

https://dspace.org/

Perspectives in Education, 10(1)

Linda Chisholm; Mastin Prinsloo; Chris Breen; Bill Nasson; Charlie Nwandula ...

1988-06
University of the Witwatersrand
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/29070
Chisholm, L., & Prinsloo, M. (Eds.) (1988, June). Perspectives in Education, 10(1).

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

Perspectives in Education

Volume 10 No 1 June 1988

ARTICLES

Chris Breen

Policing Exams: The Impact on Teachers and Students in Western Cape Schools, 1985

Bill Nasson

Bitter Harvest: Farm Schooling for Black South Africans

Charlie Nwandula

"The Head of the Native": Swiss Mission Education at Lemana, 1899 – 1955

Frans Meijers

Education, Politics and the State: The Elementary Technical School in the Netherlands, 1945 – 1955

REVIEWS ON:

"What is history?"

Fundamental Pedagogics

REPORTS ON:

The History Workshop

Kenton Education Conference

Editors:

Linda Chisholm and Mastin Prinsloo

Assistant Editors:

Joyce Hickson, Jonathan Hyslop,
Richard Levin, Johan Muller
and Charles Potter

Management and Production:

Lesley Coetzee

Regional Associate Editors:

Peter Buckland: University of Bophutatswana; **Theboga Moja**: University of Bophutatswana; **Yousuf Gabru**: University of Cape Town; **Peter Kallaway**: University of Cape Town; **Mogamed Ajam**: University of the Western Cape; **Peter Kota**: University of Fort Hare; **David Masekela**: University of the North; **Mike Hart**: University of Natal

Consulting Editors:

Michael Apple: University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA; **Madeleine Arnot**: The Open University, UK; **Michael Ashley**: University of Cape Town; **Basil Bernstein**: University of London, UK; **Andre du Toit**: University of Cape Town; **Michael Katz**: University of Pennsylvania, USA; **Es'kia Mphahlele**: University of the Witwatersrand; **Bill Nasson**: University of Cape Town; **Njabulo Ndebele**: University of Roma, Lesotho; **Jack Niven**: University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg; **Mokubung Nkomo**: University of North Carolina, Charlotte, USA; **John Samuel**: SACHED Trust, Johannesburg; **John Watt**: Murdoch University, Australia; **Michael Young**: University of London, UK

Perspectives in Education is published in June and November of each year by the Faculty of Education, University of the Witwatersrand, PO Wits, Johannesburg 2050, and incorporates the Johannesburg College of Education journal *Symposium*.

Editorial Correspondence:
Faculty of Education, University of the Witwatersrand, PO Wits,
Johannesburg 2050, South Africa

Cover Design: Steve Rothenberg, Learn and Teach Publications, Johannesburg
Lay-out and Design: Vicki Hammon, Peoples Computer Bureau, Johannesburg
Printers: Ultra Litho (Pty) Limited, 11 St George Street, Lakeview, Johannesburg

ISSN 0258 2236

Contents

Editorial 1

Articles

Policing Exams: The Impact on Teachers and Students in Western Cape Schools, 1985
Chris Breen 3

Farm Schools: Bitter Harvest for Black South Africans
Bill Nasson 13

"The Head of the Native": Swiss Mission Education at Lemana, 1899-1955
Charlie Nwandula 43

Education, Politics and the State: The Elementary Technical School in the Netherlands, 1945-1955
Frans Meijers 53

Review Essay

The State of Fundamental Pedagogics
Penny Enslin 67

Reviews, Documents and Debate

What is History? A New Approach to History for Students, Workers and Communities
History Materials Development Group, Melanie Walker 75

The History Workshop, 1987
Luli Callinicos 84

The Making of Class: Beyond Model Curricula - A Preliminary Critique of the Presentation of History in South African Schools
Cynthia Kros 87

The Kenton Conference, 1987
Joe Muller, Tony Morphet 101

Reviews 107

Notes on Contributors 119

Editorial Policy

The policy of the editors of *Perspectives in Education* is to promote rigorous critical discussion and debate about education (in the broadest sense of the word), particularly in the context of Southern Africa, through the publication of academic articles based on original theoretical and empirical research and analysis. *Perspectives in Education* attempts to reflect the variety of perspectives current in the field, and publishes both discipline-based and inter-disciplinary research. In order to ensure all articles are of the highest quality all contributions are submitted to at least two referees before acceptance for publication and decision to publish is based on their recommendations.

The editors affirm their unequivocal rejection of all discriminatory principles and practices in education, and in particular their rejection of the racist and discriminatory features of the South African system. They furthermore express their commitment to a single non-racial education system to be established by the democratic participation of all South Africa's people which will provide for the development of their full potential.

PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION, 1988, VOL. 10, NO. 1, 1 - 2

Editorial

This issue goes to press at a time when the South African public has heard muted and muffled sounds of continuing unrest in schools in the Western Cape and Soweto and continuing violence in the schools of Natal. Press censorship has prohibited not only full coverage of these events, but also information about them appearing in different regional newspapers. Thus the Western Cape, Natal and other regions seldom hear about events in the Transvaal; the Transvaal is often kept ignorant of events in other parts of the country. Although this journal is not devoted to current reportage, we hope to assist in breaking down these regional and other barriers in whatever way we can.

This is also a time when some of the most important voices in education have been silenced. Two educational organisations have been banned since our last issue, the *National Education Crisis Committee* and the *National Education Union of South Africa*. As a journal dedicated to fostering critical debate and discussion on education and schooling in South Africa, we have to protest these actions by the state and call for the unconditional release of all educationists and other political prisoners in South Africa.

We open this issue of *Perspectives in Education* with an article that begins to explore some of the educational issues that were raised in the massive school upheavals during the period 1984/1985. The legacy of these will remain for many years. At least one of the points of conflict in black schools nationally has been the system and process of school examinations. Their role in enforcing rigid teaching methods and rote learning has long been a focus of criticism by educationists.

The article by Chris Breen on the impact of police presence during school examinations conducted under extremely stressful conditions, and teachers' and students' responses to these implicitly raises more general questions about the reliance on the examination in South African schools. His article is important, because it begins to tease out some of the dynamics of a period of profound significance in South African educational history. Analyses of the relationship between the state, schooling and resistance during this recent period remain urgent, and we call for more contributions which will address these issues.

The article by Bill Nasson continues a focus begun in the last issue on schooling in South Africa's rural areas. Although the article was widely read in its unpublished form we decided to publish a revised version as it is one of the most seminal pieces on schooling on white commercial farms in South Africa. It goes well beyond a reflection on the relationship between schooling and work to consider the importance of paternalist social practices on farms, the way these structure dependants and how these seemingly inseparable bonds may be snapped.

The research for the articles by Breen and Nasson was conducted in the Western Cape. The article by Charlie Nwandula takes us to the Northern Transvaal, a heavily under researched area by educationists. The concern in this article is with the enduring and pervasive history of "adapted" education. Debate in education has tended to see the ideology of "education along their own lines" as being particular to

government policy. This article shows how, far from providing a universalist educational ethos before 1954, at least one mission society pre-figured the narrowly culturist ideological underpinnings of Bantu education.

Finally, the article by Frans Meijers although not on South Africa, raises questions pertinent to an analysis of state educational policy in South Africa. It alerts us to the parallels with other societies and specificities of our own. The article also advances important theoretical arguments about the formulation of educational policy which should be of interest to readers.

This edition of Perspectives sees the introduction of a section entitled "Reviews, Documents and Debate". We invite our readers and contributors to make use of this part of the journal as a forum for exchange of ideas and information on books, events and issues.

We hope that readers like the new cover and format, and welcome contributions in any area of education particularly with reference to Southern Africa.

PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION, 1988, VOL. 10, NO. 1, 3 - 11

Policing Exams: The Impact on Students and Teachers in Cape Schools, 1985

Chris Breen
University of Cape Town

The article argues that the actions of teachers belonging to the Western Cape Teachers' Union (WECTU) in refusing to administer exams in November 1985 were justifiable. It does so by examining the context in which exams were written, as well as by an analysis of students' maths results in Standard Nine at Crestway Senior Secondary in Cape Town. The results achieved are demonstrated to have been educationally invalid.

Introduction

> The Western Cape Teachers Union (WECTU) calls on teachers not to assist with matric exams and not to administer Std Six to Std Nine exams, because it is impossible for any student in the present climate where innocent students, parents and teachers are being detained, killed, arrested and assaulted by the defence forces to prepare for any examination.... It is an accepted fact that any examination is a culmination of an educational process. Therefore testing students on work not done is both immoral and uneducational.[1]

On 20 July 1987 the first misconduct hearing, brought by the Department of Education and Culture (DEC) against a group of 72 teachers who had refused to administer examinations in November 1985, was held in the Department's offices in Wynberg, Cape Town. The defendant was Phillip Tobias who in 1985 was acting Head of Crestway Senior Secondary School. As he arrived, over 2 000 students and parents were present to show their support for him. No observers were allowed to attend the hearing and defence witnesses were refused entry to the building. The defence lawyers based their arguments on the fact that the Coloured Persons Education Act of 1963 did not give inspectors the right to insist that a Headmaster carry out their orders. After hearing the legal arguments from both sides, the presiding officer reserved judgement and agreed not to proceed with the next case until the verdict on Phillip Tobias was handed down.

This verdict has to date not been given. On 19 August 1987 Allan Hendrickse, chairman of the Ministers' Council in the House of Representatives, intervened and announced in Parliament that discplinary action against the 72 Cape Town teachers who had refused to administer examinations in 1985 was cancelled; that the actions of the teachers to ignore lawful orders could not be justified or condoned and that the Ministers' Council had decided that the disciplinary procedures would be revised immediately.[2] It is clear that Hendrickse was forced to abandon proceedings against the teachers in the face of both the strong community support they had, and the legitimacy of their stance. The above is the concern of this article. Before elaborating the argument it is necessary to contextualise the events and examine why

teachers decided to defy the Education Department by refusing to administer examinations.

The 1985 schools' crisis

The schools' boycott in the Western Cape was sparked off by the murders of Matthew Goniwe (a teacher), Fort Calata, Sicelo Mhlawuli and Sparrow Mkonto on 26 June 1985, under mysterious circumstances, as well as by the declaration of the State of Emergency on 20 July 1985.[3] Within a week two mass meetings were held at the University of the Western Cape. At the first, 4 000 students agreed to boycott classes in solidarity with boycotting students around the country and at the second, 10 000 High School students decided to stay away from schools from the start of the next week.

There followed a six week period of class boycotts and the holding of alternative lessons. The most significant event at this time was a meeting of teachers in Athlone held in August. Here it was agreed that teachers would down tools for two days and help run alternative education programmes. Confrontation between students and police escalated in this period and on 2 September police stormed a Cape Town Bo-Kaap school, Vista High, threatened teachers at gunpoint and arrested several students.[4] On 6 September the Minister of Education in the House of Representatives, Carter Ebrahim, announced that he was closing 464 schools, technikons and colleges in the Western Cape. Hendrickse told United Press International (UPI) that these schools would remain closed "until we have ridden the wave of unrest".[5] For not the first, nor the last, time were the junior partners in the Tricameral Parliament being made to work for the state. Immediately after these statements were made, teachers, parents and students met at a large gathering and decided that they would defy this closure and would symbolically re-open the schools themselves on 17 September. Minister of Education (for Coloured Affairs), Ebrahim, immediately warned that no unauthorised persons would be allowed on school premises.[6]

The date set for this re-opening saw confrontation at most schools. More than 150 schoolchildren, parents and teachers were arrested. Most were charged with trespassing. The most serious incident was at Alexander Sinton High, a school with a rich history of resistance in education, where police fired rubber bullets and teargas at 4 000 pupils, parents and teachers.[7] Against this background the Western Cape Teachers Union (WECTU) was launched on 29 September. It declared itself committed to the struggle for a unitary, non-racial, non-sexist, democratic and free education system on all levels. It had an initial signed-up membership of 1 500 teachers.

The Department of Education and Culture announced that schools would officially re-open on 1 October and Ebrahim accordingly banned all meetings at "coloured" schools.[8] Three hundred and seventy security guards were employed to control access to school premises.[9] The students responded by meeting at the University of the Western Cape. Two were shot and 10 arrested in police action.[10]

The confrontation escalated in the first week of October with what was described as heavy police presence at many schools.[11] The Cape Teachers' Professional Association (CTPA) announced its decision to seek an urgent Supreme Court order opposing the vailidity of the ban on meetings by unofficial organisations at "coloured" schools.[12] Ebrahim announced that the normal school programme would

be continued in order to prepare students for examinations. He thus turned down a CTPA request for matric exams to be postponed for at least a fortnight.[13] During the next week young children were shot by police in Athlone, in what has become known as the "Trojan Horse" ambush, and police entered a Wynberg school, snatching a United Democratic Front (UDF) executive member.[14] Forty four principals requested that the Director of Education, A.J. Arendse, delay the exams for two weeks. The request was turned down.[15] He had to maintain the appearance of "normality". Any concession had to be avoided at all costs since it might signal weakness, loss of control, and recognition of the seriousness of events. The Athlone Student Action Committee representing 15 schools saw things differently. Immediately after the infamous "Trojan Horse" incident it announced its decision not to write final examinations. It argued that:

> the conditions under which we live and the terror to which our people are being subjected makes it impossible for students to conduct any normal study. How can students study when police enter school premises and arrest students and teachers? How can we write exams at the point of a gun?[16]

The authorities responded in what was becoming an increasingly familiar, insensitive and uncompromising manner. Hendrickse warned "coloured" pupils of the consequences of refusing to sit for year-end exams, and threatened those who refused to write, saying that they would not be allowed to return to school. The Inter Regional Forum representing 80 schools also announced its decision not to write examinations, calling on all students not to do so.[17]

The matric examinations started on 1 November under bizarre conditions. Pupils arrived at the Cape Showgrounds to write exams, but were transferred to Wingfield Air Base and wrote in aircraft hangars. Police vehicles and Casspirs kept up a high profile while shotgun-carrying policemen patrolled the parking area. Exams started one and a half hours late.[18]

Internal exams for non-matriculants started on 7 November in chaotic conditions. Exams were disrupted by students and question papers torn up and burnt. At one school an attempt to storm the exam room by pupils not writing was repelled by those who were prepared to write. Two colleges suspended exams because of disruptions.[19] The confrontation then escalated as disruption squads threw stones and smashed windows in exam venues. Police and soldiers arrived in Casspirs and Buffels and fired teargas.[20] Security forces entered Zeekoevlei High School and held 510 pupils for questioning.[21] As schools teemed with soldiers, a high-powered delegation, comprising the Heads of the Universities of Cape Town and Western Cape and the Peninsula Technikon, met the State President to discuss the issue, but they came away empty handed.[22] The next day teachers described conditions at their schools. Police armed with shotguns patrolled classrooms at at least one school as pupils wrote their language examination. Teachers reported that "armed police were patrolling corridors and walking up and down the aisles of exam rooms".[23]

Twenty organisations, including WECTU, had joined a call to postpone exams to March 1986.[24] Now teachers began to come into the firing line. The Education Department suspended eight teachers for refusing to invigilate at examinations.[25] Three teachers were arrested at Groenvlei High and pupils wrote exams under police guard.[26] Twenty seven teachers at Cathkin High in the Bonteheuwel district announced that the examinations were a farce and that they refused to administer

exams.[27] The following day armed police in 8 vehicles surrounded Cathkin and kept up a strong presence as 30 pupils wrote exams. The November salaries of 43 teachers at Alexander Sinton High were withheld because they refused to administer exams.[28]

General irregularities in the writing of exams were reported. The chairperson of WECTU told of cases where Standard Six pupils had been given Standard Nine exams to write. Sometimes pupils were only told what exam they would write after arrival at school and at Cathkin High pupils were given the same Biology question papers as had been written at Manenburg Senior Secondary three days previously.[29]

After the exams were completed the tension continued. Teachers at several schools expressed their outrage at the actions of DEC inspectors who they claimed were engineering the marks of pupils. "At our school we had to take the average mark for 1983 and 1984 and if higher than the 1985 mark we had to add the difference to the 1985 mark".[30] Action against teachers by the Department continued. The entire staff of 35 at Harold Cressy High were ordered to return their November and December salaries. No reason was given for this decision.[31]

Meanwhile the eight teachers who had been suspended had appealed on the grounds that the Minister had exceeded his authority and had not investigated the situation thoroughly. On 13 December their appeal was dismissed with costs. This seemed to encourage the Department to take further action. The new year started with the principal of Harold Cressy High receiving notification that he was being replaced with immediate effect, this despite the fact that he had been headmaster at the school for the previous 21 years. His entire staff of 35 had consistently refused to administer or set exam papers.[32] By 10 January more than 100 Peninsula teachers had been suspended, sacked, transferred or banned.[33] Carter Ebrahim was reported as stating that the Labour Party would "put an end to this kind of thing where they believe they have the authority to challenge the Minister." Taking strength from the recent Supreme Court ruling on the CTPA application, he added that "the court rulings prove that I have authority".[34] On 15 January hundreds of teachers met outside the Department's offices in Roeland Street to protest against the suspensions. In a performance that was to be repeated in 1987, Hendrickse stepped in to save the Education Department. That night he announced that the suspensions were being lifted as it was "in the interests of education that the situation be defused". He also warned that the cancellation of the suspensions would not affect charges laid against teachers in terms of the Coloured Persons Education Act. The alleged charges of misconduct against the teachers who had not been prepared to supervise exams had in the meantime been investigated and the administration was now in a position to proceed with formal charges.[35] It was, in fact, a further 18 months before the first case was heard.

The case had closed in a most unsatisfactory manner. For the teachers it was only a qualified victory. Once again Hendrickse had intervened in confrontation between the Department and teachers at a time when the Department was being forced to back down. In order to save face, the Department dropped charges, but the teachers' action was condemned as unjustified. Insinuations were made that further legislation would be passed to restrict teachers' future options.

The important question dealing with the educational validity of the examinations was avoided. The 72 teachers believed that the examinations were anti-educational, and that the students were psychologically unprepared to write them.[36] Were

they correct in this view? How should they act in the future once the technical loopholes have been removed?

Examinations at Crestway Senior Secondary School

Examinations are a crucial mechanism in South African schooling for sifting, sorting and selecting students for differential futures. They are decisive in governing a student's access to further study and work, and they control progress to each higher standard within the school. Subject and teacher choice as well as streaming decisions depend on examination results. Almost all lessons and curricula revolve around these examinations.

This article will consider the educational validity of exams held during this period, one which was characterised by considerable stress and distress. It will do so by examining the Standard Nine mathematics results of Crestway Senior Secondary School. I have chosen this particular focus because:

i) "mathematics is only one of the many school subjects ... yet there is greater pressure for children to succeed at mathematics than at any other subject."[37]

ii) the Standard Nine class is the class which had the most at stake in a decision to delay exams, in that Standard Nine represents the start of a two-year syllabus that leads to the matriculation examination, and

iii) Crestway was the school at which Phillip Tobias was Acting Head. An examination of trends here is bound to cast light on and reveal patterns that are of much wider significance than a single school and will help in judging the issue of educational validity.

Crestway Senior Secondary School is a co-educational "coloured" school of about a thousand students that caters mainly for working class families. It suffered a similar experience to most of the other "coloured" Cape Town schools during 1985.

The start of the first term, as is usual in "coloured" schools of the Western Cape, saw lessons delayed for 3-4 weeks as a result of problems with time-tabling arrangements, textbook delays and school sporting events. During the second term the customary June examinations in most standards were set on work covering less than a half of the syllabus. However, the normal number of class tests (3 per term) were written and homework lasting approximately an hour was given each day. As a result the June exmination results for mathematics fell within the "normal" annual spread. After this period, for reasons sketched above, no further lessons were possible. During this time no homework was done and no class tests were written. Against the wishes of the school staff, the school was instructed to set the December examinations based on the work that should have been covered during the year. The Acting Headmaster was suspended after he refused to organise examinations. After this, some teachers did set papers and pupils wrote such examinations in the presence of fully-armed Defence Force soldiers.

The Cockcroft report gives two fundamental principles which should govern any examination in mathematics. Firstly, papers should be used which allow pupils to demonstrate what they do know rather than what they do not know. Secondly, the examinations should not undermine the confidence of those who attempt them.[38]

It is apparent that neither of these two conditions was fulfilled. The examination paper covered work over half of which was completely new to the candidates. This examination gave the pupils no chance at all to show what they knew. In addition, the November examination could hardly have been designed to work. It was held

in conditions in direct contrast to the second condition of not undermining the confidence of those attempting them. Candidates were compelled to write an examination on what was already the most stressful school subject, without having covered over half the syllabus, without having had any opportunity to aid their memories through regular homework and class tests, against the wishes of many of the majority of their peers and in the stressful and highly unnatural presence of armed soldiers.

By no stretch of the imagination could such a mathematics examination have any educational value. It can be expected that any student promoted under such circumstances is likely to suffer from the lack of firm foundations on which to build further knowledge. In addition, negative attitudes towards mathematics as a source of failure and high anxiety are reinforced. Under these conditions it is not surprising that teachers refused to administer and mark exams as they did in November 1985. Were the teachers justified in their stand, however? Did results reflect the stress situation? Are they thus educationally invalid? I will answer this question by investigating the maths exam results of Standard Nine.

The Standard Nine class speaks

Although allegations have been made that inspectors changed the 1985 examination results at certain schools, this does not seem to have happened at Crestway.

I examined the school records for the relevant period and found that they painted a fascinating picture.[39]

(i) The "Top" Students

Looking first at the Higher Grade Mathematics class, 37 candidates wrote the June examination. Twenty one passed with a class average of 37.8%. The three top students were J.S., I.B. and K.D. For the November examination, only 11 of these 37 candidates decided to write. Of these 11, only three students passed the examination. This means that over two-thirds of the Higher Grade class decided not to write the end of year examination, and that the number who passed at the end represents only an 8% pass for the whole class. What is particularly significant is the actions of the three that passed the November examination.

I.N. was an exception. Although he was rewarded with only a 50% mark in June he actually improved his result in November to 65% through enormous personal sacrifice by him and financial support from his father. The other two students provide a fascinating insight into student perceptions of the examinations. Although O.T. (47%) and K.D. (57%) both easily passed this examination in 1985 and were promoted, they both chose to repeat Standard 9 in 1986. They realised how disadvantaged they would be without the necessary foundations and voluntarily chose to repair this educational disadvantage by repeating the Standard Nine year. Fortunately their insight was rewarded and both these students obtained 80% in the November 1986 Standard Nine examination.

The choices of the top three candidates in the June examination are also interesting. J.S. and I.B. chose not to write the examination, and the third was K.D. who chose to repeat the year after passing. So the top three Higher Grade students in the mathematics class all chose to repeat the year's work. These students show very clear insights into the reality of their preparation of these 1985 examinations, and were accordingly rewarded with marks of 95%, 72%, and 80% respectively in the subsequent 1986 Standard Nine examinations.

It is important to note that this insight is not peculiar to the mathematicians in the school. In the June 1985 examination, seven candidates succeeded in obtaining A passes overall. Of these seven, six decided that there was no point in writing the examination, and the seventh who wrote was K.D. who as we have seen, repeated Standard Nine in 1986 by his own choice. All seven of the top Standard Nine students at Crestway chose to repeat the standard in 1986.

The top students in the Crestway Standard Nine class had thus, in their results and in their actions, demonstrated that the November examinations had little educational validity.

(ii) The "Struggling" Students

The Standard Grade figures present a picture at the other end of the spectrum. 120 Candidates wrote the June 1985 examination. Of these, 95 passed with a class average of 47,7%. There were 25 failures; 13 of these obtained between 20% and 30%, and 8 less than 20%. By contrast, only 51 candidates wrote the November 1985 examination. As opposed to 95 in June, only 12 passed with a class average of 27%, instead of the 47.7% average gained in June. There were 39 failures, of whom 22 obtained between 20% and 30%, and 11 less than 20%. This represents only a 23% pass rate.

The reality and impact of these results on students' self-perceptions, lives and future prospects is dimmed by statistics. Nonetheless, a comparison of the marks obtained by the 33 November failures in the June examinations does reveal, in part, the tragedy for individual students.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	FF	G	H	Ave:
June 1985	0	0	2	9	12	7	1	6	2	42%
Nov. 1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	22	11	22%

The wholesale shift of marks to drastically lower failing marks is dramatic. Experiences of this nature are extremely damaging, scarring individuals for life, and making it almost impossible ever again to generate a positive attitude to any learning, let alone mathematics. This may seem a sweepingly extravagant assertion, but further examination of the later results of these same pupils shows some of the effects.

Twenty two of these Mathematics Standard Grade failures repeated Standard Nine in 1986. At the end of 1986 the average of the 22 was a failing 27% compared to a passing 39% a year and a half previously! Only three of the 22 had managed to improve on their June 1985 marks! And it should be stressed that this time they had covered the whole syllabus.

Further light is cast on the deleterious effects by considering the case of C.A. who had just managed to pass in June 1985 with 101 marks. His 20% failing experience in November 1985 led to 1986 marks of 26%, 10% and a final 11% in November. Far worse is C.P. who had a creditable 56% pass in June 1985. Her 25% failure in November 1985 devastated her. Although she passed Standard Nine in 1986, her 1986 mathematics marks were 29% in June, 30% in September and 18% in November. She has dropped by 38% in the one and a half years and has not passed Maths again.

The picture is hardly better for those 11 Standard Nine students who were promoted to Standard Ten in 1986. In September 1986 their average was a **failing 25% compared to a passing 48%** in June 1985. An individual case illustrates the extreme folly of passing a failing student who has missed over half a year's foundations in mathematics. D.A. moved from 40% in June 1985 to 21% in November 1985. She was promoted to Standard Ten in 1986. She was so badly prepared for this move that she obtained marks of 3% and 0% for mathematics in June and September. One can only guess at the degree of permanent damage to her self-esteem.

