. But a careful study of the material available makes it clear, firstly, that the boundary of the Colony was uncertain. Further, Professor J. S. Marais* shows that the balance of probabilities is that the only clear-cut legally determined boundary (as apart from one imposed as a result of conquest, without any agreement or legal right) was the *upper* reaches of the Fish River to the

* For example, see p. 35, Boyce on the Black Circuit, and p. 35, on Maynier.

* "Maynier and the First Boer Republic" pp. 5. 6.

† See p. 36, on implied assumptions.

mouth of the Bushman's River. This is a reasonably consistent north-south line which *excludes* the area included in the great bend of the Fish River; this bend of the Fish River brings it to the sea approximately 100 miles to the east of the Bushman's River mouth, and the area within it has become known to history as the Suurveld.

When one studies the map and the facts one sees the force of Marais's views of the legal boundary, and it becomes necessary to reverse, or at least modify in one's mind the rights and wrongs of the "Kaffir Wars". It then becomes apparent that the probabilities are that it was the Europeans who were wrongfully in the Suurveld, encroaching on the Xhosa's lands, and that it was the Xhosas who were rightfully attempting to drive out intruders and to maintain themselves on the lands of which they were in prior occupation.

Only an inarticulate assumption† that Europeans are always in the right in any dispute with African tribes can explain the tone in which this whole issue is discussed in Theal, Boyce, and the other text-books. Lindeque has rightly been criticised for introducing the frontier conflicts in his book with the words "from the beginning the Blacks and Whites were sworn enemies" on the ground that this introduces undesirable ideas of inevitable conflict into the minds of students. I submit that the idea that Europeans are always right and Africans always wrong is an equally undesirable one, even if it is implied rather than explicitly stated, and it has an equally unfortunate effect on the intellectual honesty and racial attitudes of students.

Keppel-Jones' comment on the Fowler and Smit account of the earliest conflicts applies equally well to Boyce's account: "This is an illuminating example of the unfortunate effects of one-sided selection. A full account of these events would leave an impression of violence committed by both parties, with provocation coming mostly, so far, from the European side; and of a contest for territory (the Suurveld) to which the Colony had no judicial claim except against two insignificant captains."

Clearly a text-book cannot give space to as full a discussion of the topic as Marais, Walker, and other historians are able to do; but Keppel-Jones points out that the treatment given by the text-book writers mentioned above offends against a basic requirement of unbiased writing, namely, that selection of material should not operate to give an impression which is the opposite of the impression which a full account would give.

In Chapter 17 of Boyce there are two paragraphs which take account of the findings and evaluations of Professor Walker and Macmillan. But they have not been integrated into Boyce's treatment of the earlier conflicts, described above, nor into the treatment of the later conflicts, which has the same weaknesses. These two paragraphs stand there in direct conflict with the other material, and by themselves they are quite inadequate to give students a true picture of conditions and events.

The Hottentots

The topic of the position of Hottentots in the Colony provides further numerous examples of biased treatment in the text-books. There are three aspects of this topic; firstly, the facts of the situation of the Hottentots and their treatment by individual farmers; secondly, the measures advocated or adopted by governors, judges, missionaries, and others in relation to the Hottentots; thirdly, the opinions of various people about the treatment of the Hottentots and the measures taken in relation to it.

On the first aspect, Keppel-Jones says: "There is so much evidence of ill-treatment of Hottentots by Europeans that no serious student of this period could possibly overlook it. Reasons and explanations and excuses for this treatment might be advanced, but they would have to be very weighty if they were to exonerate the Colonists."* Marais, in his "Maynier and the First Boer Republic" provides some of of the evidence,† and in his "The Cape Coloured People"§ he says: "The Graaff-Reinet colonists had had little experience of the rule of law. Each tended to be a law unto himself and resented any interference with his actions, especially his actions towards his servants. It was natural that in a colony where slavery flourished, the European should regard all coloured labour from the slave-owner's point of view. The Hottentots were pitifully, almost abjectly, backward and weak.... The temptation to deal harshly and unjustly by their servants, whose position was one of abject dependence, was often too strong to be resisted. It was high time that the insolence of the strong towards the weak were curbed in the name of the law." In a further discussion of the enforcement of the rule of law, he says:* "The institution of the system of circuit courts began the inculcation in the colonists of certain lessons which it was by no means easy, though all the more essential, for them to learn; that the Hottentots had rights as free men which were enforceable by the courts and that in prosecuting and

---

* This writer is prepared to argue that in fact the explanations and excuses were weighty, but agrees that the facts of ill-treatment are well established.