Conclusion

I believe that this study has important implications for teachers faced with similar future decisions. It shows a class whose "top" students recognised the disadvantage they would suffer in being promoted to a new standard without having been properly prepared. This is particularly problematic in a country where the final matriculation results govern entry into fields of further study. Their decisions to repeat the year support the teachers' claims that students would be educationally penalised in writing the examinations.

The results of the "struggling" students show the devastating effects inflicted on those forced to write examinations under these stressful conditions. They have been forced to accept humiliating marks that do not correspond to previous performance, and have suffered from increased maths anxiety as a result of their experiences that has carried on into subsequent years. I suggest that this study shows that the actions of the teachers were totally justified, and that its findings make it very difficult for any teacher of conscience to act otherwise in the future.

Notes and References

1. Western Cape Teachers Union General Council, Motion adopted at meeting, 16 October 1985.
2. *Cape Times*, 20 August 1987.
3. Chairperson's report, Annual meeting, WECTU, Cape Town, 25 May 1986.
4. *Cape Times*, 3 September 1985.
5. *Cape Times*, 7 September 1985.
6. *Argus*, 16 September 1985.
7. *Argus*, 17 September 1985.
8. *Cape Times*, 2 October 1985.
9. *Argus*, 3 October 1985.
10. *Cape Times*, 3 October 1985.
11. *Cape Times*, 4 October 1985.
12. *Argus*, 4 October 1985.
13. *Sunday Times*, 13 October 1985.
14. *Cape Times*, 15 October 1985.
15. *Argus*, 16 October 1985.
16. *Cape Times*, 22 October 1985.
17. *Cape Times*, 28 October 1985.
18. *Cape Times*, 2 November 1985.
19. *Argus*, 7 November 1985.
20. *Cape Times*, 9 November 1985.

21. *Argus*, 6 November 1985.
22. *Cape Times*, 12 November 1985.
23. *Cape Times*, 13 November 1985.
24. *Cape Times*, 18 November 1985.
25. *Cape Times*, 15 November 1985.
26. *Argus*, 20 November 1985.
27. *Cape Times*, 21 November 1985.
28. *Cape Times*, 22 November 1985.
29. *Cape Times*, 3 December 1985.
30. *Ibid.*
31. *City Press*, 1 December 1985.
32. *Cape Times*, 9 January 1986.
33. *Cape Times*, 10 January 1986.
34. *Argus*, 9 January 1986.
35. *Argus*, 15 January 1986.
36. WECTU, Memorandum, January 1986.
37. W. Cockcroft, *Mathematics Counts: Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Teaching of Mathematics in Schools*. (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1982), 1.
38. *Ibid.*, 159.
39. The data was obtained directly from the school's official "green book" records in my capacity as a proposed defence witness in the Tobias hearing.

Raymond Suttner

Two Years in Detention

RAYMOND SUTTNER, senior lecturer in Law at the University of the Witwatersrand, has been detained under the Emergency regulations since 12 June 1986.

For 15 months of this confinement, Raymond has been by himself.

In his academic career, Raymond Suttner has held posts in African Studies and Law at the Universities of Cape Town, Natal and Witwatersrand. Through his lectures and his writings, he has made an important contribution to the public debate on human rights.

Despite having been imprisoned for two years, Raymond has not been charged with any offence.

The Executive of the Academic Staff Association of the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg expresses its deepest concern over the continued and indefinite detention of Raymond Suttner and of all detainees. **We protest against their continued and indefinite detention.**

Academics concerned about the detention of Raymond Suttner and others are asked to place similar statements in journals in which they publish.

PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION, 1988, VOL. 10, NO. 1, 13 - 41

Bitter Harvest: Farm Schooling for Black South Africans

Bill Nasson
University of Cape Town

In order to understand the structuring presence of formal schooling for black pupils in white agricultural areas, we need to set farm-based education in the context of the white rural social order. Farm schooling lies squarely within the wider institutional matrix of social forces and relationships in rural areas: It is rooted in structures of work discipline, social order, moral policing and adolescent passivity. Riddled with poverty, the schoolhouse stands on thin and acid soil, while the fertile land around it marks the dominion of capital accumulation. The material fortunes of schooling cannot be understood independently of the workings of paternalism, charity and philanthropy, of the orbit of social practices and relations between landowners and labouring families. Farm children encounter not only forms of literacy but bouts of productive labour as the customary curriculum of everyday lessons. These are the acute and immediate realities of experience under South African agrarian capitalism.

To analyse farm schooling we need, as a starting point, to develop a conceptualisation of relations in white commercial agriculture and to situate some theoretical perspectives on the structures of rural life. Here some key questions come to bear. The essential question about the farm school is what part it plays in the reproduction of the social and economic domain beyond its walls. What is its function? This can naturally be answered partly in terms of what the school **does**, that is, in assessing its effectiveness in the teaching of reading and writing, and in providing organised forms of recreation and culture. However, beyond this instrumentalist perspective, there lies a more fundamental consideration. Beyond bricks, mortar and administrative regulations, the critical question is: Where does this kind of educational institution stand in relation to the lives of those who are poor, dispossessed and unprotected? What part do these schools play in the early ordering of the lives of those who are dependent and powerless? Embedded in a particularly "total" form of agrarian social structure, where does the school lie in relation to the closed culture of the farm? What is its place in the institutional framework of work, community and inequality? Like the elementary Chapel schools of 19th century Pembrokeshire and Carmarthenshire, are any of these schools nurseries of partial autonomy, offering children a home and an oppositional culture to the sway of capital?

The farm as a total or greedy institution

Schooling fits into the localism of the farm and, more precisely, the disciplinary social order which farm life reproduces. Squalor, chronic poverty, a general lack of alternative employment opportunities, dependency for jobs and housing on local farmers and isolation from any radicalism in working class culture are the customary expectations of the average farm worker. An intense and confining localism, disa-

bling dependence and encapsulating poverty have come to characterise the social world of agricultural wage labour.[1] How should we interpret this self-contained work and community situation? The essentially small-scale and total nature of the farm-centred social structure is a phenomenon which might perhaps be understood in the light of the suggestive sociological work of Erving Goffman and Lewis Coser. "Total institution" is the term coined by Goffman to describe all forms of institution in which dominant authority exercises a "total" regulation of inmates' daily lives. In his pioneering study, *Asylums*, Goffman applies the term not only to mental hospitals, but also to monasteries, convents, prisons, reformatories and schools. The importance of Goffman's analysis is that he applies the "total" concept to institutions with clearly diverse populations and purposes, arguing that institutional routines tend to grind out the same customs and rituals of enclosure and depersonalization, whatever their manifest purposes. All residential institutions, whatever their purposes, have many critical features in common, especially the need to regulate the lives of inmates into a common discipline.[2]

The element of totality is also of central importance in the work of Coser, who has coined the term "greedy institutions" for isolated, small-scale and total social structures.[3] As Coser has himself noted, his analysis is complementary to Goffman's, as the concepts of "total institution" and "greedy institution" are compatible. Such institutions isolate the individual from competing claims, engrossing as much of his or her life as possible. The dominance exerted is over the ordinary business of people's lives, inside and **outside** the sphere of work. Greedy institutions make total claims on the lives of members, attempting to "reduce the claims of competing roles and status positions on those they wish to encompass within their boundaries. Their demands on the person are omnivorous".[4] Where Goffman focuses on the physical walls separating the institutional members from the outside world, greedy institutions, "though they may in some cases utilise the device of physical isolation, tend to rely mainly on non-physical mechanisms to separate the inside from the outside, and to erect symbolic boundaries between them... Nor are greedy institutions marked by external coercion. On the contrary, they tend to rely on voluntary compliance, and to evolve means of activating loyalty and commitment".[5]

Those confined within a tightly-knit and tightly-regulated social enclave, like domestic servants, "being insulated from competing relationships and from competing anchors for their social identity, these selected status-occupants find their identity anchored in the symbolic universe of the restricted role-set of the greedy institution".[6] In this context, life for labouring agricultural communities and rural domestic servants is cramped by the dominance, influence and authority of greedy institutions. Access to any other independent identity and to any alternative social vision is severely limited, if not totally excluded. The farm has thus become a classic greedy institution.[7] Indeed, its circumscribing border is not necessarily just the farm gate. Its *milieu* can penetrate the locality, impregnating it with the personal

authority and influence of the propertied and powerful. Accordingly, a complete district may come to represent the spatial framework within which the traditional imperious authority of farmers and employers operates.[8] And any oppositional culture against appropriation is denied an autonomous terrain in which to take root.

Paternalist practice

The farmer's influence as a "big man" is generated not simply on his land and in his claim on cheap labour in the locality, but is mediated through a range of social practices and institutions, running from religion to schooling to family life. Much personal influence is exercised in a structured way, through a dense web of giving and receiving. Employer provision and donation can probably be best interpreted in terms of the gift relationship. Here the key factor is the well-defined personal structure of this relationship. The benevolence and generosity implicit in the gift stabilises relations of deference, damping down tensions, ambiguities and contradictions in the relationship between farmers and the rural poor. The gift celebrates kindness and obligation in the bond between dominant and dominated. As Gareth Stedman Jones has emphasised, the gift serves as a method of social control. In most societies, gifts, however disinterested they may seem, are mostly symbols of prestige. To give imposes an obligation upon the receiver. In order to receive, one must behave in an acceptable, ingratiating manner.[9] To quote Marcel Mauss, "if one hoards, it is only to spend later on, to put people under obligations and to win followers". Mauss has argued that "to give is to show one's superiority...To accept without returning or repaying more, is to face subordination, to become a client and subservient". The giver, therefore, being blessed by providence, puts the recipient "in the shadow of his name".[10]

Probably the clearest exposition of the importance of gift relationships in capitalist rural societies is provided by Howard Newby:

> The identification of agricultural workers with their employer often needs to be buttressed in a positive manner by the application of some substantive and/or symbolic form of reinforcement. That is to say that part of the expected obligations upon employers which deference entails is the recognition of duties beyond the minimal level necessary under the agreed terms of the wage contract. Because they go beyond the formal wage bargain, any extra rewards are typically regarded as gifts, and are attributed to the generosity of the employer. In return they are expected to evoke feelings of gratitude and affection among employees. In monetary terms such gifts - pleasant housing conditions, occasional farm produce, the free use of farm implements and facilities, presents at Christmas, periodic "treats" of various kinds - may not amount to much, but their symbolic importance is inestimable...whatever the consciously philanthropic motivations which help to stimulate gift relationships, in effect they represent, through their status-enhancing properties, an integral part of the legitimation of traditional authority.[11]

The special significance of the gift in paternalistic social relations is that it is overwhelmingly a relationship between **persons**. According to David Roberts, "the key to paternalism" lies "in smallness...in small spheres defined by personal relations". For it is "the existence of well-defined personal relations" which constitute "the cement of paternalism".[12] Gift relationships are thus at their most effective in rural society, where there is no huge geographical separation between rich and poor, and where the poor are known. If it is ever depersonalized and bureaucratized, the gift loses its characteristic moral features of service, obligation, subordination and pres-

tige. Gift relationships therefore work with the grain of personal paternalism on a discriminating, local basis.

Because of its overwhelmingly personal and discretionary texture, the gift relation enters the opportunities and other life experiences of **some** of the poor. These are generally those identified as displaying cleanliness, providence and good "character", those sturdy virtues which warmed the souls of Victorian and Edwardian charity commissioners. Only the "deserving" are thought suitable, for the purpose is to encourage gratitude and respect and to cement bonds of obligation, not to provide relief for those long on indolence and short on moral fibre, nor to foster independence.

Ideally, as Roberts has suggested, the gift expresses an organic relationship between the **deserving** poor and the wealthy. It imparts personal pattern and emotional meaning to relations of deference; as a thread in the web of rural dependency it helps to consolidate what Patrick Joyce has termed the "real inwardness" of deference.[13] And while the gift should be dispensed to known deferential recipients, this duty does not of course preclude acts of generosity accorded to poor communities as a whole.

Lastly, it must be emphasised that the performance of benevolent duties is a capricious affair. Paternalism is a diffuse and varied kind of social outlook. Differing perceptions of self-interest and ideas of community welfare and social responsibility tend to produce a patchy mosaic of paternalistic provision: At one farm it might be a milk allowance for infants, while at another it might be new labourers' cottages. And one ought never to exaggerate the scale of these petty acts of benevolence.

Landowners involved in gift relationships tend to express their role not in terms of benevolence or charity, but in terms of "service" to the labouring community, and more specifically, through what Newby and his co-authors call "an ideology of stewardship with regard to property".[14] That is, just as at the workplace farmers would prefer to be thought of as "looking after" their workers, so this is reflected in a similar interpretation of their associational role in the affairs of working communities living on their land. For practising rural paternalists, the cultural hegemony of social duty and fatherly obligation should form the basis of society, rather than the formation of statutory rights to collective provision. The overriding themes are voluntarism and welfare. And the socially sanctioned and customary response to the receipt of charity is naturally quite different from that which usually follows from the receipt of one's rights, for recipients generally display gratitude and indebtedness as a token of their recognition that such benefits need not have been distributed to them. Given such interaction, it is easy to see why the gift relationship is cast as a core social mechanism for maintaining deference and for legitimating structures of hierarchy and inequality.[15]

Through personal involvement with the fortunes of exploited communities, landed families convert the exercise of power and racial and class dominance, into service to those over whom they hold sway. Social relations of superiority and subordination are blurred by the affective ideal of an "organic" rural community of mutual dependency, in which the propertied discharge their obligations through the assumption of benign authority and leadership, and through periodic doles of patronage and charity. The stressed values of community and of customary social bonds of identity between employer and worker have a beguiling grip upon rural sensibilities. They fall within Edward Thompson's formulation of an inherited "grid"

of agrarian customs and controls which help to sustain a delicate class equilibrium.[16] At the heart of such perspectives lie the notions of social control and "cultural capture"; with processes of social control based on paternalism, power relations become moral relations.[17]

"Looking after" working communities most emphatically does **not** mean paying higher wages. Naturally, some of the larger and more prosperous farms do have wage rates higher than average for their localities, related to workforce composition, work practices and management concepts. But for all enterprises, "looking after" workers implies a concern for their personal welfare, including individual, discretionary help with domestic and personal matters, the provision of secure housing, and other small acts of generosity. In other words, to cite Newby's archetypal successful capitalist farmer, "the good employer is one who extends his relationship with his workers beyond the wage bargain - an employer who cares".[18] For example, farmers' wives might go sick-visiting, take an interest in visiting young single girls with small babies to give them advice on child-rearing and may provide cast-offs for a clothing club. Or a farmer may make provision for primary schooling on his land.

Education and labour

Having outlined something of the broader conceptual and explanatory framework within which to locate the question of farm education, we can now move to consider the actual position of schooling within the parameters of landed paternalism.

The research material in this article comes from a personal investigation into farm schooling carried out for the Second Carnegie Inquiry into Poverty and Development in Southern Africa. Oral data was collected from a random sample of 40 farm schools or nearby rural schools catering for farm pupils, in parts of the Western and South Western Cape and the Karoo. This was supplemented with a mix of structured and informal interviews with 30 farmers or farm managers. Field workers of the Careers Research and Information Centre assisted in the collection of some of the material.

Is education considered to be a significant force in these personalized welfare relationships? Farmers are almost to a man agreed that education is a positive social good. Despite some ambivalence about the value of post-primary schooling, "education" is generally considered to be beneficial to children's self-development, particularly the building of "character". Historically, formal education and the drive to moralize and civilize the poor are, of course, closely associated.[19] In practical terms, one catches glimpses of farmers' beliefs in education, embodied in the bricks and mortar of classrooms, in the provision of soup kitchens, in subscriptions to school funds, and in gestures on the part of wives who provide some educational assistance in the shape of books or uniforms.

But it is necessary also to note what this belief in education does not entail. It does **not** entail any acceptance by farmers of the notion that education should entitle workers to enhanced status and greater income.

There is certainly no evidence of any important link between educational certification, farm employment and earnings. Except at the upper margins, it is unlikely that rising levels of certification will be matched by rising levels of remuneration. By the standards of urban occupational structures, promotional ladders are either non-existent or highly truncated. Even on the large, capital-intensive agribusiness, where there is a formalized promotional ladder, educational credentials provide

rungs at only the upper levels. Information provided by one such estate in the Paarl district in the Western Cape confirmed this. Formal schooling is not considered relevant when hiring workers in its main A1-A2 unskilled category: general farm labourers and pruners. At the B1-B4 semi-skilled category, which includes tractor drivers and spray tractor drivers, education levels may improve hiring prospects in **particular** circumstances, and may have some incremental impact upon minimum earnings. And this is a discretionary rather than a universal practice. Attention is paid to educational levels only when recruiting and determining pay levels for more specialized employees in skilled, salaried, C1-C4 and D1-D4 occupational grades.[20]

Even in animal husbandry, which as highly skilled work is one of the few jobs requiring good formal trade certificates in the British agricultural labour market, education is not a factor in hiring or in wage negotiation. Many of the farms investigated employed African migrant contract workers to tend to their herds. Migrants' lack of schooling is considered to be of no consequence. The stated reason for employing Eastern Cape Africans as stockmen was that in comparison with "unreliable" Coloured workers, they were diligent, sharp and responsible and could be safely entrusted with valuable herds. Moreover, Ciskeians or Transkeians made "natural" stockmen. For their rural employers, what matters is not education but their rooted beliefs in the sterling virtues of a "peasant" inheritance.[21] That South African farmers are in general indifferent towards, or very suspicious of, schooling as a qualificatcation for farmwork is not a particularly novel finding.[22] Even in the heavily mechanised and efficient world of British agriculture, educational levels continue to have little if any determining effect upon pay and employment practices.[23]

Farmers' views of rural education are thus somewhat inconsistent and contradictory. Respondents were asked whether they thought educational provision for labourers' children was important, and this was followed with a question as to whether they thought that the possession of education made an individual a better farm worker, and whether it would influence employment and pay. One farmer speculated that "too much" education was of suspect value, as "big ideas" would lead to capricious behaviour, and threaten his future labour supply. He nevertheless shared a common belief that as schooling promotes the wellbeing of children, learning is to be encouraged. Yet, without exception, farmers and farm managers discounted education as an important variable in the critical area of granting employment, determining appropriate skills and working out wages. In this respect, there is little distinction between larger, fairly bureaucratized company estates and smaller family farms.

Recruiting practices are highly localized and particularistic, and concentrate heavily upon the **personal** character of labourers. What emerges is a firmly grounded belief in farming as **practical** work, in which, for self-evident reasons, education is regarded with scepticism and even scorn. What carries force is the homespun philosophy that agricultural work is something that cannot be learned from books. A premium is placed upon "character" and "quality", made up of a whole cluster of attributes, such as honesty, reliability, temperance, experience, ability, willingness to learn and stable and "respectable" family background. Agriculture, as Newby has so well illustrated, is an enterprise in which the personal nexus between employer and employee looms so large that farmers set quite extraordinary weight by their judgement of the "character" of prospective workers.[24] Education represents formal, rationalistic criteria which can undermine **personally** sanctioned work relationships:

> Of course it's useful now and then to hire a man who has a Standard 5 or Standard 6 level, as he is more likely to understand a complicated order about checking machinery in the cellar, especially from my wife, who doesn't speak good Afrikaans. But the main thing for us is, is he honest, sober, and respectable? Does he come from a good local home? For us, the most important consideration is whether a man is of good character and not afraid of hard work. I also like him to come from a clean home and a good family, so we only hire locally as the foreman knows all the people around here. Paper qualifications are no good. We want people who have practical abilities. Look, if I have the choice of some boy who has been to school but who comes from a family I don't know, and a local youngster who is willing to work hard and has some experience, it is common sense to hire the person you can judge. It's all very well to have gone to school, but that doesn't mean you'll make a reliable tractor driver.[25]

One Stellenbosch farm manager pointed out candidly that he would never hire labourers who had been in contact with "books", as he did not want men who would be out for money and who would not have the "welfare" of the farm at heart. As this wine estate was offering a miserable cash wage of R4 per day it hardly seemed the place for ambitious workers to make a killing.

Farmers and schooling development

Respondents were asked a general question about whether they would like to see any changes in schooling in rural areas, followed by a specific probe for their views on the merits of a more locally relevant rural curriculum. These queries prompted an expressive set of responses. On the whole, few farmers were willing to give the matter very much thought. Several seemed proud of the fact that teaching staff would sometimes approach them over school affairs, interpreting this as evidence of good communication and harmonious relations; everyone connected with their farms, one was told, worked together as a "family" or as a "community", those overworked organic metaphors of patriarchal paternalism which farmers seem to use with such fascinating regularity.

While the majority of landowners are clearly indifferent to the multiple hardships and deprivations confronted by rural schoolchildren and teachers - although some are disposed to murmur sympathy - a minority suggested improvements in the running of farm schools. One bluff Vredendal farmer proposed that farmers be given the right to hire and fire headmasters, to ensure the appointment of the "right man", thereby guaranteeing compatibility between the interests of the school and the needs of the farm. "Give and take", as he put it, was essential, especially at peak harvest periods when children were needed to swell the labour supply.[26] On these terms, who does most of the taking can be readily imagined.

A more disinterested suggestion came from a Paarl farmer who pointed to lack of mobility as one of the major built-in disadvantages which impede children in rural areas from obtaining higher levels of schooling and qualifications. He condemned a situation in which children of white farm personnel have access to a full range of state educational support services, such as good transport and ready boarding facilities, while Coloured children are at the mercy of inclement weather, erratic transport and poor quality schools. Increased state spending was favoured. This farmer sugested that the state ought to strengthen transport services to secondary schools in rural towns, and that the standards of schools themselves be upgraded.

This respondent was not opposed to children from his farm obtaining the kind of educational qualifications which can aid labour mobility. Over the last decade, one

youth had secured a job as a blockman in a supermarket butchery, while a girl had entered nursing, although it was not known whether she had eventually qualified. These slight examples of farm children making the urban occupational grade were a source of considerable paternalistic pride.[27] Little wonder, then, that access to secondary education is not necessarily always seen by farmers as a significant threat to the reproduction of their wage labour supply. For most rural school-leavers, the hard choice is the staple of recruitment on the land or unemployment. There is relatively little evidence of the agricultural situation being seriously threatened by urban and industrial inroads upon labour. Here and there, of course, there are small, visible changes: A brickfield here or a food processing plant there may disturb settled patterns. But their presence as competitors for rural labour fails to raise farmers' eyebrows or their wage levels. Despite slow, molecular penetration of rural areas by non-agricultural labour markets, and despite reluctance on the part of many rural school-leavers to accept the oppressive conditions of farm work, outward mobility of labour remains extremely restricted. Whether, say, over the past ten years white agriculture's preponderant share of rural primary school-leavers has markedly declined is a question well worth investigating. And, equally if not more to the point, how drastically might the supply of poorly educated farm labour outstrip decreasing demand, due to the long-term curve of mechanised agribusiness?[28] While this is a question best left to statisticians and demographers, it is clear that market prospects for future generations of children born into shrinking, stagnant and depressed rural communities look ominously bad. Unless the body walls of rural schooling undergo major surgery, these children will grow up educationally disenfranchised. The implications for survival are appalling.

In view of farmers' mistrust of formal schooling as a useful asset for farm employment, it is not surprising to find little real interest in the potential merit of vocational and technical training in agriculture or in rural studies in the school curriculum. This disdainful attitude is not peculiar to South African producers. Newby has shown that in Britain, recent attempts to introduce formal worker education in agriculture under an Agricultural Training Board have been greeted by most farmers, "with thinly veiled contempt".[29]

No interest in formal rural education or training for adult workers was expressed. Farmers tended again to stress the virtues of acquiring skills through application and sheer hard work, the proverbial muck on one's boots. It is possible that increasingly specialized job processes and the increasing complexity of the farming industry generally may make formal agricultural skills training more relevant in the future, but again, the experience of postwar British agriculture suggests that this is by no means assured.

On the question of the hypothetical value of a locally relevant curriculum for schoolchildren, one farmer and one farm manager departed from the predominant tone of uninterest. The young head of a Paarl family proprietorship deplored the inadequacies of a school curriculum wholly remote from pupils' experience. Pointing out that white schools offer agricultural science options at junior levels in rural areas, he advocated the adoption of a rural studies syllabus in all farm schools. Practical rural biology, botany and environmental studies were proposed as suitable subjects. A farm studies syllabus identical to that available to white schoolchildren at primary and secondary levels was not recommended, on the grounds that the needs

of black children would be best served by a more elementary and narrower band of studies.

Emphasising that as most of the farm workers' children on his land would remain in the district after they had left school, he felt that early exposure to knowledge about horticulture and plant and animal nutrition would make farm jobs more interesting and rewarding.[30] While such employer interest in the educational welfare of workers' children was conscientious, one cannot help thinking that present and future generations of farm workers would find more job satisfaction in an equitable share of the income and wealth derived from their sweat.

A manager of one very large Paarl holding (which adopts a paternalist role in worker welfare as a conscious and coherent policy of labour management) had equally strong ideas about the deficiencies of farm schooling. Arguing that it was in the long term interests of capitalist agriculture to construct and nourish dignified "communities" rather than "labour camps", this respondent criticized the inadequacy of state educational provision and the attitudes of many obtuse farmers which stifled educational chances for labourers' children. Although he favoured the injection of a rural studies element into the core primary and secondary school curriculum, this kind of innovation required cautious handling. Regardless of the usefulness of farm-based studies, it was argued that if this were to come to dominate the curriculum, education would become unbalanced; the ideals of a liberal schooling would be jeopardised. For one function of farm schools should be that of providing able pupils with qualifications which offer opportunities for social, occupational and geographical mobility.

What this manager advocated with some energy was the introduction of educational support services into white farming areas: Non-formal literacy programmes for adults and compensatory education to provide special learning resources for underprivileged children whose cognitive capacities were critically impaired. With overcrowded, insanitary, and incest-prone labouring households producing children with genetic and neurological abnormalities, it was suggested that adaptation classes and remedial teaching ought to form an essential part of the educational environment on farms. If implemented as state education policy, such transfusions would go some considerable way towards remedying farm childrens' lack of educational achievement.

In the case of this estate, interest in establishing remedial teaching for farm children was being actively pursued in the 1980s through lobbying of school circuit inspectors and personal representations to officials of the Departments of Education and Culture, and Education and Training. The official response has been discouraging.[31]

Farm education and the "culture of poverty"

The belief that education is the key to a better life is very old. Do beliefs in schooling and opportunities carry much popular force among the poor on white farms? Although this question is clearly in need of more informed and systematic research than this exploratory investigation, a general impression is that labouring families accord low priority to schooling. Comparative evidence worldwide reveals that manual workers are unsympathetic to their children staying at school beyond the statutory leaving age. This is a crucial issue which should be central to any discussion of educational strategy in white farming areas. How do we account for this out-

look in the family-school relation? Why is there so much parental indifference, apathy and occasionally, aversion towards schooling? Why is the adult population so socially estranged from the world of the school? Unlike many urban schools, why do almost all farm schools lack a sustaining network of active sympathies and attachments?

Lack of adult enthusiasm for schooling is mostly viewed through the prism of liberal cultural deprivation theory. Inspired by incontrovertible statistical correlations between low-income households and low educational motivation and achievement, there is a huge literature on the problems of cultural deprivation and the "culture of poverty" thesis fashioned by such 1960s American critics as Daniel Moynihan and Oscar Lewis. A "culture of poverty" argument has a number of different meanings and consequences, not all of them very useful to an understanding of why working class children have such a hesitant foothold upon the educational and cultural escalator.

The range of hypotheses about the effects of virtually all aspects of the lifestyles of unskilled, low-income and low-status families on childrens' cognitive development and responses is complex and need not detain us here. For present discussion, we need only refer to the most commonsense understanding of the effects of cultural deprivation. As Michael Flude and John Ahier have put it, the following are the distinguishing features of educational disadvantage in culturally deprived children: Linguistic inadequacies; a tightly restricted attention span; visual and perceptual deficiencies; a concrete rather than idea and concept focused mode of expression; a stress on immediate rather than deferred gratification; a low self-image; mean aspirations and low motivation to academic goals.[32]

Explanations of educational failure and underachievement provided by theories of cultural deprivation share a close affinity with the "culture of poverty" thesis. Both concepts seek to establish a causal relationship between parental attitudes and conduct, the values that underpin this and the consequent behaviour and attitudes of children. It is argued that poverty generates its own distinctive and mostly autonomous subculture amongst the poor, and that the dominant fatalistic, passive and low-motivational values of this culture help to perpetuate those conditions that bind successive generations to an impoverished existence. Educational disadvantage is thus reproduced generationally. Households in poverty are run by unskilled adults who are ill-equipped to provide a stimulating environment for learning. Through lack of material resources which affect the conditions in which children learn, and lack of education, impoverished parents are incapable of enriching the lives and minds of children and of encouraging them to remain at school and to do well. There are thus critical deficiencies, at both home and community level, in the lifestyles, values, and personality structures of disadvantaged groups.

Granted the centrality of culture in socialization and education, the lack of harmony between the cultural resources of the family and the cultural resources of the school are viewed as major obstacles to working class educational progress and achievement. Poor children who enter a period of institutionalized learning do so not only underfed and ill-clothed, but lacking what Pierre Bourdieu has called the correct "cultural capital". In recent years, both Marxist and non-Marxist French sociologists have made much use of the concept of "reproduction" when describing the social function of education, and Bourdieu, Passeron and Boudon in particular have examined what they term the unequal class distribution of cultural capital.[33]

Cultural endowments (language, status, values, norms, customs), which children absorb from family background determine how far and how fully they can respond to the literary culture of the school.

Boiled down to its basics, Bourdieu's thesis has two main elements. Firstly, capital is not only economic but also social and cultural in form. Secondly, the "aristocratic" cultural capital shared by the dominant class provides the symbols through which the controlling group's values, its master pattern or "habitus" comes to be legitimated as the natural order of things. In Bourdieu's hands, the notion of "habitus" has a wide meaning, in the sense that each class, and groups within social classes, will develop its own distinctive and organic "habitus" or master pattern. Each will develop a life perspective into which children will be socialized, and through which they will make sense of their world and at the same time consolidate, interpret, and change parts of their "habitus". Bourdieu has argued that early in life, working class children "interiorize their fate" and come to see education as having little relevance to their life chances. "Their behaviour", he writes, "is based on an empirical evaluation of the real hopes common to all individuals in the social group". Education is not seen as carrying with it the freight of emancipation, as "the structure of the objective chances of social mobility, and more precisely, of the chances of social mobility by means of education, conditions attitudes to school".[34]

How might these conceptual propositions help us to understand the representation of farm schooling in local consciousness? A most important suggestion is that the real question is not that there is an association between working class parental attitudes and failure in schooling, but why these attitudes persist. Instead of concentrating upon culture of poverty formulations such as stimulus deprivation and cultural "disability", the key point is the material context of negative parental attitudes.

At the level of concrete, immediate and familiar social experience, investment in farm schooling is not a self-evident paying proposition for poor households. Is it surprising that after bringing up children under conditions of enormous hardship and privation, farm workers should wish to get those children into employment as early as possible? Even if there were a wide range of occupational choice in rural areas, skilled occupations simply do not fill the pressing conditions of household need. An apprenticeship or some comparable period of training for a skilled occupation entails not only the loss of childrens' earning power but levels of parental economic support beyond the means of families. The same acute constraints apply should the option arise of placing children on the slippery slopes of secondary schooling. A clear consequence would be the erosion of the living standards of households dependent upon the sale of as much labour as possible.

Furthermore, it might be argued that the general irrelevance of what schools teach for the low-paid, unskilled and semi-skilled work that most farm school-leavers will end up doing, reinforces beliefs that formal education offers very little. None of this is to say that there are **no** beliefs in the potential of education to liberate children from the incubus of rural deprivation. The issue here is that it is either dimly perceived as such, or else the view of occupational possibilities for children is wholly at variance with objective realities. Echoing Kooy's findings in the 1970s, one can again encounter farm workers who express aspirations that with adequate schooling, their offspring might become nurses, clerks, or artisans.[35] But the relation between the contours of class inequality and personal hope is problematic. As far as

realistic work situations are concerned, mobility aspirations lie far beyond the pale of informed experience. The controls of the rural labour market dictate what is ultimately feasible and possible.

Wage-earning rural society has a thick blanket of **customary** community definitions and expectations. It constitutes the social experience and common lore of dominated communities, defining the boundaries of what is possible, and cramping the growth of alternative horizons and expectations. This social landscape of habits and customs runs across as well as within generations: To use a characteristically striking phrase by Edward Thompson, "each generation stands in apprentice relation to its seniors".[36] Although social life and experience is changing in a myriad of ways, and although there is slowly increasing mobility, the pull of the known, the immediate, and the inherited, is immensely powerful. Long-proletarianized rural dwellers are still far from that point at which it is commonly assumed that the horizons of successive generations will be different. Formal education - particularly post-primary - has not yet lodged itself into this generational transmission of the social experience or common wisdom of community life. It is not the common currency of emancipation from subordination and poverty.

As rural working class access to secondary schooling is negligible, it is not formative in social experience. Indeed, there is wariness even among those few households which have managed to place children in secondary schools, and have taken on the burden of their maintenance. There is uncertainty about prospects of completion, consciousness of the loss of a potential contributor to family income, and a growing scepticism about the market value of secondary school certification. The inability of numbers of older rural school-leavers (including some with Senior Certificates) to secure skilled employment is undoubtedly proving a painful experience for the tiny minority who have taken on the risk of educational investment. Firstly, the trickle of farm school children who obtain a Matriculation Certificate find themselves too well qualified for the local job opportunity structure. And the practical possibilities of outward mobility to urban centres are limited.[37] Moreover, job opportunities for matriculants generally are continuing to contract.[38] Secondly, the bulk of farm school pupils drop out at the lower, pre-Junior Certificate levels. The market value of these lower grades of formal schooling, compared with no education at all, is increasingly marginal.

Perceptions of farm schools

At this point we need to consider more closely the schooling which mediates between the labour markets of the dominant society and the discrete everyday experiences of teachers, pupils and parents. Here, one factor is immediately apparent. Farm schools clearly find it difficult to displace the subordination, deference and mystifications of living and working conditions on farms. They lie at the lower depths of consciousness and concern. Often isolated from even small rural centres of population, their existence is only occasionally acknowledged. For urban dwellers, they remain objects in the landscape, fleetingly glimpsed from a nearby road or railway line. With most of them ill-equipped to offer much more than the bare architecture of a basic formal education, these schools form the lowliest and most historically neglected link in the chain of apartheid education. Inferiority and low status are themes which continue to define social recognition of farm schools today.

If apartheid education can be seen as a system of social domination and cultural resistance, of battles of the confined and segregated against the ordering of their lives, these institutions appear to have no visible role in this drama. Instead, they endure passively, as downtrodden rural educational dormitories. Staff and some older pupils may resent the crippling lack of resources and opportunities, but bitterness does not flare up into open struggle. In the 1976 student rebellion, there were no radicalizing Thomas Mofolo Secondary Schools in Namaqualand. Farm schools' isolation and dependent situation ensures that they are generally bypassed by the main arteries of democratic political and educational communication.

In the social encounters of everyday life in small localities, farm school children are often caricatured through derogatory stereotypes of rural idiocy and the subnormal intelligence of farm workers. In the eyes of suburb and town, rural youth traditionally comprises the dense children of the poor, the inarticulate and the culturally "backward". Us and Them is sharply defined. Urban and rural community structures produce wide differences in social standing and social perception which take their meaning from relationships of superiority and inferiority. Such attitudes reside in the polarity of urban culture and class imagery against stereotyped images of rural social inferiority. They continue to infect many strands of thinking and action.

In general discussion of the position of schools, teachers seemed acutely aware of urban opinion which mostly devalues and denigrates farm education. Staff were asked, "What sort of view do you think townspeople in general have of farm schools and their pupils?". What emerged was enormous resentment at the attributional status of educational and social backwardness which defines their position. Headmasters were almost unanimously agreed that their schools find it difficult to shake off the derogatory customary meaning which the Afrikaans term *plaasskool* has acquired. The position is clearly aggravated by the fact that there are town-based commuting farm teachers who are themselves culpable of holding indefensibly prejudiced assumptions. Children are quite often viewed with open disdain as uniquely slow, stupid and wilful, and the connection between their "low" habits and their low origins is forcefully impressed upon them. "These people live in absolutely degraded and immoral conditions. You really can't expect their children to be anything but lazy imbeciles off the farm", was the long-suffering view of one teacher. One need not endorse all of Nell Keddie's polemic against the teaching profession's practices to accept the validity of her critique of the deficiency of teachers' "mainstream culture" in categorising pupils in this way.[39]

Rural teachers, including many who commute, are clearly acutely aware of their own status situation as well as that of their children. Teachers' social position can certainly be ambiguous. On farms, they can sometimes enjoy some standing in the eyes of labouring families, as well as the patronage of paternalist farmers who choose to associate themselves with educational activity. However, in an urban setting, rural teachers may find their professional position to be rather shaky. They may well find themselves at the mercy of a cluster of cliches about inferior job choices, avoiding or failing the challenges of a **real** school, and about having to deal with the bovine intelligence of farm children.

The category *plaasskool kinders* embodies alarmingly dominant assumptions about the inferior calibre of farm workers' children. Central to any appreciation of the tissue of subjective experience of a primary farm school pupil in a town secondary school is the fact that the stigma or *brandmerk* of farm education and farm

living comes to be deeply embedded in the fabric of daily life. The corrosive taint of rural "degeneration" and pauperism defines and cages children at the bottom of the schooling hierarchy. One bitter Piketberg primary school teacher summed up the situation:

> Look, if you're a *plaasskool* pupil, life can be very difficult. There is a genuine stigma attached to coming from a farm school, believe me. Some of our kids who've made it to town secondary schools don't have an easy time there. There are ignorant pupils in those schools who look down on farm children. They think they are stupid, growing up and living on a farm. Even some of the teachers have a negative attitude. They make the kids feel inferior, treating them like slum children who can't be expected to do well at school. Would you like to be called *penkop* (pencil-head) and *plaasjapie* (farm yokel) in the classroom?[40]

The experience of these wounding images, the subjective feel of condescension, of being caricatured and marginalized as a dunce living out in the sticks, cannot but be numbing. They must go towards shaping childrens' sense of their personal worth, limiting already meagre expectations and possibilities. We can have but the faintest glimmer of insight into how impoverished rural schoolchildren live out their lives in relation to their urban cohorts and to the adolescent and adult world of the secondary school. How do they cope with the injuries of inferiority? Is a *plaasskool* pedigree simply a fate to be endured? What do pupils feel about farm living, and the leisure and work patterns of youth in towns? And, most crucially, how do farm children experience the relationship between class and age? As the progeny of poor and unskilled households, they experience the bonds and deprivations of a class society simultaneously with those of age; it is the articulations of class which determine how youth learns its existence in the home, the school, and the workplace. For class, as Bill Williamson has so brilliantly illuminated, "is a system of domination, injury, constraint, and social recogintion which shapes experience, and it is confronted first in childhood".[41] Insofar as farm pupils' subjective feelings register a sense of their physical and mental infirmities as the "rough" and the "unwashed", their lived experience will reflect what Richard Sennett and Jonathan Cobb have so perceptively called "the hidden injuries of class".[42]

Glib urban perceptions of the encapsulated rural working class as slow defectives "down on the farm", slumbering on in ignorance, continue to have compelling force. Although sometimes tempered by well-meaning liberal concern for material and cultural deprivation, these meanings and values have penetrated into the bone and marrow of urban-industrial culture. Their infection cannot easily be expunged, for they are built upon an accumulation of situations, attitudes and social contacts.

It should hardly need to be said that different relations, languages and practices should be constituted. The initial cautious stirring of the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) farm unionisation has begun to point towards the possibilities of new solidarities and understandings, new forms of fraternal organisation and new points of contact between the needs and struggles of rural workers and urban labour and other social movements. The need to counter the stigma of *plaasskool* learning is something to which energies should also obviously be turned. What has to be grasped and confronted is not rural "idiocy" or uneducability but a process of exploitation, suffering, ignorance and illiteracy. And here teachers surely have a role to play, not least "by institutionalised practice to interiorise in people's minds the custom and morality of liberation.[43]

Part of any liberation should be clarification of, and action upon, educational problems and relations between the country and the city. There is no question that urban teachers and their farm school colleagues will have to find ways of engaging each others' interests and loyalties so as to bind together elemental issues of educational transformation. Unless there is mobilisation around the interests of farm schools they seem destined to remain on the margins of the educational order. It must be added, however, that this is not to suggest that the problem of farm school status is simply a matter of changing urban attitudes. There **is** a reservoir of prejudice to be breached but any transformation of beliefs involves working for the transformation of the material conditions of the social order.

Problems of provision

It is useful at this juncture to shift our focus from issues of human experience and subjectivity to examine in some detail those tight structural determinants of the day to day workings of schools as, to quote Henry Giroux, "instructional sites".[44] Since the depressing findings of farm schooling studies in the 1970s,[45] little substantive alteration has taken place in the general structure of provision, organisation, administration, uniformity of standards and funding. Despite the apparent new distributional realities of current schooling expansion, in which "urban black education is degenerating even as education in the rural areas is accelerating",[46] farm schools continue to be short-changed. While an increase of over 1 000 African farm schools in the last decade may look impressive, facilities remain wholly inadequate and difficulties of access, attendance and opportunity remain immense.

In order to reveal something of the localism, variability and also uniformity of farm school settings, some selected details of eight sample schools in the Cape Province are provided. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest ten.

Table: Some School Statistics

Place	Enrolment	Highest Standard	Staff	Classrooms	Minimum & Maximum Journey Length to School (kms)
Nelspoort	370	6	14	4	10 - 60
Letjiesbos	55	4	3	2	3 - 40
Klapmuts	435	5	15	15	4 - 7
Kareebos	10	2	1	1	1 - 2
Seekoeigat	130	4	5	2	50 - 100 (hostel accom)
Pniel	495	5	16	14	5 - 8
Agter-Paarl	120	4	5	5	5 - 12
Koelenhof	360	5	14	13	7 - 10

Part of any liberation should be clarification of, and action upon, educational problems and relations between the country and the city. There is no question that urban teachers and their farm school colleagues will have to find ways of engaging each others' interests and loyalties so as to bind together elemental issues of educational transformation. Unless there is mobilisation around the interests of farm schools they seem destined to remain on the margins of the educational order. It must be added, however, that this is not to suggest that the problem of farm school status is simply a matter of changing urban attitudes. There **is** a reservoir of prejudice to be breached but any transformation of beliefs involves working for the transformation of the material conditions of the social order.

Problems of provision

It is useful at this juncture to shift our focus from issues of human experience and subjectivity to examine in some detail those tight structural determinants of the day to day workings of schools as, to quote Henry Giroux, "instructional sites".[44] Since the depressing findings of farm schooling studies in the 1970s,[45] little substantive alteration has taken place in the general structure of provision, organisation, administration, uniformity of standards and funding. Despite the apparent new distributional realities of current schooling expansion, in which "urban black education is degenerating even as education in the rural areas is accelerating",[46] farm schools continue to be short-changed. While an increase of over 1 000 African farm schools in the last decade may look impressive, facilities remain wholly inadequate and difficulties of access, attendance and opportunity remain immense.

In order to reveal something of the localism, variability and also uniformity of farm school settings, some selected details of eight sample schools in the Cape Province are provided. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest ten.

Table: Some School Statistics

Place	Enrolment	Highest Standard	Staff	Classrooms	Minimum & Maximum Journey Length to School (kms)
Nelspoort	370	6	14	4	10 - 60
Letjiesbos	55	4	3	2	3 - 40
Klapmuts	435	5	15	15	4 - 7
Kareebos	10	2	1	1	1 - 2
Seekoeigat	130	4	5	2	50 - 100 (hostel accom)
Pniel	495	5	16	14	5 - 8
Agter-Paarl	120	4	5	5	5 - 12
Koelenhof	360	5	14	13	7 - 10

	Mode of Transport
Nelspoort	Walk. Use of Mule Carts over longest distances.
Letjiesbos	Walk. Unsubsidised rail travel from furthest point.
Klapmuts	Walk
Kareebos	Walk
Seekoeigat	School hires truck to transport pupils home every third weekend during term.
Pniel	Walk
Agter-Paarl	Walk
Koelenhof	Walk. Some farmers provide irregular transport in trucks carrying convict labour to and from prison near school.

Place	Percentage dropout rate between Sub A and highest standard	Percentage of pupils who commenced and completed highest standard 1982
Nelspoort	60	90
Letjiesbos	15	90
Klapmuts	85	90
Kareebos	0	50
Seekoeigat	20	50
Pniel	90	60
Agter-Paarl	30	80
Koelenhof	80	60

These figures do not tell the full story. Particularly notable is the fact that the dropout rate tends to be concentrated at the highest standard; as children reach an age when they might find work, the costs of schooling become too great. So at some point between roughly the ages of twelve and fourteen, for many farm labourers' children childhood comes to an end.

Farm schools all teach an orthodox curriculum, with a subject range of Afrikaans, English, Mathematics, General Science, History, Geography, Health Education, Environmental Studies, Handwork/Needlework, Music, Art and Religious Education. Size and staffing are key determinants of the content of curricula, although not necessarily of pedagogic effectiveness. While greatly disadvantaged in terms of facilities, the smallest schools have very favourable pupil-teacher ratios, and sometimes highly-motivated and dedicated staff. The largest schools teach a full spectrum of some twelve subjects, while one or two-teacher extablishments have a truncated curriculum, generally comprising Afrikaans, English, General Science, Health Education, History and/or Geography.

All schools suffer from extraordinary pressure on buildings: double shifts are common, and 37 of the 40 sample schools had different standards (sometimes several) sharing classrooms at the same time. Teachers have good reason to view the classroom as an assault course. Despite some modernization and the building of extensions, the quality of stock continues to lag behind what is needed. There are, for

instance, still plenty of schools without toilets or piped water. And there is also the continuing problem of old and dilapidated accommodation; leaks, draughts, cold cement floors and a total absence of heating makes life in classrooms in winter an unpleasantly bracing experience. Staffroom facilities are a rarity, and none of the schools on farm property possessed a telephone. This lack of a communication line is more than just an inconvenience; it is a symbol of the encapsulated structure of school life within the "greedy institution". The absence of telephones was a running grievance with teachers, particularly as installation was in all cases a simple matter of running off a farm branch line. Lack of co-operation on the part of landowners had produced friction between staff and farmers. At one small two-roomed school, the headmaster spoke of an unsuccessful, nineteen-year long battle for a telephone, against the obduracy of two local farmers who regarded the request with "genuine suspicion". They allow the school to be here on their land, but they want to keep an eye on us. That's what it is. One of them has always asked me why I don't think he's good enough to make "phone calls for us or bring messages. God, it's like a big personal issue for him".[47] Such episodes serve to remind us that the essence of farm paternalism is not benevolence as much as it is control, guidance and superintendance.

A key element in any calculation of the quality of classroom resources is unevenness in levels of provision from school to school although staff at all schools considered classroom resources to be seriously inadequate. Here it should be borne in mind that within a context of overall scarcity, schools varied considerably in the importance attached by teachers to particular items. One individual's wooden floor is another's tape recorder. One of the most urgent issues was electricity and heating. Possibly the most bizarre example of non-electrification was a Beaufort West school, privately endowed in 1981 with an overhead projector, television set and video recorder, all of which were still lying unused several years later.

All schools had the staples of blackboards, desks, tables, chairs, cupboards, stationery, occasional wall charts and a small stock of basic reading material. Head teachers fumed over extended delays in receiving school supplies of or the non-arrival of promised apparatus. Localised inequalities of provision are again striking. While one school may be short of chairs, another fifty kilometres away may boast a sportsfield. Every school reported an annual visit by Departmental Regional Inspectors who habitually promise all manner of service provision which rarely materializes.

There is also great dissatisfaction everywhere with levels of library provision. Schools are mostly meagrely equipped with textbooks and a sprinkling of basic reading matter, and what limited stock there is is under great pressure. Teachers all pointed to the need for a greater and more varied stock of reading matter, and for the construction of separate library space to compensate for childrens' reading and study difficulties in noisy, overcrowded and poorly-lit and poorly-serviced labourers' dwellings.

Thirty of the schools investigated had some formalized method of raising independent funds, although community poverty makes it impossible to generate much more than an intermittent trickle of cash to finance minor school services. Farmers are mostly tight-fisted. Only 6 schools reported farmers' contributions to funds of sums ranging from R50 to R100 per year. We are again forcefully reminded of the defining elements of paternalism. While landowners may support the erection of a

school, they are nevertheless unhappy about allowing it discretion and autonomy in deciding its own spending objectives. A good and caring farmer is one who takes the duties of elite guidance and advice seriously. As one peevish individual put it, he never contributed to school appeals as he was "never ever asked for advice on how to spend this money" and "the problem is that the teachers waste the funds on frivolous things in the school".[48]

Frivolity may include the feeding of weak and undernourished children. It is teachers who live on the most inescapably intimate terms with the needs and miseries of farm children. Most schools had some formal or casual workplace whip-round, to which staff would contribute on a weekly or monthly basis. At several schools, blankets and clothing in winter accompanied cash. Larger establishments sometimes have the human resources - if seldom the proper venues - to hold small fund-raising concerts and produce sales. In all bar a tiny handful of instances, where funds were being accumulated to assist in the purchase of sports items or to help fund a local excursion for senior pupils, collections all had some direct welfare objective.

Twenty-five of the schools maintained some kind of rudimentary pupil feeding service. Soup, bread and fruit were supplied once or twice per week. Running a daily ration was beyond the means of schools except those few able to draw on the resources of established, urban-bases pupil feeding schemes. Teachers levied a nominal charge on pupils, generally 5c, 10c or 20c per week, although one headmaster requested a steep R2 per month. Neither teachers' donations nor pupil levies are extensive or reliable enough an income source to permit more than the provision of a bare minimum. Yet it is not surprising to find that school feeding schemes are hugely popular. Schools which normally experienced a dramatic drop in winter attendance, down to 50% or 60% on the coldest and wettest days, reported that the inducement of soup far outweighed the costs of getting drenched. The record books of three schools revealed 100% attendance on the one or two days each week when food was provided, through the worst weather of June, July and August.

Recreational activities are drastically curtailed by severe shortages of equipment and suitable locations. Making the best of hard, sandy terrain, some schools held some limited sporting activity: Netball, rugby, football and occasionally, athletics. Several schools were denied land-use for weekend sports, and were obliged to use church sites. Larger and better-organized schools held quarterly or annual concerts, and occasional music and games evenings. Only two schools were able to scrape together the funds needed for a bi-annual outing for pupils. Teachers constantly underlined the desperate need for transport and for the construction of school or farm halls as a social and community recreational facility. Because of transport difficulties, inter-school contact is exceptionally perfunctory, further deepening the spatial isolation experienced by pupils.

Staffing and extra-school relations

A glance at school staffing revealed a fairly mixed state of affairs. If account is taken of the generally dismal picture of the inferior qualifications of black teachers, then farm schools do not appear to be markedly worse off than those in urban settings. Sample schools were all staffed by men and women who possessed some level of teaching certification; at several of them teachers were upgrading their qualifica-

tions. Staff turnover fluctuated from school to school, under the influence of general trends and particularistic factors. Twenty-seven headmasters reported regular staff losses as a result of urban migration or transfer. In the most isolated postings in areas like Namaqualand, it is not uncommon for new staff to leave after a stint of as little as six months. The rude shock of the solitude and conformity of farm life is often sufficient to ensure that young urban recruits do not linger for very long. The many known disadvantages of teaching and living in rural areas also make it difficult for schools to retain staff and stabilize their teaching force. One important factor which emerged from this investigation was the uncertainty and unattractiveness of the housing environment in country districts. Twenty-four schools cited accommodation difficulties as a major contributory factor in staff losses. But in complete contrast, twelve of the schools were experiencing little disruption. Mostly small, tightly-knit and run by a core of energetic and dedicated teachers, their staffing appeared stable, with minimal losses over recent years.