† pp. 70—77.

§ p. 112.

* p. 120.

punishing breaches of the law, the courts could be no exceptors of persons. There can be no doubt that the severe and often brutal punishments which ... masters were allowed to inflict on their slaves ... had a pronounced effect on the dealings of the colonists with their 'free' servants. ...

"The colonists naturally took much longer to learn their lesson than the courts did, if indeed many of them have learnt it even now. In the years following 1835 several thousands of them trekked away from the Colony, partly in order to avoid learning it. Two incidents which marked the transition of which I have spoken and which are known in Colonial history as 'the Black Circuit' and 'The Slagters Nek Rebellion', were related by the older historians, and are still widely taught in the schools today, as examples of legitimate grievances of the European colonists in the eastern part of the Colony.

... The fact that some of the charges (brought before the Black Circuit) were without foundation, and the inconvenience caused to many colonist families, have been stressed to the exclusion of the educational influence of the trials. The 'Slagters Nek Rebellion' of 1815 is nothing else than the resistance of certain frontier colonists to the new conception of justice, which was gradually becoming effective."

But no matriculation student, nurtured on Fowler and Smit or Boyce, would have any idea that one of our leading historians, after an exhaustive study of the material, has spoken so strongly and in such terms of the facts of the relation between master and Hottentot servants on the frontier. Boyce says, "The verdicts of the courts were really a vindication for the colonists and an indication that the missionaries had been too credulous." This and other comments are by no means neutralised by a sentence which seems to have been added as an afterthought, and which bears no factual or logical relation to the preceding sentences. "The court, however, was a timely demonstration of the principle that all races were equal before the law." If the farmers had been vindicated, and the missionaries proved to have been too credulous, why was a demonstration of legal equality timely?

The above examples provide illustrations of the tendentious selection and omission of material. Boyce's treatment of this topic, like Fowler and Smit's, also illustrates how the presentation of material can lead the reader to draw wrong conclusions from the facts, even when these are correctly stated. His account of the Slagters Nek Rebellion treats it as significant because it "showed the rising tide of feeling among the frontiersmen ... "the reasons given to the court for the revolt are significant: one main reason ... was ... "Because the Hottentots are favoured above the burghers" ... its real significance lay in the fact that it had great propaganda value in later years when the Great Trek commenced." Any student might be forgiven for failing to notice the connection of the Slagters Nek Rebellion with the extension of the rule of law, and for concluding that the rising tide of feeling among the frontiersmen was fully justified, especially when this is read in conjunction with Boyce's treatment of the Black Circuit.

The use of emotive language

These text-books often use emotive language to enlist the reader's sympathies on one side. "A tame surrender" is used to describe a settlement made by Maynier, of whom Theal disapproves; "a vigorous frontier policy" is used to describe a policy of which Theal approves. Boyce brings Maynier on to the stage with the "one-down" words "A man called Honoratus Maynier". "General Dundas hastened to the frontier with a strong force, but instead of using this against the Xhosa, he accepted Maynier's advice to make peace with the Xhosa" carries a clear implication to any student that anybody with any common-sense would know that of course one uses a strong force against the Xhosas, and that to make peace with them is something that could only be contemplated by a character as unsatisfactory as Maynier has been indicated to be. After two paragraphs of slighting references to Maynier, followed on the next page by further such references, it does not in any way restore the balance to insert a remark that "Professor J. S. Marais in his book 'Maynier and the First Boer Republic' has defended Maynier, pointing out that he was neither a sentimentalist nor a visionary; his policy had a practical aim, namely, to keep the black and white races apart and thereby prevent trouble"; in fact, a remark in these terms, taken in this context, merely serves to strengthen the impression in the student's mind that Maynier was in fact a sentimentalist and visionary, except to the rather romantic gaze of Professor Marais.

Needless to say, Dr. Philip gets similar treatment.