Communication between teachers and parents is generally poorly developed. Two of the schools operated a system of *huisbesoek* (house visiting) by teachers and held regular quarterly parent-teacher meetings. For the remainder, there were annual get-togethers at the end of the school year and some sporadic contact. Predictably, meetings were widely held to be of limited value to either party. Widespread adult illiteracy, class divisions, and the absence of a common educational experience in the countryside make bridging the gap difficult. Teachers rightly saw poor contact with parents as a vital educational issue. Yet, not unexpectedly, they were prone to stress the usual litany of cultural and character deficiencies: negligent families with low "values" and "motivations".

Three of the schools on non-farmland had no official contact with farmers, while the headmaster of one larger church school deliberately avoided any personal dealings with several nearby producers, who were all unsympathetic or openly hostile towards schooling. Whether or not landowners were acting as school managers, there were varying levels of interaction between farmers and teachers in all other cases, ranging from an annual meeting to discuss pupil progress, to farmers' attendance at staff meetings. Anxious to display their paternalist plumage, most farmers interviewed laid claim to frequent contact with neighbouring or directly dependent schools, and to thriving welfare relationships. When measured against teachers' accounts, a strong element of exaggeration was very evident.

Post-primary schooling

What are the routes of entry into higher levels of schooling? For all bar a statistically insignificant number of pupils, educational prospects beyond farm school horizons are bleak. What paths there are lead steeply uphill. For those who complete a full course of instruction and breast Standards 3 ,4, 5 or 6 there are huge problems of cost, mobility and access in maintaining some kind of progression. Economic barriers to pupil entry and the burden of maintenance to impoverished families are fearsomely high. Hostel facilities at country secondary schools are extremely limited and of a rather spartan kind. Unless there is cash for boarding fees, nearby kin, or other connections, adolescents have no realistic hope of continuing through Secondary or Senior Schools which can be very far away from homes. Again there is an important spatial dimension to the feeding of schools. In the Western Cape, for ex-

ample, pupils in Simondium and Klapmuts have at least the opportunity of free if irregular state transport to secondary schooling in nearby Paarl. In more far flung areas, schools are exceptionally far apart, and there is no assisted transport. In Beaufort West, pupils from Nelspoort and Letjiesbos faced an average journey distance of 80 kms to the nearest high school. It is clear that the proportion of farm pupils who achieve any kind of sustained contact with the secondary educational system is negligible.

Teachers' solutions to disadvantage

Interviewees had much to say about what they saw as appropriate compensatory strategies. Firstly, teachers produced a remedial shopping list: Transport, proper sports fields and equipment, recreational halls, audio-visual classroom aids, libraries, truancy officers, social workers, experienced child welfare fieldworkers and bursaries to ease the economic burden of higher levels of schooling. All cited the need for a programme of adult worker education on farms to teach such things as literacy, health and environmental education. This, it was felt, would help to weld closer relations between schools and unskilled and inarticulate parents. Secondly, a number of headmasters favoured the **closing** of all farm schools and the transfer of pupils to conventional State or Church Chools, in order to place schooling outside the dominating influence of agricultural enterprise. A third theme was indignation at the appalling material circumstances of labouring families. Teachers were sharply aware of the patchwork of social conditions on farms in the vicinity of their schools, where there were marginally better levels of housing and wages, where ultra-exploited cheap labour was most concentrated, where the use of child labour was customary, and from which farms levels of pupil attendance were higher than average. They certainly see a better wage and housing deal for farmworkers as one of the primary ways in which to stem pupil "wastage".

Child attendance and labour

Levels of school enrolment appeared to fluctuate greatly from farm to farm. One or two farmers boasted that all children under the age of 14 on their properties were in primary school but such inflated assessments were wholly implausible. Compulsory schooling has no force in the countryside. The universal trend is one of partial attendance. On some farms, two-thirds or more were being schooled, at least up to the age of 12-14, while on others, rates of attendance are much lower and irregular. On all farms there were proportions of the child and young adolescent population of school-going age which never entered a classroom. Even on the most smoothly-run large capitalist estate, with well-equipped separate primary schools for African and Coloured children, an estate manager reflected that given the deprivations under which farmworkers lived, there was no reasonable short-term hope of getting all their sons and daughters into its schools. There were also cases of extreme adversity. On two farms, parents could not enrol children in school of their own accord. In effect, they were illegally bound; employers lay down work stipulations which prohibited full-time attendance. At another, a farmer prevented children from neighbouring farms from entering his property to attend a school which had accepted them. At a fourth only a small minority of children were freed from primary schooling because, as a respondent candidly pointed out, "we pay quite low wages

here and our families can't really afford to spare children from their share of work. They need the money".[49]

How do school-going children fit into structures of service work and production? Given what we already know of the widespread use of child labour on South African farms, it was not surprising to come across only one big company farm with labour relations which expressly prohibited the employment of **all** children under the age of 16. There was little evidence here of employment practices directly undercutting childrens' rights and access to education. In all other cases, farmers acknowledged that farm pupils were often involved in what they were at pains to describe as light or part-time work.

Within the firmly controlled and "closed" social situation on farms, the structural dependence of the farm school means that it is invariably unable to protect children from the predatory presence of employers. This study found that farmers a mere 70km from Cape Town were quite brazenly poaching children from classrooms for daily stints of work in harvest fields. In some cases further afield, teachers were threatened with eviction and schools with closure if any protests were made about the appropriation of child labour in their care. Such patterns are continuing to repeat themselves with only small or more extreme variations. The Natal *Sunday Tribune* has recently provided some harrowing accounts of conditions for tenant families in which schoolchildren were being forced to work as farm labourers or domestic servants for six months without pay in return for parents' "right to remain on the land and perhaps graze some livestock". On certain farms children were routinely beaten and parents were secreting them away to try to prevent their seizure from school and impressment into work. "It's true that she was taken from school... What can you do if the farmer wants your children to work?",[50] exemplifies the anguish and resignation of adults.

The general indications are that even where labour demands are less brutal and greedy, rural pupils are all socialized into farm work at an early age. Gender affects labour rhythms: young girls' weekend and afternoon domestic tasks for farmers' wives can be a year round business, while boys' agricultural work tends to be seasonal. Thirty-seven schools confirmed that it was customary for pupils to undertake paid work after school hours, at weekends and during holidays. These part-time, casual duties are often far from light; in several cases, 10-year old children were doing heavy housework and fetching and carrying crates.

Not all child work rests upon wage imperatives. Teenagers on larger farms could be found bartering part-time labour for educational requirements. The classic mentality of moral accountancy was very visible in the case of those farmers - and their wives - who were lightly involved in childrens' educational welfare at a personal level. Much emphasis was laid upon affective relations between employers' and employees' children in helping to meet childrens' needs. The costs of an inherited educational culture bite deeply, especially in places where pupils are commuting to town or village secondary schools. Where children are judged for neatness of dress as well as for cleanliness, punctuality and classroom performance, it is likely that daily contact with traditional school values will tend to sharpen differentiation between "rough" and "respectable" working families. In formal schooling culture, the distinctions that often really matter are those between clean and dirty hands, bare feet and shoes and socks, and a frayed vest and white shirt. Older farm pupils are not indifferent to these distinctions. One interviewee revealed that pupils worked at

weekends for items of school clothing, reflecting that "it's not as if the teachers oblige them to wear uniforms, but I suppose they like to feel properly dressed for school, like most of the other children. So I do what I can to give them opportunities."[51] Another farmer's wife disclosed that in return for laundry work and household cleaning, she supplied sweaters and blazers to older pupils, emphasising, "I'm a great believer in helping whenever I can, but not in giving something for nothing. I try to teach them the importance of **earning** things they want. It doesn't do to let our workers' kids grow up thinking the world owes them a living, now does it"?[52]

Schooling under authoritarian paternalism

This provides an apt point at which to return to the question of paternalist social practices which formed the opening emphases of this articles. For the approach to uniform provision surely serves as a kind of metaphor for the whole suffocating edifice of discretionary, particularistic patronage, reward and personal incentive, and indebtedness which runs in the grain of social relations on so many farms. Active paternalism is rarely the pure milk of benevolence. Farmers are not charitable organisations and any apparent liberality of provision is tempered by beliefs in the earning of rewards and in the value of "responsible" self-improvement. Whether it is providing some of the capital costs of establishing a school, erecting a new ablution block or donating a weekly milk ration, farmers anticipate a dividend. If it is not necessarily better-educated or certified school leavers to feed their labour force, it is a compliant school to keep daytime order among children and to instil the norms of deference, obedience and punctuality from an early age. Or it may just be an enlarging of the moral sovereignty of capital; like the provision of tied housing or the granting of allotments, educational service is a mode of institutionalising paternalism. "Duty" towards schools meshes with rituals of personalised giving and supplicatory receiving. It is not beneath the dignity of the most conscientious and attentive rural patriarch to pray with pupils and teachers at a Friday school religious assembly, filling their consciousness of relations of personal indebtedness.

Any struggle for the transformation of farm schooling must first be a struggle to snap the seemingly inseparable determinative bond between classroom and farmer. For there is little to be gained from children accumulating cultural capital to help break a "poverty culture" unless the circumscribing power of agricultural capital is checked. Brian Levy's conclusion to his 1976 farm schools study remains relevant:

> Whatever the (educational) solution is to be, (for example, the establishment of Government-run schools on Government-owned land in strategic parts of the rural areas) it must clearly involve some diminution in the authority of the farmer, especially with regard to the power he exerts over his workers. Given the nature of the distribution of power in this country ... it will take much effort and will before such a step is taken.[53]

The reality is that existing relations between farmers and the state perpetuate the drastic vulnerability of schools. As Libby Ardington has recently emphasized, "there is **no** system for educating African youth on farms; there is merely a method of government to subsidise education if farmers **choose** to provide facilities".[54] (emphasis added) However much prodding there may be from clergymen, agricultural bodies or state officials, it is the farmer who decides whether or not to establish a school. Its erection is a voluntary, paternalist initiative and its continued existence and use is not ensured by law. While the state provides generously increasing sub-

sidies for construction and maintenance and for specific items of additional expenditure, while there is a notional regulatory presence in the shape of a school inspectorate, while teachers oversee the daily running of schools, ultimate power over the destiny of any particular school is always in the hands of the landowner. A farmer who opens a school may equally, if he so chooses, close it. Starkly contrasting determinations can be readily identified. On the one hand, education might form part of the planned paternalism of emerging "progressive" producers, whose small corporatist vision involves consultative workers' committees and the incorporation of workers into supervisory positions in an effort to secure the active co-operation of a stable, disciplined and more productive workforce. Their interest in "harmonizing" the interests of capital and labour can be served by joint schemes whose object is to encourage industry, providence and an approved measure of self-reliance. A succinct illustration of this is provided by a Transvaal "progressive" farmer who recorded of his labourers, "they approached me to build a school on my property and I agreed to help. The arrangement was that they had to contribute something towards it and had to make a contribution towards school fees".[55] On the other hand, contrasting responses can be blunt and brutal. In Natal, a 93-pupil school has been closed by a farmer because teachers declined to assist him in tracking down stock thieves.[56] And again in the Transvaal, a thirty-year old school, first funded and constructed by labourers, has been summarily closed by a new landowner who, upon assuming ownership, insisted, "I merely inherited the school when I bought my farm so it's not my problem... I want that school shut down".[57] Farm schools are therefore always vulnerable, insecure and at risk from arbitrary acts.

What is so crucial about farmers' assumptions is not simply the rights and leverages they are able to assert **over** the life of the school, but their mediation **in** the school itself, in conscious and structured involvement. This article has sought to stress the Janus-like qualities of paternalism in the sphere of rural education. Life in proximity to the farmhouse can lead to intolerable levels of interference in schools and to all manner of authoritarian restrictions on access and use-rights. Thus, attempts to use schools as a meeting place for adult literacy evening classes can be typically sabotaged by petty farmers able to deny access to facilities with impunity. The offensiveness of proprietorial prerogatives is vividly revealed by the outrage of one Namaqualand headmaster. Pointing out that one of his three classrooms had been appropriated as storage space by the landowner, he observed: "He gave the land, he helps with repairs to the building, so now he looks upon my school as part of his farm".[58]

In related areas of educational concern it is again the symbiotic relationship between the farmer and those whose livelihood depends on him which makes outside intervention or interference extremely difficult. A currently proposed Education Laws (Education and Training) Amendment Bill which promises that "anyone who removes a child from a farm school during school hours will be guilty of an offence and can be fined up to R150 or jailed for a month"[59] seems unlikely to end agriculture's squalid commitment to widespread and often forced child labour. As long as child labour remains an integral part of the farm economy, as long as ultra-exploitative wages force households to bring children into paid work and the servicing of essential needs, it is difficult to see how compulsory education in the countryside can become really effective. This is not to deny that some combination of promised new protective legislation for agricultural workers apparently "based on

trust and consensus"[60] and a Children's Act with relevant protectionist criteria would have a role to play in ensuring that the interests of farm children are served by their being educated rather than worked. But it remains instructive to note a revealing comparison with British experience: Despite the cumulative impact of the 1867 Agricultural Gangs Act, 1875 Agricultural Children's Act and 1870 Education Act, it was only when changes in the productive process removed children from farm labour that compulsory schooling bit fully in the British countryside.[61]

In South Africa at present one need hardly stress that the individuals who have the **real** power to enforce compulsory schooling in white farming areas are precisely those who continue to benefit from the availability and utility of ultra-cheap child labour.[62]

Conclusion - partial resolution and continuing contradiction

Any question of "improving" farm education thus obviously raises important strategic implications. At one level, ways of incremental material advancement almost suggest themselves: Proper transport provision, mobile libraries with specialist staff to provide an infrastructure of literacy, specialised in-service training to improve selected trainee teachers' preparation for the real world of farm schools, peripatetic teachers and mobile classrooms to break the cultural and psychological isolation and augment the resources of the most remote one or two-teacher schools, pre-schooling facilities, the social provision of school feeding, locally-based secondary schools and an expansion of boarding facilities for farm-based students at small town secondary schools.

But if social development is to be realised it is the fundamentals of local authority, local power and local repression which need to be confronted. In the present period it is the abiding power of localism and the visceral aversion of landowners to anything construed as "interference" in the "freedom" to manage their own fiefs which will bedevil any creation of a coherent structure of independent education provision.

It is evident that the needs and requirements of farm schooling are so embedded in the culture of private agrarian capital, so hobbled by the uneven patchy configurations of rural paternalism, that any reconstruction of the terrain will be no easy task. But it is only with an independence born of greater autonomy, rooted in firm statutory rights, that these schools might at last emerge from their precarious and marginal locations to begin to develop curricular and pedagogic practice to equip pupils with an alternative repertoire of meaning, identities and skill. It is only then that farm schooling will break with its doddering history and begin to meet the kind of hope recently expressed by Jan Theron of the Food and Canning Workers' Union, namely that of "giving labourers' children adequate education to allow them to move off the farms".[63] Only an education which is no longer parasitic upon or imbricated in paternalist relations of social regulation may help to liberate exploited children from the enervating poverty and bullying containment of the classic "greedy institution".

This brings us, by way of conclusion, to the relationship between the state and the recomposition of farm schooling. For it is clear that the present moment of black schools crisis in 1970s-1980s South Africa is also a moment of state-imposed reconstruction and reform. While farm schools have not exactly been seething "sites of struggle", there are nevertheless signs that they are not being left completely behind in the formulation of an educational component of a wider national strategy to

contain popular struggles and restore cohesion to the capitalist economic and social system. For instance, the 1983 *White Paper on the Provision of Education in the Republic of South Africa* singled out farm schooling for special mention; referring to the "development and upgrading of state-aided farm schools", it asserted that, "the Government is of the opinion that farm schools make a very important contribution to the provision of education at present and will have to continue to do so in future. The Government also accepts that the standards at farm schools will have to be raised to acceptable levels in cases where they are not acceptable at present". The *White Paper* promised an investigation into the "provision of more comprehensive and differentiated secondary school facilities for farm school pupils", and a range of new services -remedial teaching, Department of Education and Training (DET) management courses for headmasters, in-service teacher training, subsidy increases for construction and maintenance, "the introduction of a class library scheme" and the enforcement of minimum standards, with "inspectors solely for farm schools to carry out an upgrading programme".[64]

According to the most recent available figures, in 1987 there were 477 260 African pupils enrolled at 5 484 farm schools registered with the Department of Education and Training (DET). This accounted for close to three-quarters of all DET schools and approximately one-third of all its pupils. Subsidy per pupil was R208 during 1986-87 and an average of R18 000 per farm school had been budgeted for 1987-88.[65]

A DET working party under its Director-General, Dr. Dirk Meiring, has also pushed for further conversion, recommending that "the onus should no longer be on the farmer to provide school facilities and accommodation for teachers, these should be the DET's responsibility". Translated into practice, this would mean "investigations into the possibility of purchasing or renting land for the erection of schools, teachers' housing , and so on".

But despite what would appear to be a potentially significant extension of bureaucratic state education regulation, it is deeply conditioned by the need to observe dues of conduct towards farmers and their social routines of employer domination. Any new alignments in the wake of the Meiring inquiry remain "very much in transition" as the aim is "the mutual satisfaction of both farmer and department". Because of the traditionally "harmonious" social norms of the agricultural sector, innovations should be handled "with trust and consensus rather than coercion". And, accordingly, personal activism remains formative: As a DET spokesperson has stressed, "the establishment of farm schools all over South Africa is always at the initiative of the farmer. Once that initiative has been taken it is the department's duty to give effect to it".[66]

In other words, there is a strong sense in which any "reform" of farm schooling will be slow, partial and uneven. Any new rationalizing administrative and technical renovation of the farm system will be accommodative towards the underlying and persistent social logic of its inherited voluntarist and private contractual elements. Education as a philanthropic initiative within an intensely local nexus is to be increasingly funded and directed by the state but its conception is not to be stifled by it. What appears to be emerging is a new trajectory which rests on peculiarly striking elements of displacement and historical continuity. The question for the state is to find the forms within which these peculiar contradictions find space to move.

For if the state acts, in Michael Apple's words to "reallocate resources to the have-nots at a minimal level", thereby assuming a substantially increased share of the "social costs of private capital",[67] a consequence will undoubtedly be, with modifications and qualifications, the establishment of farm schooling as part of the state apparatus of education. From this representation arises a possible new ensemble of relationships involving farm schools and other sectors of education, the texture of interest between the agricultural bloc and the state, schooling and the literacy and other skill needs of capitalist production, and the constantly shifting balance between education and other state apparatuses. None of these interconnections are unproblematical. Their contradictions will pulsate within the state. Future investigation of farm schooling will perhaps need to attend more closely to identifying and exploring these and other contradictions, perhaps within a context offered by Martin Carnoy's and Roger Dale's general methodological indications.[68] In the crisis of farm schooling there still seems a long way to go. Shifting the educational balance so that schools may take their identity from the "public" sphere of mass schooling rather than the "private" sphere of localized capital and property relations will be a protracted and contested process. In essence, the attempt to partially resolve the legitimation crisis in black schooling and the accumulation crisis in the economy through a "more comprehensive" or " differentiated" pupil learning structure applies to a Magaliesberg farm school as much as it does to an urban high school in Soweto. But that reformulation of the education system is inflected in radically different ways. The "instrument" for the achievement of expansionary schooling reform in white agriculture, the farm, is also a site of contradiction and ambiguity, both within its own structures and in relation to external social forces. An inevitable consequence is the insertion of farm schooling into the national programme of black education modernisation in an overwhelmingly secondary and subordinate position. What Stuart Hall has called the "logic" of the system remains in force so long as the fundamental social and economic relationships of a society remain intact.[69]

Acknowledgements

Earlier versions of this article were first presented as papers at the Conference of the second Carnegie Inquiry into Poverty and Development in Southern Africa at the University of Southern Africa at the University of Cape Town in April 1984 and at the Yale-Wesleyan Universities in November 1984. The text has since been updated, but in essential respects its substance remains the same. I am grateful to conference participants and others who offered helpful comments on earlier drafts and, in particular, also to Linda Chisholm for her constructive editorial guidance.

Notes and References

1. *See*, for example, F. Wilson, A. Kooy and D. Hendrie, (eds.), *Farm Labour in South Africa* (Cape Town: Philip, 1977); F. Wilson, "South African Poverty: Major Issues", *Social Dynamics*, 10, 2 (December 1984): 61-9.
2. E. Goffman, *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and other Inmates* (New York: Doubleday, 1961). *See also*, M. Ignatieff, "Total Institutions and Working Classes: A Review Essay", *History Workshop Journal*, 15 (Spring 1983): 167-8.
3. L.A. Coser, *Greedy Institutions: Patterns of Undivided Commitment* (New York: Free Press, 1974).
4. *Ibid.*, 4.
5. *Ibid.*, 6.
6. *Ibid.*, 7-8.
7. H. Newby, *The Deferential Worker: A Case Study of Farm Workers in East Anglia* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977a), 427-9; *Green and Pleasant Land? Social Change in Rural England* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1980), 161-4; Newby, "Paternalism and Capitalism", in R. Scase, (ed.), *Industrial Society: Class, Cleavage and Control* (London: Unwin, 1977b); 66-8; Newby, C. Bell, D. Rose and P. Saunders, *Property, Paternalism and Power: Class and Control in Rural England* (London: Hutchinson, 1978), 28, 170-1. For the historical context of South African farms as "total" or "greedy" institutions, see A. Stadler, *The Political Economy of Modern South Africa* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1987), 55.
8. Newby (1977b), 67-69; Newby, "Urbanization and the Class Structure: Reflections on a Case Study", in F.H. Buttel and H. Newby, (eds.), The Rural Sociology of Advanced Societies: Critical Perspectives (London: Hutchinson, 1980), 257.
9. G.S. Jones, *Outcast London: A Study in the Relationship between Classes in Victorian Society* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976), 251-2.
10. M. Mauss, *The Gift* (London, 1954), 38, 72-3.
11. Newby (1977a), 429-30. See also, his "The Deferential Dialectic", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 17, 2 (1975): 161-2.
12. D. Roberts, *Paternalism in Early Victorian England* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979), 270.
13. P. Joyce, *Work, Society and Politics: The Culture of the Factory in Late Victorian England* (Brighton: Harvester, 1980), especially chapter 4.
14. Newby and others (1978), 349.
15. B. Williamson, *Class, Culture and Community: A Biographical Study of Social Change in Mining* (London: Routledge, 1982), 60-1.
16. E.P. Thompson, "The Grid of Inheritance: A Comment", in J. Goody, J. Thirsk and E. P. Thompson, (eds.), *Family and Inheritance: Rural Society in Western Europe, 1200-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 337.
17. N. Kirk, *The Growth of Working Class Reformism in Mid-Victorian England* (London: Croom Helm, 1985), 176; G. Stedman Jones, "Class Expression versus Social Control?", *History Workshop Journal*, 4 (Autumn, 1977): 165. There is a large international historical literature on this aspect of rural paternalism: *See*, for instance, A. Morel, "Power and Ideology in the Village Community of Picardy: Past and Present", in R. Forster and O Ranum, *Rural Society in France: Selections from the Annales* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1977), 115-22; F.M.L. Thompson, "Landowners and the Rural Community", in G. E. Mingay, (ed.), *The Victorian Countryside*, vol. 2 (London: Routledge, 1981), 469-73.
18. Newby (1977a), 307.
19. *See*, for example, R. Colls, "'Oh, Happy English Children!': Coal, Class and Education in the North-East", *Past and Present*, 73 (1976): 75-99.
20. Farm manager, interview with author, Paarl, December 1983.
21. Farmers, interviews with author, Paarl, December 1983-January 1984. The fact that migrants appear to be so highly valued as stockmen probably has as much to do with demanding hours of work as with specialist skill. Unlike "Coloured" labourers with resident families, African migrants are generally "freer" to undertake unsocial weekend and overtime work.

22. *See*, for example, A. Kooy, "Farm Labour in the Karoo", in *Farm Labour*, 116-7; "Farm Labour in South Africa: A Review Article", *Social Dynamics*, 2,2 (1976): 140. For a contrasting view, see M. Lipton, *Capitalism and Apartheid: South Africa, 1910-1986* (London, 1986), 88.
23. Newby (1977a), 158; Newby (1980), 98.
24. *Ibid.*, (1977a), 159.
25. Farmers, interviews with author, Paarl, Stellenbosch and Robertson districts, December 1983.
26. Farmer, interview with author, Vredendal, January 1984.
27. Farmer, interview with author, Paarl, January 1984.
28. Wilson (1984), 64.
29. Newby (1977a), 197.
30. Farmer, interview with author, Paarl, February 1984.
31. Farm manager, interview with author, Paarl, January 1984.
32. M. Flude and J. Ahier, (eds.), *Educability, Schools and Ideology* (London: Croom Helm, 1974).
33. *See*, for example, P. Bourdieu and J-C. Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (London: Sage, 1974); Bourdieu, "The School as a Conservative Force: Scholastic and Cultural Inequalities", in J. Egglestone, (ed.), *Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education* (London: Methuen, 1974), 32-46; R. Boudon, *Education, Opportunity and Social Inequality: Changing Prospects in Western Society* (New York: Wiley, 1973).
34. Bourdieu (1974), 32.
35. Kooy (1976), 116.
36. E.P. Thompson, "Eighteenth Century English Society: Class Struggle without Class?", *Social History*, 3, 2 (1978): 152.
37. *See*, for instance, L.J. Loots, *A Profile of Black Unemployment in South Africa: Two Area Surveys*, SALDRU Working Paper No. 19 (University of Cape Town, 1978), 23.
38. L. Chisholm and P. Christie, "Restructuring Education", in Southern African Research Services (eds.), *South African Review One* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1983), 258.
39. N. Keddie, *Tinker Tailor. The Myth of Cultural Deprivation* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973). *See* also, J. Demaine, *Contemporary Theories in the Sociology of Education* (London: Macmillan, 1981), 60-4.
40. Teacher, interview with author, Piketberg, January 1984.
41. Williamson (1982), 18.
42. R. Sennett and J. Cobb, *The Hidden Injuries of Class* (New York: Knopf, 1973).
43. G.A. Williams, "Land of Our Fathers", *Marxism Today* (August 1982): 25.
44. H.A. Giroux, "Ideology, Agency and the Process of Schooling", in L. Barton and S. Walker (eds.), *Social Crisis and Educational Research* (London: Croom Helm, 1984), 311-15.
45. T. Plaut, "Farm Schools for African and Coloured Children in South Africa", Conference Paper No. 17, SALDRU Farm Labour Conference, University of Cape Town, 1976; B. Levy, "Farm Schools in South Africa: An Empirical Study", Conference Paper No. 44, SALDRU Farm Labour Conference, University of Cape Town, 1976.
46. J. Muller, "People's Education and the National Education Crisis Committee", in *South African Review Four* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1987), 28.
47. Headmaster, interview with author, Paarl, November 1983.
48. Farmer, interview with author, Stellenbosch, February, 1984.
49. Farmer, interview with author, Stellenbosch, February 1984.
50. *Sunday Tribune*, 29 March 1987.
51. Farmer's wife, interview with author, Elgin, February 1984.
52. Farmer's wife, interview with author, Elgin, February 1984; Stellenbosch, February 1984.
53. Levy, 27.
54. L. Ardington, "Farm Villages", *Indicator*, 4, 2 (1986): 70.
55. *Sunday Times*, 7 February 1988.
56. *Sunday Tribune*, 22 March 1987.

57. *Sunday Times*, 4 December 1983.
58. Headmaster, interview with author, Citrusdal, January 1984.
59. *Cape Times*, 23 January 1988.
60. *Cape Times*, 2 September 1987.
61. J. Walvin, *A Child's World: A Social History of English Childhood 1800-1914* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984), 75.
62. For a review of child labour, *see Child Labour in South Africa: A General Review*, Anti-Slavery Society Child Labour Series, Report No. 7 (London, 1983).
63. J. Theron, "Unionising Farmer White", *Indicator*, 4, 2 (1986): 96.
64. *White Paper on the Provision of Education in the Republic of South Africa* (Pretoria, 1983), 19.
65. *Cape Times*, 10 July 1987.
66. *Sunday Tribune*, 22, 29 March 1987; 12 April 1987.
67. M.W. Apple, *Education and Power* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982), 53,55.
68. R. Dale, "Education and the Capitalist State: Contributions and Contradictions", in M.W. Apple, (ed.), *Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982), 127-61; M. Carnoy, "Education, Economy and the State", in Apple, (ed.), (1982), 79-126.
69. S. Hall, "Schooling, State and Society", in R. Dale, G. Esland, R. Ferguson and M. McDonald, (eds.), *Education and the State Vol.1: Schooling in the National Interest* (London: Falmer Press, 1981), 10.

PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION, 1988, VOL. 10, NO. 1, 43 - 52

"The Head of the Native": Swiss Mission Education at Lemana 1899 - 1954

Charlie Nwandula

This paper continues the debate on the continuities between Bantu Education and missionary schooling by examining the role of the Swiss Mission Society. It shows that in terms of its aims, the emphasis on manual education and on teaching the vernacular rather than English, there were significant continuities with the practices of Bantu Education.

In their article, "Bantu Education: Apartheid Ideology and Labour Reproduction" published in 1982, Christie and Collins opened a debate about the links between Bantu Education and missionary schooling.[1] On the grounds of the function that schooling performed in both eras in reproducing unequal social relations, they argue that the continuities are far greater than the discontinuities posited by various liberal and missionary writers. In the most recent issue of *Perspectives in Education,* Hyslop continues and refines the argument by showing the congruence of interests before 1948 between missionaries, the National party and the United Party in the creation of a centralized system of schooling for Africans under a Board of Bantu Education.[2] This article lends weight to this general argument and perspective by examining the role of a specific mission society, the Swiss Mission Society. It will try to show that there was no fundamental difference between the way the Swiss missionaries and later apologists for Bantu Education viewed the purpose and practice of schooling for Africans.

The importance of this debate is underlined by a large, existing literature which tends to glorify and romanticize missionary schooling. Writers as diverse as J. du Plessis, C.T. Loram, M.F. McKerron, R.G. Jones and S.T. Mona[3] across a wide spectrum of time, see missionary schooling as having brought the blessings of Christianity and Civilization to the African people. Both Loram and du Plessis take missionaries' statements at face value, arguing that religious reasons were the main motive behind their educational practices: Civilizing the heathen. For McKerron, the missionaries command our admiration as they "consistently set before the Non-European a higher standard of life, and bore with patience and fortitude acute physical and spiritual deprivation".[4] In a much later period Jones reiterated these views when he argued that formal education for African children was first established for the primary purpose of Christianizing them.[5] As late as 1984 Mona, in concluding her research into the Swiss Mission, restates this position when she writes that: "The Swiss were dedicated to their cause. It was only unfortunate that their good work was destroyed by the Bantu Education Act of 1953".[6]

Such writers tend to present the introduction of Bantu Education as an absolute break with previous educational history, and the missionaries as bringing light

through education to a heathen, uncivilized, people. These critics ignore the role of missionary schooling in enhancing the social and racial inequalities within South African society. This article is an attempt to illustrate the latter argument by examining available evidence concerning the educational work of the Swiss Mission at Lemana Institution between 1899 and 1954. It will look in particular at the curricular aspects of manual instruction and the teaching of English. The argument will further be developed by examining some responses by students. Before doing so it is necessary to provide some detail about the history of the Swiss Mission in South Africa and at Lemana.

From Switzerland to Africa

The pioneers of Swiss Missionary work in South Africa, it is generally acknowledged, were two friends, Ernest Creux and Paul Berthoud.[7] In 1869 Creux and Berthoud offered themselves to their own church, the Free Church of the Canton de Vaude in Switzerland, as available for the establishment of a foreign mission. After due consideration, the Synod of their church accepted their offer and the *Mission Vaudoise* - the Mission of the Church of Vaude - was thus inaugurated.[8]

Berthoud and Creux arrived in Lesotho in 1872 and spent three years (1872 - 1875) at Morija, the Paris Mission Station. In 1875 Creux and Berthoud left Lesotho for the North Eastern Transvaal. They arrived in the Zoutpansberg, at an area which the local Afrikaners called *Spelonken* (caves), because of the caves in the mountains.[9] They began their mission work at Valdezia. In 1879 another mission was founded at Elim under the Reverend and Mrs de Meoron. In 1897 Dr. Liengme took up work at this station and the present Elim Mission Hospital was started. In 1886 another mission station was founded at Shiluvane in the district of Tzaneen under the Reverend and Mrs Eugene Thomas; and in 1897 at Mhinga under the Reverend and Mrs. P. Rosset. Thus the North Eastern Transvaal came under the influence of the Swiss Mission.

Lemana Institution was founded on the Rossbach Farm in January 1906 about five miles to the south of Elim Hospital. Although the institution was under the direction of the Swiss Mission, two inspectors of Native Education appointed by the Transvaal Education Department were responsible for supervising the establishment and recommending the necessary government grants.[10] In the same year the institution was registered with the Transvaal Education Department as the Lemana Training Institution.

At first Lemana trained teachers as well as evangelists who served the Swiss Mission. It was only after a separate evangelist training school was started at Alice in the Eastern Cape that the idea of training teachers and evangelists at Lemana was abandoned. Some teachers, having completed their training at Lemana, proceeded to the pastoral school to train as ministers of religion.

In 1941 a secondary school was established and incorporated with Lemana Training Institution: The Douglas Laing Smit Secondary School, named after the then Union Secretary for Native Affairs. In 1956 the Swiss Mission transferred the administration of Lemana to the Department of Bantu Education.

Swiss Mission liberalism

One of the most influential and prominent Swiss missionaries during its formative years was Henri Junod, Superintendent of the Lemana Institution from 1906. He was succeeded during the 1920s by F. Cuendet who was far less outspoken than Junod. For this reason the article focusses mainly on the period in which Junod headed Lemana. It was during his Superintendency that the main features of Swiss Mission work in the North Eastern Transvaal took shape.

In a context where many argued that Africans should not be educated, Junod was a proponent of education for Africans. In a letter to the Secretary of Native Education, W.E. Clarke, in 1906, he argued that by providing training for Africans, the Swiss Mission had a two-fold aim: Firstly to develop the mind of the native and secondly to make Africans useful members of the community.[11] Junod and his colleagues felt that the school ought to help the African to become a thinking and a moral man instead of keeping him as a "savage" or a "mere child". When this was achieved, then the African would find his place in the South African commonwealth and contribute to the welfare of the whole.[12] Junod seems to have envisaged a non-racial and equal society in South Africa in which Africans, through education and training, would become incorporated into white society, each contributing towards the common good as a whole. This integrationist stance was repeated on several occasions.

It is surprising that at the same time that Junod displayed such a liberal attitude, he stressed industrial instruction and manual training for Africans. In a letter to Clarke,[13] around 1906-10, he stated that his mission should provide African boys and girls with a training such as would enable them to take their (proper) place in life when they left school. In another letter to Clarke, he elaborated on where this place was.[14] It was conceived of almost totally in relation to service for whites.

More than forty years later, the mission was still expressing itself in the same terms. In response to a questionnaire on Native Education in 1949, it stressed that much more emphasis should be placed on training scholars in how to think and express their thoughts simply and clearly.[15] But what the mission implied here was that this thinking should be, as Dr. Eiselen, architect of Bantu Education put it, "within the African's inherent racial qualities and their distinctive characteristics and aptitudes", that is, within the intellectual limits of a supposedly inferior and backward nation, not of a South African community. This is clearly demonstrated by the Swiss Mission's suggestion that the syllabus should bear in mind that the background of the African child was very different from that of the European, and that the syllabus should be shaped accordingly.[16] This was part of the discourse of those advocating a differentiated curricular content, serving white and African children differently and separately. This article will now show that this **was** the Mission's aim for Africans over this period, separate and inferior education. It will do so by examining what the Swiss Mission offered their students in practice.

Industrial training and manual labour

The Swiss missionaries seemed to have aimed at training African teachers to educate African children for specific adult occupational roles. One of the most important instructional objectives of the Swiss Mission was to train teachers and secondary

students in industrial and manual labour. Such training was regarded as significant for the African child because his future and functions were regarded as being in this area, whether on the land, in the workshop, in the garden or white home. Teachers had to be equipped to prepare African youth accordingly.

In March 1906 Junod, then Superintendent of Lemana Institution, informed the Inspector of Native Education in the Transvaal that the necessary stress at Lemana would be placed on manual labour. He added that pupils were already occupied for two to three hours, on a daily basis, in various manual occupations.[17] He believed that manual labour ought to be an integral part of an African's course of study. This was so because, he wrote, "...the head of the native is not able to sustain the strain of mental study so well as the heads of whites".[18] He went on to say that:

> He (the African: CN) has not been accustomed for generations to school attendance and to mental work, and would be apt very quickly to get headaches, nervous exhaustion arising from overstudy if he has not as a diversion the bodily exercise of outdoor work. We feel moreover that to accustom the native teachers to work with their hands is to give them...a sense of the dignity of labour.[19]

What was important for the Swiss missionaries was teaching Africans the discipline of manual labour. As servants and workers-to-be, Africans were expected to accept the "naturalness" of their place of inferiority and to be equipped with an appropriately servile mentality.[20]

Of course the claim by Junod was similar to the myth propagated by segregationists like Loram in the 1920s and early 1930s that Africans were "retarded" and "stupid" and lacked ability.[21] Loram, Junod, and like-minded critics spoke for education, but against academic education for Africans, which they condemned as being a bookish affair, and almost entirely tinged with the white man's outlook.[22] Creux, during his pioneering days as a Swiss missionary, also referred to Africans as heathen drunkards and adulterous men with limited intelligence.[23]

Junod, like Loram, felt that the Transvaal Education Department curriculum offered to Africans was too academic and too little related to the needs of Africans. These needs Loram defined as those of a backward, primitive and retarded people. As Hunt Davis has shown, Africans, for these men, were to perform manual, and particularly agricultural work. If race enmity was to be avoided, the logic went, African education had to be adapted to those ends.[24] The implication of such a belief about education is quite obvious. According to Junod and the Swiss Mission whose ideologist he was, academic education was meant for white children who would perform mental activities, while African children were to receive industrial instruction and manual labour as befitted their assumed mental capacities.

This training in manual labour also had a broader economic root; one which underlay most official segregationist thinking in this period. There was often considerable synchrony between official government and Swiss Mission objectives, especially in this regard. The 1915 Third Report of the Council of Education, appointed by the Union Government and dealing with African education, for example, recommended manual labour for Africans. It maintained that if education could make the African's maintenance and development more enduring and stable where he was an occupier of land, the country would reap direct and indirect advantages from his increased productive power.[25]

The Swiss missionaries seem to have been in support, if only in broad principle, of the sentiments expressed in the 1915 Report on African education. Education for

Africans had to be conducted on different lines from those for whites. The schooling provided them had to support the economic and social role for which they were being fitted. For S.T. Mona, writing in 1984, arguments such as these later reduced themselves to more or less refined justifications for the policy of apartheid and specifically the policy of Bantu Education.[26]

The overlap between government and mission aims is again illustrated by a letter from the then Principal of Lemana, the Reverend Lenoir, who wrote the Secretary of Education in the Transvaal that:

> Our mission is in sympathy with the efforts made by the government to impress upon the native mind the importance and the moral value of manual labour, and to offer to pupils in training institutions an opportunity to be developed in some form of industrial knowledge.[27]

We can see here that the Swiss Mission was advocating an "adapted" education for Africans long before the Phelps-Stokes Commission (1922) recommended it.

Part of the work of the Phelps-Stokes Commission had been to assess schools for African children, and to rank them according to the extent of their adaptation to the "realities" of African conditions.[28] "Education along their own lines" was very much the credo of the commission. The Swiss missionaries and certain South African educationists like Loram felt that their moves towards segregated education were blessed by the recommendations of this commission. They had received official sanction.

Such educational ideas are similar to those expressed by Christian National Education policy and the school of thought in South Africa known as Fundamental Pedagogics. In both, stress is laid on the cultural differences between whites and Africans, as well as differences in stages of development and, by implication, potential.[29]

If we ignore such links we will fail to grasp the development of South African education policy in the twentieth century. It was on the basis of these perceived differences that the Swiss Mission, long before the National party, maintained the principle of separate education for African children. But in South Africa the principle of "separate" amounted to nothing but a disguised form of racial discrimination through which people are kept apart and very far from equal.

This division of labour based on race, the division between mental and physical activities, prefigured the ideas of the originators of Bantu Education that schooling:

> ...should not give Natives an academic education...if we do this we shall later be burdened with a number of academically trained Europeans and non-Europeans, and who is going to do the manual labour in this country?....We should so conduct our schools that the native who attends those schools will know that to a great extent he must be the labourer in the country.[30]

A subordinate nation was in the making. Care was taken that manual work was taught, and this tended to be training in manual labour rather than training in specific skills. Africans were not to receive any training in high level skills. The main interest was to teach the African to work, and to work particularly on white farms and in the rural areas.[31]

The teaching of English

Junod objected to the method of teaching English to African children as used in the teaching of white pupils and stressed the necessity of teaching the vernacular. In a

memorandum to the Transvaal Education Department in 1906 he stressed the necessity of preserving African languages in order to ensure the future of separate races:

> Without entering into politics, will not everybody admit that we must try to avoid the sad state of things which we see now in America? We find there the black race speaking only English (or spoiling it) and remaining in a state of inferiority and dissatisfaction.[32]

What was implied by Junod was that the white Americans erred by not providing black Americans with instruction in their mother tongue. This would have kept them in a position of inferiority and facilitated their acceptance of white supremacy. But Junod forgot that black Americans had lost their mother tongue generations earlier. He went on to state that:

> Our races in South Africa have preserved their tongue, consequently their mentality. Let them keep it and they will better hold the place for which they are fitted in regard to the higher and more intelligent race....should the school do that, it will be a great benefit to the whole of South Africa.[33]

According to Junod the proper method of teaching English to African children would be to start from what they knew and with the use of phrase-books of vocabularies adopted by the Transvaal Education Department teach them English. These phrase-books were calculated to give them the knowledge of those words which they needed in their relations with whites.[34] In short, education in the mother tongue and not in English but a simplified version of it was the language policy equivalent of "adapted education" and "education along their own lines" - a segregationist policy justified on cultural grounds and whose aim was the preservation of unequal economic and power relations.

This deeply racist and paternalist attitude was very common at the time. The notion of racial superiority implicit in Junod's statements was essential to the function of an ideology such as expressed by the Christian National Education policy document. Like Christian National Education policy, Junod's statements stressed cultural differences. The type of schooling he envisaged was to prepare Africans to accept inequality as part of the natural order. Perceived cultural differences legitimated the apparent need for racial separation. "Education", as a prominent Afrikaner Nationalist politician expressed it:

> Is the key to the creation of the proper relationship between European and non-European in South Africa....I say that there should be reform of the whole educational system and it must be based on the culture and background and the whole life of the native himself in his tribe....This whole (present) policy is also a danger for our western civilisation[35]

By advocating an unequal and separate education for Africans, Junod was propagating an apartheid education long before the Bantu Education Act made it legal in 1953.

Impact of Swiss Mission educational practices

According to Kallaway,[36] mission schools reinforced a self-image of incompetence and ignorance among many Africans who did not go to school. Such an attitude

often also led those who did attend such schools to despise their own traditions or, at the very best, to become ambivalent about their links with the "traditional" past or social milieu.[37]

Evidence I have found of students' responses to Swiss mission education at Lemana come largely from the Lemana School Magazine between 1932 and 1934. This may be a source of dubious authenticity, telling us more about what the missionaries wished to see than was actually the case. It is, though, one of the very few sources available and may be able to cast some light, at least, on the more accommodating students' responses. There is evidence of a students' revolt, but this is only for 1945. Although no firm conclusions can be drawn from the evidence provided by the school magazine, it can perhaps suggest at least one aspect, however limited, of the reality of the students' responses. Much more oral research needs to be done to provide a fuller picture than the mission sources provide.

Evidence of students' political accommodation at Lemana is found in a report of a meeting of the Lemana Students' Debating Society where students debated issues such as "The best form of government for the Native."[38] The students' most important objection was to "the absolute power" of the traditional chief who, they argued, had led and would still lead to cruelty and oppression.[39] The magazine put it as follows:

> Finally, the students came to the conclusion that in the present state the natives are not capable of managing their own affairs, even in part, and that the only system possible at present, if they were to have any voice in the government at all, would be for them to elect some white man to represent them in the white parliament and look after their interests.[40]

If this report was not written by the missionaries themselves, the attitudes displayed by the students here support the argument that the Swiss Mission at Lemana played an important role in shaping the attitudes of the students. The students here appear not to have addressed themselves to the question of white oppression and domination in South Africa. On available documentary evidence, the students at Lemana saw the unequal system in South Africa as the natural order of things.

These students were placed in an ambiguous position.[41] According to a former student at Lemana, H. Muzwayine,[42] Swiss Mission education helped in the creation of a group of schooled Africans who felt themselves elevated above the rest of the people while at the same time they felt inferior to whites. This exclusive group of converted and schooled people came to be identified by the Tsonga people as "majagani." "Majagani" acted as intermediaries between the white administration and the mass of the colonized people. They promoted, as Kallaway puts it, by example, the legitimacy of colonial rule and the capitalist system that it represented. They also helped to change the older social structures to fit in with European concepts of work and interpersonal relationships. A second year student at Lemana in 1934, Ramaliba, wrote in the *Lemana Magazine* that:

> I live in the extreme east of the Transvaal where civilization has not yet come in touch with my people....Considering the ignorance which still keeps my people in the great vale of darkness, my heart gets sore and my thinking powers weaken.[43]

Ramaliba was here agreeing with the missionaries in condemning his own people. He viewed himself as contributing in the work of raising his "primitive people" to civilization. Ramaliba's case can be seen as similar to that of the Swiss missionaries: Christianizing and civilizing. He saw himself as something of a missionary:

> I shall go home and lead my people to light by sharing with them the knowledge which I have got from the school I went to.[44]

Thus Swiss mission education tended, in such cases, not to develop persons who felt compelled to challenge either the school or those ideas which were basic to their social institutions.

Part of this colonized mentality and persona was achieved through the erasure of African history and the construction of a historical memory sympathetic to and based on the colonizers' perspective. A student who gave his initials as S.Sh., writing in the *Lemana Magazine* in 1933 about the Great Trek had the following to say:

> We can now picture to ourselves conditions of the countries in those times and the difficulties which the Trekkers had. There were no roads, no bridges, and the Trekkers had to go through forests, through homes of savages, their wagons breaking on the way, waiting several days to pass the flooded rivers and expecting death at any moment.[45]

S.Sh. also referred to African people as "savages" and as "uncivilized." He appears to have identified totally with a Eurocentric interpretation of South African history. In the writing of S.Sh. we see the impact of the Swiss Mission at Lemana in helping to incorporate sectors of the African people of the Spelonken district into the mental structures of colonial domination.

S.Sh. was obviously depicting a romanticized as well as an emotional version of the Afrikaner national struggle; and this led him to a stereotyped version of South African history. While through history lessons S.Sh. came to understand the position of the "oppressed" Afrikaners at the Great Trek, he was unable to question, from his daily experience, his position and that of his own people in relation to the whites in his locality. He failed to draw an historical parallel between the Afrikaner struggle against British domination and the position of African people during his time. He did not seem to have questioned why and how the Afrikaner people became "nationally minded" and rose against what they referred to as the "tyranny and oppression" of the British. It is worth drawing a final quote from S.Sh. to illustrate the point:

> To-day we know the names of the towns which are named after famous people of the Great Trek, such as Louis Trichardt... Lydenburg the town of suffering and Winburg named after winning a great battle against the Matabele... To my imagination the Boers were a very brave people to undertake such a journey, and they helped to open up new countries bringing civilization and Christianity to many parts of South Africa.[46]

While Lemana seems to have played a significant role in the promotion of racial differences and inequality in South Africa, it would be an over-simplification, however, to think that their educational role was exclusively functional in this sense. As Cock has noted, for a minority at least, missionary education involved an exposure to ideas which questioned the fundamentals of both tribal and colonial inequality.[47] It is noteworthy, for example, that the school also produced men like the former President and founder member of FRELIMO in Mozambique, Eduardo Mondlane who was educated between 1945 and 1947 at the Douglas Laing Smit Secondary School at Lemana.[48]

According to a student at the school during that period, the Swiss Mission helped Mondlane by exposing him to the English language, thereby introducing him to Western literature, and Western politics and forms of government.[49] In 1949 Mondlane apparently became one of the early victims of apartheid policy in educa-

tion when the Malan government expelled him from the University of the Witwatersrand and eventually deported him to Mozambique.[50] In this article he is, however, only one example, and we must assume until more evidence comes to hand, that the overall impact of mission education here, as elsewhere, was contradictory.[51] This article has tried to demonstrate mainly one side of this impact.

From my argument in the above discussion, it would be incorrect to assume that the introduction of Bantu Education in 1953 was an absolute break with past educational history. Features such as segregationist schooling patterns and the supporting racist ideology were already present in the schooling provided for Africans during the period of mission school predominance. The roots of a racially differentiated education system in South Africa long predate the Bantu Education Act.

Notes and References

1. P. Christie and C. Collins, "Bantu Education: Apartheid Ideology and Labour Reproduction", in P. Kallaway, (ed.), *Apartheid and Education: The Education of Black South Africans* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1984).
2. J. Hyslop, "The Concepts of Reproduction and Resistance in the Sociology of Education: The Case of the Transition from 'Missionary' to 'Bantu' Education, 1940-1955", *Pespectives in Education*, 9, 2 (September 1987).
3. J. du Plessis, *A History of Christian Missions in South Africa* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1911); C.T. Loram, *The Education of the South African Native* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1917); M.F. McKerron, *A History of Education in South Africa 1652-1932* (Pretoria: van Schaik, 1932); R.G. Jones, "The Education of the Bantu in South Africa" in B. Rose (ed.), *Education in Southern Africa* (Johannesburg: Collier Macmillan, 1970); S.T. Mona, "The Role Played by the Missionaries in the Education of the People in the North Eastern Transvaal with Special Reference to the Swiss Missionary Society" (B. Ed. thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1984).
4. McKerron, 159.
5. Jones, 47.
6. Mona, 47.
7. *The Tsonga Messenger*, 1,1 (April/June 1949): 2.
8. Du Plessis, 330.
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Zoutpansberg Review*, June 1906.
11. H.A. Junod to W.E. Clarke and Ware, undated, File No. 32.1: 1903-1906, correspondence between Swiss Mission Station and Transvaal Education Department, Swiss Mission Archive, Church of the Province of South Africa, University of the Witwatersrand.
12. *Ibid.*
13. Junod to the Secretary of the Transvaal Education Department, undated, circa 1906, File No. 32.1: 1903-1906, Correspondence, Swiss Mission Archive.
14. Junod to Clarke, 1906.
15. Questionnaire on Native Education, 10 May 1949.
16. *Ibid.*
17. Junod to Inspector of Native Education in the Transvaal, 3 March 1906, File: Correspondence, Regulations, and so on, 1906-1924, Swiss Mission Archive.
18. Junod to Superintendent of Education, Pretoria, 2 February 1902, Swiss Mission Correspondence and Reports 1899-1902.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *See* F. Molteno, "The Historical Foundations of the Schooling of Black South Africans" in Kallaway, 25.