Boyce's treatment of Ordinance 50 illustrates the effect of quoting the opinions of one side to a controversy only, as if they were the final word that could be said; and thus of conveying the writer's opinions through the medium of one party to a dispute, without any discussion of the validity of those opinions. Thus Boyce, in leading up to the passing of Ordinance 50, makes links in the minds of the readers between Philip's "Researchers in South Africa", which has "little value, however, because of the many exaggerated statements", and the "Fiftieth Ordinance which was a definite outcome of missionary propaganda on behalf of the Hottentots".

Boyce then goes on to write a paragraph putting the point of view of the farmers only, "who were beginning to feel desperate for their position apparently elicited no sympathy in Cape Town or England". This is just one example of many.

Implied assumptions

Another very effective technique is what Keppel-Jones calls the technique of the implied assumption. He distinguishes between the legitimate and illegitimate implied assumption. "It is legitimate," he says, "to assume as common ground between a writer and his readers the moral code that is accepted in the civilized world. If, for instance, an historical personage is caught breaking his word . . . or practising any other deliberate deception, there is no need for the writer to argue that this conduct was wrong; that can be taken for granted."

An illegitimate implied assumption is one which assumes that the writer and his readers have some point in common which need not be mentioned or justified, but which consists of an agreement that one party to a dispute must at all costs be defended; that the interests of our own nation, or our own race, or our own religion have a claim to our advocacy which rival interests could not have. It is not stated, it is merely implied; the implication can be read between the lines and the implication itself helps to form the reader's judgment." It is this kind of implied assumption against which Professor Marais is protesting when he says that justice does not allow for the use of two measures, "one for ourselves and our own people, and another for those who differ from us." (See page 32 supra.)

Keppel-Jones gives an example from Fowler and Smit: "For two generations young men had been wanting more land, and yet they were prevented from displacing the Bantu tribes or crossing the Orange River." The implied assumption here is that if young white men wanted more land, they ought to have it, whether or not it belonged in the first place to black men; that to prevent them from taking it from the black man was an injustice. It is not said that it is an injustice, it is implied by the form of the sentence. Similarly, Boyce says of Janssens and de Mist "Both men were firm believers in the principles of the French Revolution—liberty and equality—nevertheless, they were practical men and able administrators." The implied assumption here is that one who believes in liberty or equality is unlikely to be a practical man or an able administrator; taken in conjunction with the references to Maynier, this helps to produce a stereotype that one who believes in liberty and equality is very likely to be a sentimentalist or a visionary.

In the period after the Great Trek, the text-books markedly gloss over the unfortunate or dishonest dealings of Britain with Africans and other non-Europeans, such as the abandonment of the Griquas across the Orange River in the 1840's, and in 1854; the Langalibalele rebellion; and the dealings with Lobengula. They omit to point out or discuss the dilemma of English liberals, namely, sympathy for Africans as well as Boers, and as part of this, they omit to describe Sir George Grey's views on the colour bar. They gloss over British responsibility for the South African War.

The South African War

There is a good example of this latter in Boyce. It also provides another illustration of an illegitimate implied assumption.

In writing about the South African War, Boyce says: "Milner has often been blamed for the outbreak of the war, and perhaps he was too inflexible in crucial moments. At first Milner showed patience, but he was soon convinced that the South African Republic was the chief obstacle in the way of political and economic co-operation in South Africa. Kruger's victory over his more liberal rivals in the presidential election of 1898 was a blow to Milner. He had hoped a more amenable government would be formed—one that would follow Britain's lead. With Kruger at the helm again it seemed to Milner that there was no solution to the political problem except war." Here the implied assumption is that writer and readers are agreed that Britain was entitled to take the lead, and be followed by the South African Republic, as the young men in the Fowler and Smit example were assumed to be entitled to take what land they wanted. There is an assumption, too, that this assumed right of Britain to have an amenable government in the South African Republic was so strong that Britain was entitled to enforce it even by going to war with the Republic. Further, to say that "Both sides began to regard war as inevitable", distorts the picture. The fact was that Milner had decided that there was no way to enforce British supremacy except by war, and that the Republic was arming in the fully justified anticipation of a British attack; there was no question of Britain bringing in re-inforcements in anticipation of the Republic going to war with the British Empire in order to establish a more amenable government in Britain, or even in the Cape Colony.