21. See R. Hunt Davis Jr., "Charles T. Loram and an American Model for African Education in South Africa", in Kallaway, 114.
22. *Ibid.*, 113.
23. *The Tsonga Messenger*, 1,1 (April/June 1949): 2.
24. Hunt Davis.
25. Third Report of the Council of Education dealing with Native Education, 1915, 2, Church of the Province of South Africa Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.
26. Mona, 12.
27. Lenoir to Secretary of Education in Transvaal, 18 March 1905, File No: 32.1 1903-06, Swiss Mission Archive.
28. K.J. King, *Pan Africanism and Education* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 97.
29. G. Carter, *Which Way is South Africa Going?* (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1980), 105.
30. Quoted in *Hansard*, Union of South Africa, 1945, col. 4528.
31 See E.M. Sathekge, "Aspects of the History of Lemana Training Institution" (B.Ed. thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1984).
32 Junod to Clarke and Ware, File No. 32.1, Correspondence and Reports, 1903-1906.
33. *Ibid.*
34. *Ibid.*
35. Cited by Christie and Collins, 176.
36. Kallaway, 9.
37. *Ibid.*
38. *Lemana Training College Magazine*, undated.
39. *Ibid.*
40. *Ibid.*
41. See S. Marks, "The Ambiguities of Dependence: John L. Dube of Natal", *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 1, 2 (April, 1975): 162-180.
42. H. Muzwayine, former student at Lemana, now principal of an Adult Education Centre in Pretoria, interview with author, 8 September 1986.
43. *Lemana Training College Magazine*, 1934.
44. *Ibid.*
45. *Ibid.*
46. *Ibid.*
47. J. Cock, *Maids and Madams* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1980), Chapter 4.
48. E. Mondlane, *The Struggle for Mozambique* (London: Zed Press, 1983), xviii.
49. H. Muzwayine.
50. Mondlane, xix.
51. K. Blakemore and B. Cooksey, *A Sociology of Education for Africa* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1981).

PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION, 1988, VOL. 10, NO. 1, 53 - 66

Education, Politics, and the State: The Elementary Technical School in the Netherlands, 1945 - 1955

Frans Meijers
University of Leiden, The Netherlands

In this article, an empirical attempt is made to explore the function(ing) of the state in the reproduction of social inequality via education, a topic many radical educational theories are in fact blind to. In the period between 1945 and 1955 a completely new type of mass education was set up in the Netherlands, the Elementary Technical School (ETS). ETS is attended only by working class boys and was, at least in the fifties, the final stage of regular education for well over 70% of the pupils. For them, ETS held out the prospect of semi- and unskilled labour. The article argues that the establishment of ETS and it's subsequent functioning (i.e. the class specific selection this school realises) is linked to the dominant interests of the ruling classes in the Netherlands after the Second World War. It shows how this dominance is realised through the discourse of the "industrialization", "breakthrough" and "massification" debates.

Central in the radical educational sciences in the seventies is the notion that education contributes to the existing imbalance of power in capitalist societies. Education is socially organised socialization.[1] This means that the form, content and class specific selection of education is seen as the result of class interests and class struggle, in which education in its turn plays a part. The starting point of all reproduction theories is the evident class specific output of the educational system. Research shows that the selection the school makes especially concerns the dominance of the values and norms (i.e. the culture) of the higher classes in education. Having or not having at one's disposal the cultural capital of these classes proves to be the most important indicator of a successful or unsuccessful school career.[2]

The explanation of the cultural dominance of the higher classes in education is usually sought in the fact that especially the so-called "new middle class" looks upon and uses education as an important means to reproduce its position within wider social relations. The position of this class - in between working class and bourgeoisie - is in particular due to the fact that this class controls the specialised forms of communication.[3] The entrance to and, to a lesser extent, the control of specialised forms of communication can be regulated by education, in a way which is acceptable to all classes. This is particularly so because it concerns knowledge and skills that have to be taught in formal learning processes. The interests of the new middle class, as reproduction theory further states, are not incompatible with the interests of those possessing capital (that is, the means of production), since the new middle class in fact controls capital.

The main and still unsolved problem in reproduction theories, however, is that they fall short when it comes to answering the question of how the new middle class

succeeds in organizing education such that the existing asymmetrical class relations are reproduced. The concept "power", although it is a central notion in reproduction theories, functions - as Archer puts it - "as a passive conductor, perfect and without resistance, linking social domination to educational control... The actual processes of adaptation, adjustment and alignment which match educational practice to class structure and educational change to shifting class composition remain completely unexplained".[4] It is Archer's opinion that it is necessary to focus attention especially on the structure of educational systems and their origins in order to provide (a) a detailed specification of the processes producing educational change and (b) a theory of the conditions under which different social groups can influence the prevailing definition of instruction through the above processes.

In her impressive *Social Origins Of Educational Systems*, Archer takes up such an analysis.[5] She clearly demonstrates that education is by no means a completely permeable social institution. The educational system has a logic and a dynamic of its own, and its autonomy with respect to the interests of social groups increases as it becomes more of a state educational system. But, because Archer is mainly concerned with the properties of the educational system as such, her analysis is - as Dale correctly suggests - primarily "an account of how educational changes are made rather than an explanation of what changes are made and why they are made".[6]

In order to reveal what changes are made and why they are made it is necessary, I believe, to concentrate not only on the dynamics of the educational system but also on the (dynamics of the) educational policy of the state. There is a good theoretical and empirical reason for this. Starting with the latter: Archer, who has done the most elaborate empirical research on this topic, clearly points out that the relative autonomy of the educational system is directly connected with processes of state formation and, therefore, is originally a historically contingent result of the struggle between various interest groups. The way in which this struggle becomes institutionalized in various state apparatuses defines, in its turn, the boundaries within which the discourse about education on the political level proceeds.

The theoretical reason is provided by the works of Gramsci, Althusser and Poulantzas.[7] They demonstrate that the unity of a class is not automatically the result of the place shared by its members in the process of production. This unity has to be organised on the political and ideological level. A class is a power in society in so far as it manages to obtain an identity of its own beside other classes by means of the organisation of its own culture and its own political representation. The acquisition of such an identity and, along with that, the formulation of its own class interests, take place under existing, asymmetrical power relationships. At least in Western capitalist societies, the state is the institution in which classes must formulate their interests. In this manner, one can speak of a condensation of class struggle within the state.

Educational policy as a discourse

If we assume that the state is an institution within which classes attempt to formulate their interests in such a way that specific interests seem to be general interests, then class struggle within the state can above all things be regarded as an ideological struggle. The educational policy - as a result of this struggle - has to be analysed primarily from this perspective. In the first place, this calls forth the question of

what an ideology is. In his already classic essay "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses", Althusser describes ideology as the representation of the imaginary relation of individiuals or groups to their real conditions of existence.[8] Ideologies, Althusser stresses, have a material existence; they exist as more or less institutionalized social interactions given to the individual. Only with the help of ideologies can a class formulate its interests with respect to the interests of other classes (that constitute its "real conditions of existence") and, therefore, organise its unity. With that, an ideology is a symbolical and practical solution for orientation problems with which a class is faced. The more this solution as a specific definition of the situation seems self-evident to all classes the better a class can rule other classes because it can legitimise its claims to power.

The educational ideology which different classes develop can particularly be regarded as an action perspective. It is a definition of the situation that is determined by (a) the interests a class takes in the educational system from the position it occupies in actual class relations, and (b) the historically developed structures within which these interests must (and, therefore, can) be formulated. But how to identify these action perspectives? As, among others, Foucault and Donzelot demonstrate, words are the most important weapons in the ideological struggle at the political level.[9] It is via language that individuals or groups arrive at a definition of the situation and it is especially via language that they try to turn a specific definition into a universal one. Therefore, the action perspectives of a social group or class can only be detected by means of a discourse analysis.

The aim of this analysis is twofold: the discourses have to be reconstructed as accurately as possible in order to be able to reconstruct, on the basis of this, the ideologies (and, in relation to them, the action perspectives which are used by the different interest groups. The latter, then, is an interpretative operation which can only take place on the basis of an explicit theory about the objective position (and, therefore, objective interests) of the groups which constitute the discourses. After all, these objective interests will only occur in mediated form in the discourses: that is the very nature of ideologies.

Education and interests: what is the basic structure of the educational debate?

As Giddens points out, social or class relations in advanced industrial societies are reproduced structurally as well as culturally.[10] Structural reproduction, that is, the maintenance of the existing class structure, takes place primarily in the labour market. In the labour market the actual allocation processes are realized, guaranteeing the maintenance of the hierarchical structure of the labour system and, along with that, one of the basic conditions for the capitalist system of production. Differences in market capacity (all forms of relevant attributes which individuals may bring to the bargaining encounter) are decisive for the actual allocative processes of the labour market. Cultural reproduction (that is, the maintenance of the conditions of the process of structural reproduction) takes place especially in the educational system. This system must produce differences in market capacity and must legitimize them. This means above all that the educational system, as far as it concerns the interests of the ruling classes, must be organised in such a way that there are at least two actually (but not formally) separated learning routes: one for the

majority of pupils, qualifying them for the lower positions in the labour system and one for a minority, qualifying them for the better positions.

This does not imply, though, that education is an instrument in the hands of the ruling classes and that it can be used at will. Differences in market capacity can only be produced via a "cultural detour". This cultural detour, however, can only be made when the educational system has a certain autonomy. Central in the educational system is the culture of the ruling classes. This culture is presented as the only true culture. The inequality in educational participation and school success results from the fact that only families that belong - both materially and culturally - to the ruling classes possess a cultural heritage, as Bourdieu and Passeron call it, which interacts with the culture that is passed on in education and on the basis of which differences in market capacity are produced.[11] This class specific selection is disguised because education only refers to internal school functions: "Good education just asks for...". So, in order to reproduce the class relations, there must be room for functions internal to the school.

Baudelot and Establet make clear in how far this functional autonomy operates as an operational autonomy. Their research shows that education, if it wants to accomplish its class specific selection, should maintain two illusions. The first concerns the unity of the educational system. Education should preserve the image that it forms a unity in which every type of school builds on the knowledge acquired in previous education with, as a common goal, transfer of knowledge and cultivation of the personality.[13] The second illusion concerns the integrating nature of education. The educational system should maintain the image that it introduces all children equally into the same cultural heritage. That only one cultural heritage is acknowledged entails the view that differences in achievement are the result of differences in talent alone.

But in order to be able to present itself as the "unifying school", a number of conditions have to be met. The educational system must be organized such as to provide formal streaming possibilities. Every schooltype should have scientifically justified curricula. The teachers should be professionals. And, last but not least, the selection procedures should be as fair as possible. Everyone must have an equal opportunity to perform. These conditions are the material nucleus of the operational autonomy of the educational system. The key word is "professionalization". The "needs" of a professional educational organization cannot be ignored.

The basic structure of the educational debate is, however, not only determined by "qualification arguments", used by the ruling classes to reproduce the hierarchical division of labour and, along with that, their privileged position in this division. It is also determined by "developmental arguments". These are used by educationalists to preserve their relative autonomy. There is, finally, a third party involved; the state. In advanced industrial societies, the state must function as a crisis-manager in order to secure social cohesion.[14] Education is increasingly the subject of a constructive state policy since it is regarded as an instrument to manage social crises. So, for example, adult education is stimulated in the light of the battle against unemployment. If, however, the state wants to handle the educational system as an instrument in a policy aiming at crisis-control, this system has above all to be controllable, both as far as the output and as far as the deployment is concerned.

This means that the state is, in general, not particularly interested in the form and content of the actual learning processes but leaves them to the educationists. The

state is more interested, first of all, in the construction of a transparent, cohesive but at the same time flexible system of educational facilities and, secondly, in legislation organized such that quick state interference is possible when crises occur at a political level. This is enabled by creating and using framework-laws which only roughly regulate the state's actions.

Who governs education? Some research results.

I have recently finished a study of the educational policy the Dutch government has pursued between 1945 and 1955 towards the Elementary Technical School.[15] The Elementary Technical School (ETS) was established at the explicit initiative of the government as part of a "modern" educational system immediately after the Second World War. Ever since, it has been attended by working class boys between the ages of 12 and 16. For them, ETS was to hold out the prospect of semi- and unskilled labour. Because ETS was, at least in the fifties, the final stage of regular education for well over 70% of the pupils, these pupils were "learning to labour".[16] In my analysis I try to answer the question whether the establishment and subsequent functioning of ETS (that is, the class specific selection this school realizes) is linked up with the dominance of the interests of the ruling classes. Especially by means of content analysis of the archives of the Department of Education, together with all the relevant reports of the organizations of employers, employees and teachers, political parties and with interviews with "key persons," I have attempted to reconstruct all the discourses relevant for the formulation and development of the ETS policy,in order to discover the covert structures of meaning in these discourses. First, I shall outline the discourses that were relevant for the establishment of the ETS.

Dutch society after 1945: between hope and fear for the future

The actual policy towards ETS immediately after the Second World War was determined by three interrelated discourses: A discourse about a "modern" political order; a discourse about a "modern" economic order; and a discourse about the effects of modernization on youth. In the pre-war period, Dutch society was characterized socio-economically by the fact that industrialisation was only poorly developed, especially when compared to the surrounding countries. Industry was mainly concentrated in and around the large cities in the West of the country, with some occasional industrial centres in the East and the South (chiefly textile industry). In effect this meant that by far the largest part of the Netherlands was a rural society.

In the political power bloc, group configurations on a denominational basis - the so-called "pillars" - were predominant. Already from the mid-19th century onwards, three pillars have almost totally set the fashion; the Roman-Catholic, the Protestant and the general pillar, the latter consisting of liberals and social-democrats. According to Van der Linden, the internal cohesion of each pillar could, because of the tight organizational structure, be characterised by a completely idiosyncratic culture, which revealed itself in language-use, ways of clothing, atmosphere and style. The development of this group formation was - with respect to important political issues - stimulated by following a pacification policy in order to arrive at a reasonable agree-

ment.[17] Within all pillars, a high degree of internal discipline and co-operation could be observed, irrespective of the differences of opinions between the various factions:

> The ultimate goal of this group and culture formation was to secure the identity internally as well as externally. The acquisition of political power was after all a profane means to be able to pursue a purposeful defence.[18]

After 1945, the hitherto extremely stable social and political relations were subjected to great pressure. National-socialism had left a ruined Europe, which in order to survive had to orientate itself to internal and transatlantic co-operation both in a political and in an economic sense. This concerned the Netherlands as well. Almost immediately after the end of the war, an industrial policy was established that was to change the pre-war class relations and the relations between town and countryside. This industrialization was, to be perfectly clear, not a freely chosen alternative but urged by geo-political and geo-economic facts. Nevertheless, there was no protest against it; for every social group, it was self-evident that only by means of industrialization could a safe and prosperous future be realised. The process of industrialisation was speeded up: between 1 July 1948 and 1 June 1951, 140 000 new jobs in the industry were created, an extension of almost 15%. The government set itself the target not to concentrate industry in the already existing industrial agglomerates but rather to spread it all over the country. According to the government, concentration of industry in any one region would not only heavily overload the available infrastructure in the West of the country; it would also cause a rapid migration of the countryside to the town. This, in turn, could lead to social disruption.[19]

The effect of this decentralization policy was an industrialization of the countryside. This had far-reaching effects on the traditionally rural communities: New labour relations were introduced, geographical mobility was stimulated through the extension of the road system and new education facilities were established in the countryside, especially elementary technical schools. The new industrial centres attracted workers from the surrounding countryside: Commuting set in. Many of them settled in industrial centres of growth. From a sociological point of view, the "new" working class came into being. This process of industrialization of the countryside broke open old socialization relations. Young people ended up in situations that were characterized by industrial production instead of traditional craft or rural labour, by fast extending residential precincts instead of old village communities, by the modern entertainment industry instead of mostly church-based youth clubs.

All these changes stirred due commotion among the "organic intellectuals" of the political parties and churches. A vast "new" working class with a "new" mass culture had emerged, threatening the "old" political and cultural order. This commotion resulted in a fierce debate both about the necessity of new political relations and about the effects of urbanization and industrialization on the mentality of youth in general and working class youth in particular. The former was expressed in the "break-through" idea and the latter in the "massification debate". It should be noticed, however, that people in general were not afflicted by a crisis awareness, as table 1 and 2, both based on data from representative sample carried out by the Dutch Institute for Public Opinion (NIPO), show.[20]

Table 1: Has the war greatly changed your life?.

Yes	32%
No	62%
No opinion	5%

Source: Press report NIPO 30.08.1945

Table 2. Which three wishes would people like to see fulfilled most?

More money, pay, profit, a good living, a carefree old age	58%
More goods available	32%
Peace, no war threat any more, tolerance	30%
Better house	27%
Health, cure	16%
Pragmatic political wishes (less taxes etc.)	11%
General political wishes (better government etc.)	9%
Happiness, contentment	5%

Source: Press report NIPO 15.09.1948

Immediately after the end of the war intellectuals especially those belonging to the general (liberal and social democratic) and the protestant pillar, stated that a new spiritual-political power centre should be created: this was defined as "personalistic-socialism". This political and social program aimed at a break-through both from the old "pillarized" political and social structures and from the conflicts between labour and capital inherent in a capitalist mode of production. Personalistic-socialism was an amalgam that was to weld conflicting views and ideologies. The aim was, as Bank[21] points out, the development of the human personality in the service of what is called a tightly-knit fair and inspired community. The concept "personalism" implied criticism of "collectivist" ideologies such as National-socialism but also Marxism-Leninism. It could be a formula on the basis of which the alignment to class and class struggle was rejected. The notion of socialism was understood as pursuit of a "just community", of a "radical social policy on the basis of the community spirit that tries to look far ahead and that can offer our people an inspiring perspective". This concept of socialism did not embody a notion of class struggle or a classless society, but an ordering of the capitalist market economy and establishment of labour relations in terms of the legal order.

The break through idea soon vanished, resulting in a strong re-pillarization. The personalistic socialism notion enabled a short-term phase of active cultural policy, which can be understood as an attempt of the ruling classes to "modernize" the old dominant bourgeois culture in such a way that the "new" working class could be incorporated. Central to this phase of active culture policy was the so-called "mass youth project". On 15 October 1948, the then Secretary of Education, Professor Rutten, commissioned seven social research institutes to investigate the nature of "mass youth". "I would like to point out", he states in a letter to the institutes, "that

the Government has provided considerable sums of money for the investigation of the problem of mass youth not primarily because of its scientific value, which this research undoubtedly has, but rather because it expects it (the research: FM) to yield results for combatting the 'massification' of the youth".[22] By these results he was referring especially to methods which could potentially prevent or stop the massive drain from the traditional, church-based youth organizations.

But what, then, was mass youth or - in the words of some researchers - "modern youth"? This youth lived, according to Langeveld in his final report:

> in an excessively amorphous world. The amorphousness of its world is revealed in the inability of taking on form itself. The outward appearance is either an imitation of films or it is totally neglected. Attitude and movement do not express an orientation coming from within ...[23]

Although one encounters these phenomena among youth from all social classes, as much research shows, they nevertheless mainly focus on working-class youth: "It is exactly this group that, up to now, has not - or only in a small degree - profited from the existing education facilities within or outside the school. It is also this group that can help itself least", according to Perquin.[24] Together with Langeveld, Perquin was responsible for the entire mass youth project. This project entailed diverting youth from the "mass" entertainment industry to more accepted, traditional values and forms of behavior. And, of course, it was precisely working class youth that could not be organized in traditional youth organizations any longer because they were much more in favour of the delights of modern mass culture (cinema, jazz and dancing). The ETS policy was to become a major plank in this new state strategy.

It is striking that, despite their different denominational backgrounds, both Langeveld and Perquin arrived at fairly similar conclusions. They could not detach their central concept of "genuine maturity" from traditional views on gender and class. The adult personality was still the bourgeois subject pursuing (and achieving) a harmonious balance between the sexual, the emotional and the rational. And this balance should be arrived at in various ways by boys and girls, in accordance with their anthropologically different natures and the different positions they have in the social division of labour. However, in their attempt to found the anticipated social modernization process pedagogically, the pedagogues were swung back and forth between the old and the new. Their orientation to the new was shown by the fact that, although they were quite explicit with regard to the fact that large parts of the youth developed insufficient or no spiritual values at all, they nevertheless did not want to pronounce on the attitudes and behaviour that should actually be developed. They refused to prescribe one single pattern of education, which would, in their view for example, derive from a "pillarized pedagogy". Instead, they continually emphasised that pedagogical space should be created.

Pedagogical space was defined both materially and with regard to content. The need for material space led Langeveld and Perquin to a plea for the improvement of housing conditions for the working class, for better care of youngsters on the shop floor and for better facilities that would be more attractive to working class youth. They also stress the pedagogical space with reference to content, however. All adults having to do with youngsters, either as parents or professionally, should be prepared and able to enter into relations with youngsters in such a way that the youngsters are given the opportunity to grow to maturity in their own ways. Adults

should not use force but persuasion; they should set an example to youngsters and enable identification.

They realised that such a pedagogical program could not restrict itself to education alone. They anticipated that the socialization framework "school - family - work - leisure" should be related much more tightly in order to fit (working class) youth into modern society. School pedagogues should, therefore, not only be concerned with the cognitive domain but pay attention to the entire "life world " of their pupils.

The policy towards the Elementary Technical School

The ETS policy was one of the many strategies employed by pre-war elites to "normalize" post-war class relations via the state. The starting point of this specific strategy was the perceived self-evident connection between industrialization and better schooling. It was argued, not only by the Secretary of Education but also by the government as a whole, that industrialization was only possible if the level of qualificatiion of the working class was to be upgraded. This argument followed from the view that industrialisation created skilled jobs. In reality, only 10-20% of the newly created jobs between 1947 and 1955 were skilled jobs. Nonetheless few doubted the definition of the situation given by the government. As a result, dozens of elementary technical schools were set up all over the country in a short space of time. The explicit purpose was to create the best possible infrastructure for heavy industry. It was to be achieved firstly, by promoting an industrial mentality among traditionally agriculturally oriented boys and - to a lesser degree - their parents and secondly, by qualifying these boys for industrial labour. This meant qualifying them in such a way that the possibility of their deployment in various labour situations would increase.

But there was a more implicit purpose too. Professor Kohnstamm, the most prominent pedagogue of the protestant pillar and chairman of the state committee that - as a part of a general policy of improving the living conditions of the socially marginal groups - had to study the educational opportunities of the working class, stated it as follows:

> For the first time in history mankind has the task of building a culture that is not only open to a small minority but to all individuals. This is the crisis of culture that is often referred to as 'the dangers of mass culture'. Just because we do not underestimate these dangers, we think it is highly urgent and important to develop all talents fully, which are not latent in the masses.[25]

In 1947, almost 50% of all 14-year-old boys and girls did not follow any regular full-time education. The educational system was quite openly reproducing the existing class structure: There was hardly any trace of social mobility on account of education. This situation, however, could not continue - in the opinion of those who participated in the "break-through" and the "massification debate" - because it would, given the rapid economic and cultural changes in society, blow up the social order. The "modern" society had to be a meritocratic society; reward (in terms of income, power and status) for results (in terms of school achievements).

So, the main challenge was to develop a kind of education that was attractive to working class boys; was firmly part of the whole system of secondary education (thus, formally allowing an up-streaming) and that, at the same time, guaranteed a continuous production of labourers prepared to do semi- and unskilled industrial labour. A special state committee was established in 1947, presided over by the

second in command at the Ministry of Education, Secretary-General Goote, to prepare an initial outline of the ETS. Half of the members of this committee were directors of schools which already provided vocational training. The other half consisted of officials of the Ministry of Economic and Social Affairs and of representatives of the trade-unions and of employers' organizations. In 1948, the committee published a report in which it pleaded for a three year school: The first year had to be preparatory, the last two years had to provide training for a specific profession. In the preparatory year "cultivation" was to have a central place. The committee did not elaborate their ideas about this first year. This, it maintained, was a task for educational professionals. However, to make sure that the concretization of its plans were not obstructed by endless pedagogical disputes, the committee pleaded for a continued active role by the government. Only the government could ensure that the necessary pedagogical debate would be structured by the "general interest" and would, therefore, be productive.

Thus, in 1949, another state committee was established, consisting of educational professionals (mainly teachers and a few educational psychologists and pedagogues), presided over by Faber, an official of the Ministry of Education. The employers' organisations had one representative, the trade unions had none. The task of the committee was well defined: It had to produce a complete, fully elaborated curriculum for all three years of the ETS. The theoretical starting point of this committee was found in the massification debate: In the interim reports Langeveld and Perquin (and their collaborators) wrote within the framework of the mass youth project. When the committee published its final report in 1956, this report was actually a concretisation -for the ETS only - of the recommendations Langeveld and Perquin had developed with respect to the total system of secondary education.

Central to the thinking of the committee was the "scientifically" based conviction that there are two kinds of intelligence; a practical and a theoretical one, both of them demanding a different and therefore separate kind of education. As a result, it was the teachers - stressing the point that all talents have to be developed as optimally as possible - who emphasized the point of external differentiation of the educational system and, thus, of separate learning routes, thereby creating a division between lower vocational secondary education.

However, a true meritocratic society demands that every type of schooling selects on fair principles. This means that everywhere in the educational system every pupil must have a fair chance to develop his or her talents as fully as possible in order to get the highest possible qualification. The latter includes the notion, as mentioned above, that the educational system must allow up-streaming, at least formally. The committee, therefore, had to solve some problems, since it had pleaded for different learning routes. Assuming that the pupils of ETS (which actually meant working class boys) had a practical intelligence, the committee suggested that the actual learning of ETS should be organised in such a way that emphasis was laid on obtaining practical qualifications. However, it would serve no useful purpose, either for the developing industry or for the pupils to qualify too narrowly. "Industry demands independent and responsible labourers, and youngsters must develop their personality", the committee stated in its final report.[26] Thus it defined the interests of pupils and industry as synonymous. So, in the first - preparatory - year, the foundation was laid for the development of what the sociology of labour calls "extra functional qualifications".[27]

To develop the personality of pupils in a "practical way", the committee pleaded for, what was in the Netherlands of the fifties, a very revolutionary curriculum in the first year of ETS. The curriculum was characterised by what Bernstein calls a "weak classification".[28] According to the committee:

> The element only has meaning in a totality. The isolated element can, therefore, never attract attention. This implies that the learning processes must be built around concrete tasks, which form a meaningful unity and, further, that the complete subject-matter in a certain period must be a meaningful totality or, put differently, an organic unity. Thus, we propose an educational structure in which in the same period interrelated units are presented, resulting in concrete tasks.[29]

The committee had already reached this point in 1950. By 1955 it had elaborated all units and formally experimented with them in about thirty elementary technical schools. Teachers did not like to work with this curriculum since it threatened their individual autonomy in the school. However, in the long run they had no choice; after a short period the government subsidised only those schools that were working with this curriculum. The main reason for this was, as Goote argued to the teachers, the necessity of uniformity and clarity in the ETS policy. "Without them, you cannot do your job, to educate children for a modern world".[30]

The preparatory year was the first answer to the problem of how to maintain the illusion of the unity and of the integrating character of education, as described by Baudelot and Establet.[31] Because in the preparatory year emphasis was placed on the development of the personality of the pupils and only afterwards on "real" qualification, it could be argued that ETS in fact offered the same education as the rest of secondary education: ETS introduced its pupils into the same cultural heritage as the other types of school did. Formal up-streaming, however, still had to be realized. In 1950, ETS pupils did not have direct access to further regular technical education after finishing ETS. They had to follow a 2 years' course before they were admitted to the so-called "medium technical schools". These schools were mainly attended by middle class boys after finishing the first stage of general secondary education. In 1950, out of 16 000 pupils who obtained an ETS certificate, only 628 pupils entered a medium technical school.

Therefore, the committee pleaded for the establishment of a new type of school in between ETS and the medium technical school; the "extended technical school". The organizations of employers strongly opposed this plan. They feared that the establishment of the extended technical school would result in a decrease in the flow of ETS pupils into industry. Despite this objection of this then very powerful social group, the Secretary of Education immediately agreed with the plans of the committee and before the final report of the committee was published, several experimental extended technical schools were already functioning. Nevertheless, for over 70% of ETS-pupils, ETS remained the final stage of regular education.

Conclusion

Looking at the aims and the results of the educational policy regarding ETS, there can be no doubt that the interests of the ruling classes are readily met. The emergence of the "new" working class, which threatened in several ways the then existing class relations (that is, the privileged position of some social groups), was channelled in a twofold manner. First, by attempting to bring thousands of working class boys under the cultural hegemony of the ruling classes, "qualifying" them in a

specific way for industrial labour. Secondly, and closely related to this, by integrating the working class in an industrial society in such a way that it seemed self-evident that the majority of working class individuals should obtain the lowest places on the social ladder.

In the period under review I found hardly any trace of direct participation of the political and/or economic elites in the formulation of ETS policy. There is a continuous and often intense struggle between the Department of Education and the organizations of teachers. Central in this struggle is the autonomy of the education system. The power of the state to dictate both the form and content of the curriculum, not the interests of "the economy", was the major concern ofteachers. Direct participation of the organizations of employers and their political-ideological allies is not necessary to create a policy which meets their interests.

The main reason for this is that the discussion about the ETS was, and is, totally dominated by a meritocratic ideology. The essence of this ideology can be expressed very briefly: Reward for results. In this ideology four assumptions are formulated with respect to the function and functioning of education. First, the hierarchical structure of the labour system is presented as the result of an autonomous advance of the technical sciences instead of as the result of a drive by owners and controllers of capital to discipline the working class with a view to maximum profit. Subsequently, a self-evident link is made between education and labour; each kind of labour requires technical-instrumental qualifications which have to be acquired through formal education. Thirdly, meritocratic ideology postulates a hierarchy of knowledge. Practical-manual knowledge is considered to be inferior to theoretical-verbal knowledge, because the latter is more difficult to acquire. Finally, it is assumed that complex labour demands complex qualifications (that is, qualifications acquired in theoretical-verbal training) in which the distinction between complex and non-complex largely coincides with the distinction between mental and manual labour.

These four assumptions were not explicitly discussed in the establishment of the ETS. The structural division of the educational system in lower vocational and general secondary education resulting from these assumptions, was legitimized by assuming (and by the subsequent scientific "proof") that two kinds of intelligence were involved. Differences in intelligence on this level were not seen as artefacts of the structure of the educational system, but as biological facts. Consequently, it was the teachers, stressing the point that all talents had to be developed as optimally as possible, who emphasised the point of separate learning routes. The state could confine itself to financial support of numberless teaching experiments. It had only to keep these experiments financially and juridically under control. In this way, the reproduction of existing class relations was a smooth and silent process, actually carried out by the teachers and their organisations, who in fact thought that they were emancipating the working class.

Notes and References

1. C.H.R. Hurn, *The Limits and Possibilities of Schooling* (Boston: Bergin and Garvey, 1978), vii.
2. P. Bourdieu, "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction", in J. Karabel and A. Halsey, (eds.), *Power and Ideology in Education* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977); J. Cl. Passeron, *La Reproduction. Elements pour une Theorie du Systeme d' Enseingement* (Paris: Editions de Minuit 1970).
3. B. Bernstein, *Class, Codes and Control, vol. 3, Towards a Theory of Educational Transmission* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975), 131.
4. M. Archer, "The Sociology of Educational Systems", in T. Bottomore, (ed.), *Sociology, The State of the Art*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982), 241.
5. M. Archer, *Social Origins of Educational Systems* (London and Beverley Hills: Sage Publications, 1979).
6. R. Dale, "The State and Education. Some Theoretical Approaches", in Open University Course E 353, Block 1 Part 2, Unit 3, *Society, Education and the State* (London: Open University Press, 1981), 24.
7. A. Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, by Q. Hoare and G. Nowel-Smith (London: Falmer Press, 1971); L. Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses", in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, (New York: New Left Books, 1971); N. Poulantzas, *Politsche Macht und Gesellschaftliche Klassen* (Frankfurt: Athenaum Fischer Verlag, 1975).
8. Althusser.
9. Donzelot, *The Policing of Families. Wesfare versus the State* (London: Hutchinson, 1979); M. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979).
10. A. Giddens, *The Class Structure of Advanced Societies* (London: Hutchinson, 1973).
11. Bourdieu and Passeron.
12. C. Baudelot and R. Establet, *L'Ecole Capitaliste en France* (Paris: Maspero, 1971).
13. *See also* Bernstein; C. Charlot, *La Mystification Pedagogique* (Paris: Maspero, 1976); R. Sharp and A. Green, *Education and Social Control* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975).
14. *See*, J. Habermas, *Legitimationsprobleme im Spatkapitalismus* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1973); C. Offe, *Contradictions of the Wesfare State* (London: Hutchinson, 1984).
15. F. Meijers, *Van Ambachtsshool tot LTS. Onderwijsbeleid en Kapitalisme* (From training for handicrafts up to Elementary Technical Education. Educational policy and capitalism) (Nijmegen: SUN, 1983); F. Meijers and M. duBois-Reymond, (eds.), *Op Zoek naar een Moderne Pedagogische Norm* (In search of a modern pedagogical norm) (Amersfoort/Leuven: Acco, 1987).
16. P. Willis, *Learning to Labour. How Working Class Kids get Working Class Jobs* (Farnborough: Saxon House, 1978).
17. J.T.J.M. van der Linden, *Economische Ontwikkeling en de Rol van de Overheid. Nederland 1945-1955* (Economical development and the role of the government. The Netherlands 1945-1955) (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Kobra, 1985), 57.
18. *Ibid.*, 57.
19. W. Brakel, *De Industrialisatie van Nederland Gedurende de Periode der Marshallhulp* (The industrialisation of the Netherlands during the Marshall Aid period) (Leiden: Stenfort Kroese, 1954), 154.
20. Both tables are derived from J.C.H. Blom, "Jaren van Tucht en Ascese. Enige Beschouwingen Over de Stemming in Herrijzend Nederland (1945-1950", (Years of discipline and ascesis. Some considerations about the state of mind of the Resurrection of the Netherlands (1945-1950), in P.W. Klein and G.N. Van der Plaat *Herrijzend Nederland. Opstellen over Nederland in de periode 1945-1950* (s'Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1981), 142 and 130.
21. Bank, *Opkomst end Ondergang van de Nederlandse Volksbeweging (N.V.B.)* (Rise and fall of the Dutch National Movement [N.V.B.]) (Deventer: Van Loghem Slaterus, 1978), 20.
22. Quoted in M.J. Langeveld, *De Geestesgesteldheid van de Massajeugd* (The mental make-up of the mass youth) (s'Gravenhage: Staatsuitgeverij, 1952), ii.
23. *Ibid.*, 8.

24. N. Perquin, *Moderne Jeugd op haar weg naar Volwassenheid* (Modern Youth on its way to maturity) (s'Gravenhage: Staatsuitgeverij, 1953), 5.
25. Kohnstamm, Ons Onderwijs en de Ontwikkelingsmogelijkheden der Nederlandse Jeugd, (Our present-day education and possibilities for development of the Dutch youth), 1948, Central Archives of the Ministry of Education (C.A.B.), Section K.B.O., L.O 560-B.
26. Commissie Faber/Hennequin, *Ontwikkeling van het Technisch Onderwijs. eindrapport van de Werkcommissie* (Development of technical education. Final report of the committee) (s'Gravenhage: Staatsuitgeverij, 1956), 5.
27. See, for example, H. Kern and M. Schumann, *Industriearbeit und Arbeiterbewusstsein*, vol.1 (Frankfurt: Athenaum Fischer Verlag, 1971), 48.
28. Bernstein, 68.
29. Commissie Faber/Hennequin, 25.
30. M. Goote, "De Opleiding van Leerkrachten bij het Nijverheidsonderwijs en de Herorientiering van de thans om functie zijnde leraren" (The education of teachers for technical education and the re-orientation of the teachers which already work in technical education), in *Mededelingen van de Vereeniging van Directies van Nijverheidsscholen*, 215, (August 1952): 47.
31. Baudelot and Establet.

PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION, 1988, VOL. 10, NO. 1, 67 - 74

REVIEW ESSAY

The State of Pedagogics

Penny Enslin
University of the Witwatersrand

J. L. le R. Cilliers, *Education and the Child* (Durban: Butterworths, 1975), ISBN 409 09400 5.
C.G. de Vries, *Orientation in Fundamental Educational Theory* (Stellenbosch/Grahamstown: University Publishers & Booksellers, 1986), ISBN 0 86995 122 X.
E.G. Kruger, *Education - Past, Present and Future* (Pretoria: Euro Publications, 1986), ISBN O 620 10285 3.

South African teacher education remains deeply divided between two seemingly incommensurable sets of theoretical discourses. On the one hand the open universities offer a critical, oppositional discourse drawing on liberal and marxist perspectives. On the other hand remains the edifice of Pedagogics, often referred to by calling up its epistemological foundation, Fundamental Pedagogics. For those on the first-mentioned side of this great divide it is sobering to be reminded, in spite of claims that critiques of Fundamental Pedagogics are passe, or that Fundamental Pedagogics is on the retreat in some universities, that the majority of teachers in South Africa, and the vast majority of black teachers, continue to be products of faculties and colleges of education which offer Fundamental Pedagogics as the sole theoretical discourse through which to understand schooling in South Africa. The three books reviewed here each reflect aspects of the state of this discourse. Together they are symptomatic of the problems in underlying assumptions, methodology and self-depiction, which characterise Pedagogics.

Science and doctrine

De Vries's *Orientation in Fundamental Educational Theory* is an introduction to Educational Theory, a term De Vries prefers to Fundamental Pedagogics. As an introduction it is clear and generally quite readable, partly because the translation into English is unusually professional. I will focus this review on Section B, which is concerned with "Evaluation of Particular Educational Schools of Thought".

De Vries explains that as a scientist the pedagogician has two tasks. The first is to describe what is universally characteristic of education. But:

> It is always the personal life-view of the educator that provides the final and complete content in accordance with the specific situation in which he acts. Complete giving of content to universal educational essences is a specific matter and, as such, prescriptive, and therefore falls outside the limits of Educational Theory as the science of the phenomenon of education.[1]

The discipline of Educational Theory as a science is left behind when the pedagogician fills the universal structures of education "with specific content, implying norms and values, from his own personal world- and life-view, with the aim of establishing an educational doctrine for use in specific educational situations".[2]

The second task of the scientist is to test the content of specific educational doctrines against the universal structures of education to see whether they are pedagogically justified - grounded in the universal structures. An extension of this task is to test the content of specific educational situations, as shaped by specific educational doctrines or schools of thought. Distinguishing "what is pedagogically permissible and valuable from what is inadmissible and valueless"[3] is done on the basis of pedagogic criteria.

> When reference is made to the evaluation of an educational doctrine on the basis of pedagogic criteria, it means that the specific doctrine is judged in the light of pedagogic criteria, that is, fundamental pedagogic essences themselves, for if the essences do not figure in such a doctrine, one acts unpedagogically and children educated in this manner have their adulthood impaired. In the evaluation, distinction must be made between what belongs to the essential nature of education and what actually is only the propagation of a particular life-view.[4]

De Vries develops a pedagogic evaluation of several educational doctrines, of which I shall focus briefly on three, that is, the doctrines of liberalism, communism and Christianity. In offering a pedagogic evaluation of each doctrine and its accompanying "educational doctrine" De Vries describes its origin and characteristics, its anthropology, and its view of the nature and aim of education. He then evaluates it in terms of anthropological and pedagogic criteria. That the accuracy of his account of the evaluated doctrines is frequently doubtful is not my central observation in this analysis, but worth noting. For example, it is claimed that for the liberal "Since man is free **to choose what he wills**, he must also be allowed **to choose to do what he wills**".[5] (Emphases in original) This is a puzzling claim, given De Vries's citing of John Stuart Mill as one of the "chief representatives" of liberalism, and Mill's stipulation in *On Liberty* that the freedom of the individual may be interfered with if its exercise threatens harm to others. Marx, we are told, "defended the right of the proletariat (working class) against the oppressing capitalists. . . by the twisting of philosophical concepts to justify a world revolution...".[6]

These inaccuracies are not surprising, since no original sources are cited in the bibliography. One wonders whether such sources were consulted by the author, or whether he confined his research into the characteristics of these doctrines to the sources he cites, mostly works by South African authors, mainly written in Afrikaans.

But more important than these issues of accuracy is to note the formal function of De Vries's "evaluation". Liberalism and "communism" are found not to match his requirement of being pedagogically "founded", because they do not pass muster when he rates them against his anthropological and pedagogic criteria. Neither, for example, meets the anthropological criterion of religiosity, for the "liberalist" rejects the absolute authority of God and the communist allows no place for religion.[7]

The scientist should not despair, however, because there is one doctrine on which an educational system can be safely founded, and that is "Christianity". In this part of his account, De Vries breathes not a word of criticism, offering such scientific observations as:

> Because of the **child's nature** (emphasis in original) he is still dependent, in need of help and seeking help because he is incompetent, ignorant, unskilful, irresponsible and undisciplined... Because the child is not good by nature and as a fallen being is inclined to evil, he will not of his own accord find the way that leads to truth and persist on it.[8]

From these observations the author deduces the need for a Christian education. Christianity, as described by De Vries, succeeds in satisfying all of De Vries's anthropological and pedagogic criteria, for example the authority relationship as one of the "relational" pedagogic criteria:

> The Christian educator acknowledges that the child is conceived and born in sin and consequently is inclined to evil. He also knows that the child cannot be educated without authority, but acknowledges that God is the absolute authority and that all human authority is therefore only delegated authority.[9]

While De Vries erects a procedure for pedagogic evaluation which appears reasonable and careful, even scientific, we should not be taken in. For he indulges in a textbook example of the circular argument. The conclusion pedagogicians wish us to reach when evaluating educational doctrines is that Christian education is, unlike its competitors, pedagogically founded. The proof for this conclusion rests on the application of criteria which are themselves reflections of the Christian worldview. That De Vries begs the question may be concealed by the elaborate "scientific" procedures which make up the method of Fundamental Pedagogics. These procedures boil down to pedogogicians intuiting their own beliefs, which are paraded as if they were scientific findings **free** of such beliefs. The pity is that this sleight of hand may deceive some into accepting De Vries's conclusions and discarding rival "doctrines" capable of offering tools for critical reflection on education.

Desperately seeking guidance

The inclusion of J.L.le R. Cilliers's *Education and the Child* in this review calls for justification. This is not a recent publication. But the subject of childhood is topical, and comparisons with Burman and Reynolds's *Growing up in a Divided Society*[10] are inevitable. The publishers continue to promote Cilliers's book, and are considering a new edition. Events since 1976 have brought children increasingly to the fore as participants in the conflict which characterises South African society, not only as victims but also among those who resist the present social order.

As students, many of whom are by any account still children, take part in and organise resistance against apartheid schooling and its corresponding social order, the nature of childhood is a topic which must interest committed teachers. Both the publisher and the author are to be commended for their attempt in this book to lift the veil, as the author puts it in his preface:

> For the benefit of those parents, teachers and other educators who are truly interested in the development of the child by explaining what actually happens when a child is being educated, what the child experiences in his own particular environment, the relationship between authority, freedom and education, why there are so many differing educational theories and practices and finally why it is necessary to educate the child.

The question to ask of what follows is: What in effect is this "lifting of the veil"?[11] While Cilliers says little of the method of which his book is a product, this is undoubtedly a work out of the Fundamental Pedagogics stable. Given this, Cilliers lifts the veil on little more than his own received views on childhood, education, God,

authority and a variety of other topics. It is Cilliers's own unexamined assumptions which are of greater interest than the substance of his speculations on childhood.

There is much of the stock Fundamental Pedagogics position here: "Education is the deliberate, purposeful, systematic, planned and directional guidance by the mature person with the intention of forming or moulding the immature person".[12] While supplying us with this universal characterisation of the education of children, Cilliers, like all good scientists, is quick to emphasise that when it comes to filling in the particular content to this universal framework,

> Although the direction of the paths may not be the same in the philosophies of the Christian, Hindu, Moslem, democrat, communist, capitalist and pragmatist, each will try to steer the child in his care in the direction of his own particular philosophy of life.[13]

Here is the standard pedagogician's distinction between the task of the scientist and that of the pedagogue. One is never sure which hat Cilliers wishes to wear. One must assume that *Education and the Child* is the outcome of scientific practice, of radical reflection on the universal nature of the child. Yet it is easy to pick out frequent and obvious lapses from the requirements of the scientific method, for example where Cilliers assumes the theistic view of education and the child:

> Through education the child must not merely be guided to partial truth, beauty and goodness but must be guided to the comprehension of complete truth, beauty and goodness as exemplified by his God.[14]

And, exploring the concepts of maturity and immaturity:

> Which one of us would consider some of our long-haired, lice-infested and filthy demonstrators as mature people? Yet it is they who too often try to guide the whole nation to "maturity"...[15]

The uncertain status (universal or particular?) of Cilliers's assertions characterises much of his book. What is more, particularly in the final two chapters, his discussion switches endlessly back and forth from a series of unsubstantiated claims about human nature and the nature of the child to homilies about what teachers and parents **must** do. From such observations as "Experience shows that the parent's attitude to religion is an important factor in a child's upbringing. In a truly God-fearing household he soon senses that there is an existence beyond this one in which the adults are intensely interested",[16] Cilliers arrives at the conclusion that: "Religion must be seen as the influencing factor for all thoughts and actions of man during his life-span".[17]

In the course of these leaps across and beyond the rules of logical argument Cilliers paints for his reader a picture of society in which co-operation, harmony, concord and unity prevail. He assures us that authority is necessary "because of the necessity for unanimity in progressing towards a harmonious society".[18] Where such harmony breaks down, "Where conflict or friction between people is in evidence we may have a clear case of maladjustment".[19] Cilliers allows for resistance, but with qualification, suggesting of "the child" that

> He will, however, seldom offer overmuch opposition to authoritative guidance (for which he craves) if and when this guidance is given sympathetically. This opposition may be a good thing. Because evil is always present, even in the finest specimens of adulthood, there always is and will be a most real danger that the child, not knowing the right way, may be wilfully misled into a non-acceptable way-of-living. His resistance may enable him to take a positive stand against such evil influences.[20]

Legitimate resistance, then, is indeed resistance against evil influences, but beyond this resistance is of little interest to Cilliers. There is no further space in his view of the child for resistance, apart from that offered by the maladjusted, towards a particular social order. This is the crux of the problem of the content of Cilliers's musings on the child. For one wonders what Cilliers's book can possibly say to a teacher grappling with the nature of real children in many black schools in South Africa. What has gone wrong when children show signs of "maladjustment", resisting evil influences en masse? Could it be that the children live in a society to which adjustment is impossible, that evil is all around them, in all its institutions? Cilliers does not raise such possibilities. Perhaps they may not have been so obvious in the pre-1976 era in which Cilliers wrote. But in considering a new edition the publishers would do well to ponder these issues.

Cilliers's book is typical of the pedagogicians' lack of perspective on the realities of education in South Africa. This is borne out by the imaginary household which he fondly takes as an example to illustrate some of his thoughts on education and the child. Here is a family comprising Dad, Mom (who goes to formal dinners with Dad), Rian (who is untidy), Lorraine (who is tidy) and Hannes. The family has a lounge, access to newspapers (which Dad reads), and a car (which Dad drives).

Cilliers makes the common mistake of the pedagogician, purveying the particular as if it were the universal. He fails to note that many South African households lack fathers, lounges, cars, newspapers and formal dinners. Only studies which recognise that the features of childhood are to a large degree contextually determined, and contextually understandable, will offer something of value to teachers facing in their classrooms the realities of widely differing childhoods in South Africa.

One cannot leave this discussion of Cilliers's book without commenting on a feature which must also seriously affect teachers in training who read it. Cilliers offers no bibliography. He occasionally cites a reference, for example to Genesis, or to a certain Ballard's *The Changing School* (this author apparently lacks initials, a publisher and a date of publication.) Worse, Cilliers plagiarises R.S. Peters discussion on "authority".[21]
Referencing in the proper manner is part of the task of making it clear to students that a statement is not true by virtue of its appearing in print; the author's claims can be tested, in part by checking his references.

Practical history of education

Education - Past, Present and Future improves on some of the failings of *Education and the Child*, but ultimately fails to extricate itself from others. This work, by authors all members of the UNISA Department of History of Education, except for T.C. Bisschoff, Director of the Sebokeng campus of Vista University, is written in the hope that it will "enable our students to improve their communication with children and young people".[22]

The preface also tells us that History of Education comprises two parts, a theoretical component and a practical one. Two of the chapters purport to illustrate the theoretical component, and the remaining nine the practical. Taking this distinction at face value for the moment, I.S.J. Venter's opening chapter "History of education: Demarcation of field of research", is an informative introductory account of History of Education as perceived by pedagogicians. After briefly describing

Pedagogics or Theory of Education and its various part-disciplines the author offers the reader an account of what the discipline of History of Education involves.

> ...by way of historical-pedagogic investigation and reflection that which is timeless and unchanging in educational thought should be derived from educational ideas and practices which had existed in the past (and which had thus been subject to the process of change and transience) with a view to the enrichment, explanation and critical review of the existing education situation.[23]

The ensuing discussion of the historical-educational research method promises much from the later chapters which are to offer an illustration of the practical component of the discipline. The historical-educational researcher aims "at subjecting all procedures as well as the information obtained to as strict a critical review as possible".[24] What is more,

> ...the historical-educational researcher constantly strives to eliminate personal feelings, preferences and dislikes, emotions and preconceptions from his academic work. He resists the temptation to collect only those data which fits (sic) his hypothesis or frame of reference; he does not propagate specific points of view and attempts to test his hypothesis rather than prove it.[25]

This description is not always matched by what follows. I take Elsa G. Kruger's chapter, "The family and the school in a socio-pedagogic time perspective" as an example, and quote at length from a passage discussing the emancipation of family members, as illustrative of the breaking of Venter's rules for the good historico-educational researcher.

> The father figure is becoming less important, since the child often experiences the mother as the sole figure of authority and trust. The era of "women's lib" and concomitant absolutising of women's rights also contribute to this "dwarfing" of the father figure. In many cases the father has almost completely relinquished his position of authority. This change of roles gives rise to problems such as femininity amongst boys, homosexuality, rejection of authority, vandalism and violence, work-shyness and other divergences from accepted ways.[26]

No specific reference is offered to substantiate these claims; no studies are cited or evidence produced, although later in the same paragraph the author quotes Pistorius's claim in *Kind in ons Midde*[27] that the absent father makes orphans of his children. In the absence of appropriate attempts to substantiate, let alone question her various claims and assumptions about the father, it is obvious that Kruger breaks the rules established in Venter's chapter.