A deplorable attitude to history, and its effects

All this reflects a deplorable attitude to history, namely, that it ought to support and confirm the prejudices of its writers and readers.

Further, it produces deplorable effects on the students. Most students who have emerged from the rat-race of matriculation history, in private schools as well as high schools, in English medium

as well as Afrikaans, have acquired a set of more or less unconscious axioms and propositions which are firmly established in their minds, and which Keppel-Jones sums up as follows:

"i. That South African history is the history of the white race; other races figure in it merely as obstacles or problems, but not, as it were, in their own right.

ii. That there are two opinions about the treatment of these other races: the opinion of the colonist, a practical, common-sense opinion, grounded in sure knowledge; and the opinion of the philanthropists, philosophers, theorists, etc. which was visionary and impractical, based on ignorance of 'the Native'.

iii. That governors, officials and others may be classified as good if they accepted the first of these opinions and bad if they accepted the second.

iv. That the Colonial Office was an evil influence because it was guided by visionary philanthropists and Exeter Hall."

What a text-book should be like

All these are examples of the kind of writing and thinking that should *not* be found in a text-book. Is it possible to list qualities that one is entitled to expect in a text-book?

It seems to me that one is entitled to expect that the selected and omitted facts, the emphases, the choice of words, the balance of presentation of facts and opinions should give, as nearly as possible, the same overall impression as the fullest possible version of the story would give. The reason why so many text-books must be regarded with suspicion is that they do not give the same impression that a full account would give, but in fact very often they give the opposite impression.

Keppel-Jones suggests two principles that *should* be followed by the writers of text-books, namely,

"i. that whenever there is a conflict of interests between two groups in a population, or between the government and the governed, or between two nations, it can be assumed that each side has a case.... A writer may, of course, conclude that one case was stronger than the other... but then he must have presented the evidence fairly.

"ii. Emotive language must not be used to enlist the reader's sympathy on one side. But he may, indeed he should, quote the emotive language that was used by partisans on both sides in order to enable the reader to understand the emotional forces that were at work."

How to bring about improvements

What can be done to remedy the unfortunate state of affairs described above? I suggest that a great deal can be done. As Keppel-Jones puts it, "the mere teaching of the truth... is not enough. It is not enough that justice be done; it must be seen to be done. The student must not leave without having had implanted in his mind the knowledge that different versions of history approximate in different degrees to an objective validity, and the belief that the pursuit of this truth is the proper object of historical study. He must know that the advocacy of a cause is not its object; that an historian is properly judge, not advocate....

"...It is well known that in a few years the facts memorised for an examination fade in the mind....What does not fade is the attitude of mind that was formed by the teaching of the subject at school. It is well known that South African students acquire certain notions, which an impartial judge would condemn, about Hottentots, missionaries, Trekkers, and so forth. But these notions are far less to be condemned than the monstrous heresy that they imply, that History ought to support and confirm the current loyalties and antipathies of those who write or read it. Clio does not belong to the class of handmaidens."

To translate these principles into educational practice, University Departments of History and Education should teach *all* their students the elements of South African history, even those who do only a first year course in history. Further, the students should be given the tools for criticism of the text-books they used in school, and the others they may meet if they become teachers.

Then teacher training colleges could give more attention to the content of the South African history that their students are being trained to teach. At present, the emphasis is largely on method, and the result is that students are equipped with increasingly high-powered methods and tools, such as dramatic representations, films, etc., for indoctrinating the children they teach with biased history and prejudiced attitudes towards other groups in our country. This teaching of historical content to the student teachers should be in the nature of remedial teaching, designed to correct the distorted history that they learned at school. It should be designed, furthermore, to give them sound critical standards for judging between truths and propaganda, and for evaluating in a fair and rational way the past behaviour of the various groups of people who have contributed to the history of our country.

If the Universities and training colleges could do this, they would stimulate an atmosphere of lively and critical interest in South African history, and a recognition of what is required for intellectual honesty in learning and teaching in other subjects as well as history. Out of this in turn would come the kind of text-books that we need, for primary schools, and for the lower standards of secondary schools; for Race Studies and Social Studies, as well as for matriculation history.