Later in this chapter Kruger makes a move reminiscent of Cilliers's style of argument. Discussing "Social Changes relating to the family and the school" in a section headed "Future Perspectives", she remarks:

> ... each parental couple **must** reflect on the place and task of the father as husband and head of the family. The father **must** regain his position as "priest" by leading his family in religious observances... The father **must** once more become a "minister" who can guide his children by way of his greater wisdom, richer experience and clear judgement. The authority of the father (his fatherliness) **must** be unequivocally restored in the current social set-up and time-spirit and he **must** be able to rely on the full support of his wife.[28] (emphases added)

Setting aside the logical problems in Kruger's argument, most obviously its undefended premises, we can only presume that these recommendations are part of the "practical" element of this and other chapters in this collection. It is striking that for many South African families Kruger's recommendation about the restoration of

the father is highly impractical. The policies that have shaped South African society and its schooling system since 1948 and before have forced many black households in the "homelands" to do without fathers for much of the time. Many urban black households are headed by single mothers. Restoring the father to the role Kruger cherishes for him is out of the question. Underlying the discussion is the problem of the very distinction between theory and practice. For the "practical" chapters, like the one in question, are theoretically more remarkable for their unexamined theoretical assumptions than the "theoretical" ones. The theory-practice distinction to which the authors subscribe is problematic in a number of ways and I will not explore them here. But it is theoretically naive to imply that practical chapters can be distinguished from theoretical ones, because all practice is underpinned by theoretical assumptions.

The structure of the chapter in question is shared by others in this collection. The pattern is to begin by positing an issue, for example the role of schools and parents in the education of the child. This is followed by an historical-pedagogical review which includes Greek, Roman, Jewish, early Christian, Medieval, Renaissance, Reformation and modern trends, with reference to some philosophers on the way. Out of this eventually emerge some "musts" which are offered as practical recommendations.

But most striking of all the problems in the chapter under discussion, and others, is the failure to include discussion of black education. The section on "Schools in the Republic of South Africa (1652 to the present)" omits black schools altogether.[29] So too does S.M. van Heerden's chapter on "The language and language-medium question in the development of education in South Africa", which focuses entirely on English and Afrikaans as mediums of instruction for whites. Kruger's concluding chapter, "Technical education in the Republic of South Africa" does offer brief discussion of technical education for blacks, "coloureds" and Indians. But the overwhelming emphasis in this collection is on white education, in both the choice of topics and the emphases in the discussion. The absence of a chapter on the events of 1976 and subsequent developments in black education is a serious and revealing omission. It is complemented by gaps in the references cited in the quite detailed bibliographies at the end of each chapter, where the authors reveal no apparent awareness of revisionist approaches to history of education, either abroad or at home. The collection fails to meet the expectation of critical review created by Venter's introductory chapter. Sadly, the authors will fail their students, many of whom must be black teachers, in offering them this collection as a prescribed text.

Black teachers in South Africa work in a schooling system which is at once a cornerstone of the apartheid system and a primary site of struggle against it. They find themselves located at a conjuncture within our society which makes them both individually vulnerable and, collectively, potentially vital agents in the process of transforming South Africa. For those who recognise the role which teachers can play in the struggle to liberate South Africa from the present order, the brand of theoretical discourse available to teachers in a phase of transition should be of some interest. On the evidence of the texts reviewed above, the dominant theoretical approach in teacher education in this country holds out little hope of fostering a discourse offering a language of critique and of possibility.[30]

Notes and References

1. C.G. de Vries, 116.
2. *Ibid.*, 116-117.
3. *Ibid.*, 121.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*, 155.
6. *Ibid.*, 165.
7. *Ibid.*, 159, 175.
8. *Ibid.*, 204.
9. *Ibid.*, 211.
10. S. Burman and P. Reynolds, (eds.), *Growing up in a Divided Society: The contexts of childhood in South Africa*:, (Johannesburg: Ravan press, 1986).
11. J.L. le R. Cilliers, Preface.
12. *Ibid.*, 36.
13. *Ibid.*, 38.
14. *Ibid.*, 54.
15. *Ibid.*, 23
16. *Ibid.*, 105.
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Ibid.*, 63.
19. Ibid., 62.
20. Ibid., 44.
21. Compare R.S. Peters, *Ethics and Education*, part 3, chapter 9 (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1966) and Cilliers, chapter 3. For example, Peters writes on page 238: "Authority' thus presupposes some sort of normative order that has to be promulgated, maintained, and perpetuated. Legislators, judges, umpires, colonels, policemen and priests are typical figures of authority. There are procedural rules which give such people the right to decide, promulgate, judge, order and pronounce. They are thus authorized to lay down what the substantive rules are, apply them to particular cases, enforce them or announce them publicly perhaps with the appropriate rituals. In other words the concept of authority would be unintelligible unless we first had the concept of following rules with the built-in notion that there are correct or incorrect ways of doing things". Cilliers writes on page 63: "Authority presupposes some kind of normative order that has to be promulgated, maintained and perpetuated by experts in each particular field. Legislators, judges, umpires, policemen, priests, teachers, prefects... are typical figures of authority and there are procedural rules which give them the right to decide, promulgate, judge, command, or to pronounce in their particular field of knowledge. They are thus authorized to lay down or interpret what the substantive rules are, apply them to particular cases, enforce them and announce them publicly. The concept of authority would be unintelligent (sic) unless one first had the concept of following rules with the built-in notion that there are correct and incorrect ways of acting".
22. E.G. Kruger, (ed.), Preface.
23. *Ibid.*, 4-5.
24. *Ibid.*, 8.
25. *Ibid.*, 9.
26. *Ibid.*, 70.
27. P. Pistorius, *Kind in ons Midde* (Cape Town: Tafelberg, 1976).
28. *Ibid.*, 87.
29. *Ibid.*, 77-86.
30. H.A. Giroux and R. Simon, "Curriculum Study and Cultural politics", *Journal of Education*, 166, 3 (1984).

PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION, 1988, VOL. 10, NO. 1, 75 - 83

REVIEW

"What is History?" A New Approach to History for Students, Workers and Communities

By THE HISTORY COMMISSION, Skotaville Educational Division, Johannesburg (1987). ISBN 0 947009 27 2. 102 pages.

The *What is History?* booklet draws heavily on the resource pack or kit method of teaching history formalized by the Schools' Council 13-16 History Project (SCHP) in Britain during the early 1970s. The debate over this approach since its inception indicates that a large number of active history teachers believe the approach is basically a Good Thing, even if more radical colleagues have problems with the SCHP's content. There are ongoing evaluations of the project which show that "pupils' conceptual development has been advanced by the course, although much depends on the teacher".[1] It is clear that SCHP materials, and many other similar packs, work well if adapted to pupils' needs by a good teacher working in a supportive context. The context will in fact dictate whether users of such material will become better critical and analytical thinkers than their peers who have been taught in a traditional way. So it is important that material like the *What is History?* booklet is not viewed or reviewed in isolation from its context.

Bearing this in mind, we offer our thoughts on the booklet as teachers involved in the development and testing of history materials for use in and outside state syllabi. The booklet provides a valuable starting point for the discussion of what sort of history "people's history" is, and how it should be taught. Perhaps this review can be seen as part of this discussion. We have looked at the booklet in the following way: First, we considered the way it tackles the question of historiography, how it encourages users to view the study of history. Secondly, we briefly analysed the activities in terms of the development of historical skills. And finally, we have considered the problems of the context in which this booklet might be used.

The booklet does a number of things which might surprise and excite people who have been subjected to textbook-based history. The introduction says that the booklet is not designed to cover particular areas of content; instead it uses certain historical events and people to explore how historians make history. The events chosen have an immediate and obvious appeal - "What happened on June 16"; "The 1946 Mineworkers' Strike"; "Nelson Mandela, the making of a people's hero"; although examples from areas outside South Africa could have given the booklet a broader perspective. The booklet gives the user a chance to work like an historian by giving him/her some of the raw materials of the historian's craft; documents, pictures, newspaper articles, etc. The booklet promises that subsequent publications will also present a wide variety of sources, which should encourage students to

"view all sources critically and discourage them from relying on one source, such as a school textbook".[2] The booklet does not attempt to fit in with any formal syllabus, but it does encourage users in the classroom to integrate some of the material into conventional history where possible. Users outside the classroom are freer to explore the booklet in its entirety.

It is quite useful to compare this booklet with the SCHP *What is History?* pack which also acts as an introduction to the SCHP course. Both packs emphasize that history is a construction based on the selection of evidence. They ask the user to work like a detective to construct the life history of a fictitious man, using clues found in documents from his life. The SCHP pack then moves on to two real historical mysteries: The Bronze age "Tollund Man", and Richard III and the princes in the Tower. The detective analogy is useful for a number of reasons: It is a lively and accessible way of presenting the process of selection of evidence, and it allows students to start to develop a wide range of historical skills while in "detective mode".

There has been some debate about the use of the detective analogy.[3] As with any analogy, this comparison is merely a starting point, and it is important that teachers and students get beyond the idea of the historian as detective, so as to confront the ways in which he/she is not like a detective. As the booklet warns, all historians have a point of view, affected by their own position in society. The booklet reminds us of E.H. Carr's caveat: "Study the historian before you study the facts". But this issue isn't really explored: After working through the booklet activities, the user might regard history as a series of conflicting opinions, and think that writing history is an individual, rather personal, endeavour. The booklet should explore the idea that there are different schools of history, each informed by a particular analysis of society. It is not easy to tackle such concepts on paper, but they are important for developing a disciplined approach to historical investigation and understanding. Andre Proctor and Peter Garlake have made a brave attempt to do so in their textbook *People Making History*.[4]

This raises the broader and rather thorny issue of what assumptions should shape "people's history". Is this type of history social history, nationalist history, socialist history, or just the Famous Five find out more about the 1946 mineworkers' strike? On what basis will source material for subsequent packs be selected? Within what parameters will users critically evaluate their material? These questions need to be widely debated.

Like the SCHP, the History Commission's booklet assumes that access to a wide range of sources, secondary and primary, will help students to develop a critical and questioning approach to these sources, and therefore to historical material in general. The booklet is vague about what it means by a critical approach, but includes "critical analysis" and "forming one's own conclusions" as components of this. It also refers to, but does not examine, "language skills". Implicit in the booklet is the idea that the development of historical skills, like ordering information, translating it from one form to another, comprehension, analysis, synthesis, is desirable. It is important to spell out these objectives in the study of history. Coltham and Fines's educational objectives for the teaching of history are still extremely useful in helping teachers to articulate what historical skills they want to teach, and to organise materials so that students do learn specific skills and get a cumulative overview of the process of studying history. Fines himself does not advocate the mechanistic use of objectives, but regards his outline as useful as a "checklist and a

map, for its intentions are to act as a jolt to memory, to orientate the user, not to provide a route or suggest a sequence".[5]

Skills development in the *What is History?* booklet is uneven and quite arbitrary. The Mofokeng mystery activity requires students to use quite a large number of skills, but is followed by some activities which are much simpler to tackle. Later, students have to compose a time line of Nelson Mandela's life after they have written a short biography. The Mofekeng mystery could have been more extensively used to begin to explore the nature of historical evidence and to begin to develop historical skills. Concentration on one topic initially could provide cohesion for the students' work, and give them an overview of the historical process, but this activity needs to be carefully structured. Where one topic - June 16 - is the basis for a number of activities, the activities are long and complex and repetitive, and require good basic reading and comprehension skills before students can begin to work with the material. For users whose home language is not English, this is a daunting task. The activities based on the 1946 mineworkers' strike are more carefully structured, and provide students with better signposts in approaching the issues.

Someone might argue that the proper use of group work could help students tackle tasks which appear to be too difficult for the individual. The booklet recommends that users work in groups because "we believe this is the most effective way to learn".[6] Group work promotes peer group discussion, the sharing and defining of ideas, and it takes the focus off the teacher/facilitator. The booklet doesn't raise the issue of assessment in this context, which needs to be considered. In fact the whole group work approach, which is foreign and threatening to many teachers using traditional methods, should be discussed in the workshop situation, perhaps along the lines of the workshops arranged by the *National Education Union of South Africa* (Johannesburg) last year.

Involving teachers and other users in the construction and discussion of materials is of the utmost importance. The SCHP reported in June 1987 that one of the main reasons the project material was not used, or hardly used, was that teachers did not fully understand its philosophy and approach.[7] For many teachers, the view of history contained in the pack's approach is alien, for historical theory is seldom taught in a meaningful way at university or at training college, and is actively denied by the textbook system. So teachers found it difficult to move away from a narrative approach to "concept led" teaching; and they battled to devise their own materials, appropriate the methodology, and develop new ways of assessing pupils. Many reverted to traditional teaching methods. In the SCHP this happened in spite of the fact that the project's packs all have separate teachers' guides.

Perhaps some of the difficulties we have raised about the booklet could be addressed by providing a separate teachers'/co-ordinators' pack. In this, the rationale behind the booklets as well as the activities themselves could be discussed. However it is clear that such teachers' aids could not do more than be signposts or springboards. At the same time teachers should be involved in the discussion and development of a philosophy of history education which should inform the future production of material and teaching practice. This philosophy should be part and parcel of the debate about people's history and people's education.

Workshop sessions will no doubt raise the practical problems of implementing this approach. Reports from Britain, Zambia, Nigeria and Zimbabwe indicate that teachers there face similar problems to our own. We have too few accessible texts

"view all sources critically and discourage them from relying on one source, such as a school textbook".[2] The booklet does not attempt to fit in with any formal syllabus, but it does encourage users in the classroom to integrate some of the material into conventional history where possible. Users outside the classroom are freer to explore the booklet in its entirety.

It is quite useful to compare this booklet with the SCHP *What is History?* pack which also acts as an introduction to the SCHP course. Both packs emphasize that history is a construction based on the selection of evidence. They ask the user to work like a detective to construct the life history of a fictitious man, using clues found in documents from his life. The SCHP pack then moves on to two real historical mysteries: The Bronze age "Tollund Man", and Richard III and the princes in the Tower. The detective analogy is useful for a number of reasons: It is a lively and accessible way of presenting the process of selection of evidence, and it allows students to start to develop a wide range of historical skills while in "detective mode".

There has been some debate about the use of the detective analogy.[3] As with any analogy, this comparison is merely a starting point, and it is important that teachers and students get beyond the idea of the historian as detective, so as to confront the ways in which he/she is not like a detective. As the booklet warns, all historians have a point of view, affected by their own position in society. The booklet reminds us of E.H. Carr's caveat: "Study the historian before you study the facts". But this issue isn't really explored: After working through the booklet activities, the user might regard history as a series of conflicting opinions, and think that writing history is an individual, rather personal, endeavour. The booklet should explore the idea that there are different schools of history, each informed by a particular analysis of society. It is not easy to tackle such concepts on paper, but they are important for developing a disciplined approach to historical investigation and understanding. Andre Proctor and Peter Garlake have made a brave attempt to do so in their textbook *People Making History*.[4]

This raises the broader and rather thorny issue of what assumptions should shape "people's history". Is this type of history social history, nationalist history, socialist history, or just the Famous Five find out more about the 1946 mineworkers' strike? On what basis will source material for subsequent packs be selected? Within what parameters will users critically evaluate their material? These questions need to be widely debated.

Like the SCHP, the History Commission's booklet assumes that access to a wide range of sources, secondary and primary, will help students to develop a critical and questioning approach to these sources, and therefore to historical material in general. The booklet is vague about what it means by a critical approach, but includes "critical analysis" and "forming one's own conclusions" as components of this. It also refers to, but does not examine, "language skills". Implicit in the booklet is the idea that the development of historical skills, like ordering information, translating it from one form to another, comprehension, analysis, synthesis, is desirable. It is important to spell out these objectives in the study of history. Coltham and Fines's educational objectives for the teaching of history are still extremely useful in helping teachers to articulate what historical skills they want to teach, and to organise materials so that students do learn specific skills and get a cumulative overview of the process of studying history. Fines himself does not advocate the mechanistic use of objectives, but regards his outline as useful as a "checklist and a

map, for its intentions are to act as a jolt to memory, to orientate the user, not to provide a route or suggest a sequence".[5]

Skills development in the *What is History?* booklet is uneven and quite arbitrary. The Mofokeng mystery activity requires students to use quite a large number of skills, but is followed by some activities which are much simpler to tackle. Later, students have to compose a time line of Nelson Mandela's life after they have written a short biography. The Mofekeng mystery could have been more extensively used to begin to explore the nature of historical evidence and to begin to develop historical skills. Concentration on one topic initially could provide cohesion for the students' work, and give them an overview of the historical process, but this activity needs to be carefully structured. Where one topic - June 16 - is the basis for a number of activities, the activities are long and complex and repetitive, and require good basic reading and comprehension skills before students can begin to work with the material. For users whose home language is not English, this is a daunting task. The activities based on the 1946 mineworkers' strike are more carefully structured, and provide students with better signposts in approaching the issues.

Someone might argue that the proper use of group work could help students tackle tasks which appear to be too difficult for the individual. The booklet recommends that users work in groups because "we believe this is the most effective way to learn".[6] Group work promotes peer group discussion, the sharing and defining of ideas, and it takes the focus off the teacher/facilitator. The booklet doesn't raise the issue of assessment in this context, which needs to be considered. In fact the whole group work approach, which is foreign and threatening to many teachers using traditional methods, should be discussed in the workshop situation, perhaps along the lines of the workshops arranged by the *National Education Union of South Africa* (Johannesburg) last year.

Involving teachers and other users in the construction and discussion of materials is of the utmost importance. The SCHP reported in June 1987 that one of the main reasons the project material was not used, or hardly used, was that teachers did not fully understand its philosophy and approach.[7] For many teachers, the view of history contained in the pack's approach is alien, for historical theory is seldom taught in a meaningful way at university or at training college, and is actively denied by the textbook system. So teachers found it difficult to move away from a narrative approach to "concept led" teaching; and they battled to devise their own materials, appropriate the methodology, and develop new ways of assessing pupils. Many reverted to traditional teaching methods. In the SCHP this happened in spite of the fact that the project's packs all have separate teachers' guides.

Perhaps some of the difficulties we have raised about the booklet could be addressed by providing a separate teachers'/co-ordinators' pack. In this, the rationale behind the booklets as well as the activities themselves could be discussed. However it is clear that such teachers' aids could not do more than be signposts or springboards. At the same time teachers should be involved in the discussion and development of a philosophy of history education which should inform the future production of material and teaching practice. This philosophy should be part and parcel of the debate about people's history and people's education.

Workshop sessions will no doubt raise the practical problems of implementing this approach. Reports from Britain, Zambia, Nigeria and Zimbabwe indicate that teachers there face similar problems to our own. We have too few accessible texts

which have academic integrity, and a shortage of documentary resource material collected in published form. Both these factors limit the creation of new material.

Very different audiences and language levels make the written components of resource packs difficult to assemble. But it is important to remember that heavy reliance on printed documents means that the history of women's activities, for example, is neglected or omitted.

Once resource packs reach teachers and users, large classes and poor facilities make group work and discussion of material very difficult. Overcrowded syllabi, even in post-colonial educational systems, make the use of packs a luxury. And so there may be strong teacher and student resistance to an approach which they see as inappropriate to their own circumstances.

Here, in South Africa, two additional factors constrain us. The first is that much of the material being produced, including the *What is History?* booklet, is aimed at a senior secondary level. At this stage there are far fewer students at school, and they are primarily concerned with certification. They see alternatives as a luxury, in the classroom context at any rate. Secondly, the National Education Crisis Committee (NECC), sponsor of the booklet, is seen as a threat by the state, which has clamped down on activities related to the discussion of alternatives to state education, and on the NECC itself. This of course limits the possibilities of workshopping the material.

In conclusion, it is important to see the *What is History?* booklet as work in progress. In 1986, the History Commission felt that it was necessary to produce material quickly, to respond to the demand for an alternative, "people's history". Some of the problems raised here may have resulted from the haste with which the booklet was produced. Now is the time to confront in greater depth the ideas and issues raised by *What is History?*

The History Materials Development Group
The South African Council For Higher Education, Johannesburg

Notes and References

1. Schools Council History Project, "News from the Schools Council History Project", *Teaching History, 27 (June 1980): 29.*
2. History Commission, 2.
3. J. Plowright, "Watching the Detectives", *Teaching History*, 35 (February 1983).
4. P. Garlake and A. Proctor, *People Making History* (Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House, 1985).
5. J. Fines, "Educational Objectives for History: Ten Years on", *Teaching History* 30, (June 1981): 8.
6. History Commission, 2.
7. Schools Council History Project, "Schools History Project: Some Responses", *Teaching History*, 48 (June 1987).

A Response to the History Materials Development Group

The following is a personal response and in no way represents the position of any organisation.

The preceeding critique of the *What is History?* booklet by the History Materials Development Group of the SACHED Trust is a useful opening to debate and discussion about the form and content of history education both in the present framework of schooling and in a future education system. In their conclusion the SACHED group mention that the book is work in progress. It was designed in response to a fairly urgent demand for alternative history material for senior secondary students in urban Department of Education and Training (DET) schools. Work began in November 1986 on a book which had to be ready by the following month in the hope that the material would be available by the opening of the 1987 school year early in January. The writers had limited time for careful and thorough preparation and revision of the material. Nevertheless this was not seen as a major disadvantage in that the book was not envisaged as a "final text", but as material which could provide a concrete starting point for discussion around appropriate methods and materials for the teaching of history. The design of the book was intended to look somewhat "rough" and unfinished to emphasise that it was, indeed, only a first draft.

The emphasis on senior secondary students was at the request of the NECC itself which at that time saw urban high schools as a focal point in the opening of the new school year. At the initial meetings at which the book was discussed by the History Commision the issue of primary education was raised but further discussion around primary school history education has not yet materialised. The Commission was aware of the problem of focussing on the top end of the high school, not least because of the high drop out rate in DET schools before junior secondary level. An attempt to meet the needs of younger students in some way led to the inclusion of an activity at the end of the book where older students are asked to think about how they might change the book to make it suitable for use with younger people. They are asked to select an activity and to present it to such a group.

I intend to focus in some detail on only two of the many useful points made by the SACHED group: First, the writers' understanding of the process by which critical thinking and a critical approach to the study of history might be developed; and secondly, to look at history teachers and this particular approach to history education which the SACHED group, probably correctly, characterise as "alien", "foreign" and "threatening".

Central to the writing of the book was the belief that the development of language is central to the development of conceptual thinking. The writers believe that a mastery of conceptual thinking together with a mastery of language develops critical thinking. Given that advanced critical thinking cannot take place without language and because thought is heavily dependent on language, an attempt was made to concentrate on providing students with opportunities to read, to write and to talk. The more students **use** language themselves, rather than copying the language of teachers and textbooks, the more literate and skilled they will become.

Those students who use a language "better" have usually had more opportunity to develop language through reading, writing and talking.

The writers of the *What is History?* booklet also believe that the most powerful form of critical language learning is collaborative or group learning. Central to collaborative learning is the opportunity for discussion of all kinds - the pooling of information, the sharing and exploration of perspectives, conjecture and refutation, the mutual adjustment of opinions and so on. Douglas Barnes calls this "exploratory talk" which, he says, is often incomplete, hypothetical, and directed not to making confident assertions but to exploring possible explanations as learners bring together old knowledge and new experiences.[1] In discussion the students will be **thinking** aloud. Their languaging and thinking are interdependent and strengthened by the community of learners. *What is History?* attempts to implement a process which enables students to develop reflexive and hypothetical modes of thought and to become the subjects of the learning process and not its passive objects. The students' language thus not only reflects their knowing but also causes their knowing. The emphasis on group learning represents, too, an attempt to develop democratic social relations in learning situations where learners are given real power to define the learning process. The emphasis is on students negotiating their own meanings, not passively taking on the teachers' meanings; of developing their own critical reading of history and of society.

What is History? attempts to break with the stereotype of history as it is taught in schools, as a collection of pre-existent, non-negotiable facts, to be transmitted, memorised and repeated in examinations. Instead, the book attempts to present history as a problem-solving discipline in which students use language to construct knowledge about the past from different kinds of evidence. The book attempts to involve students in developing an understanding and analysis of history that will counter the offical version of the school textbooks. SACHED's criticism that students might well end up thinking that history is merely a series of conflicting opinions and that writing history is a rather personal endeavour is important and could be met, perhaps, by the inclusion of an activity, after the Mofokeng mystery in which students work with and discuss extracts from Garlake and Proctor.[2] They would then have the opportunity to discuss the importance of studying history; they would have some understanding of the concept of history, and a further exercise of this sort would move on their thinking further to an understanding of the ideological nature of all history writing.

So the book attempts to develop conversational language skills, to develop critical reading of text, pictures, graphs, etc. and to develop expressive and transactional writing skills by providing examples of different kinds of writing about history. Frank Smith argues that we learn to write by reading; so students need to "read like writers". To learn to write history you must read history. "Everything", says Smith "points to the necessity of learning to write from what we read, as we read".[3]

The second issue I wish to discuss is that of history teachers. The SACHED group point out that teachers find it difficult to move from a narrative approach to conceptual teaching and that poor facilities make group work and discussion of material difficult. These are important issues. We need to remember that teachers even more than their students are the products of the curriculum content and processes of South African schooling. Research in other countries (cited by Sachs)[4] and others, suggests that teacher behaviour is learnt during one's own schooldays

and that this school experience is more significant than pre-service training in shaping how one teaches. Most history teachers in South African schools have experienced a school education dominated by teacher talk and the transmission of prescribed "knowledge". As school pupils they were mostly passive and inert, restricted to receiving, memorising, and regurgitating the official textbooks. By the end of ten or twelve years of schooling and a further two or three years of teacher training most history teachers will have internalised a particular understanding of teacher behaviour which they then act out in their own classrooms. Watson and Young's review of the evidence on teacher questioning found that teachers commonly ask as many as 50 000 questions a year, and their students as few as ten questions each. About 80% of teacher questions are likely to call for memory processes only.[5] Who, one might ask, is doing the cognitive work in the classrooms? Who, indeed, is becoming more literate - student or teacher? The kinds of language activities that would appear to promote thinking - asking questions, clarifying, expanding, evaluating, are systematically excluded from history classrooms by such teaching practices. Betsy Byars in her novel *The TV Kid* captures the "guessing" game that goes on in most classrooms:

> "Do you think he was just talking about one year passing?", the teacher went on. "Or do you think, Lennie, that the poet was seeing his whole life as a year, that he was seeing his whole life slipping past...?" "His whole life slipping past", the class chorused together. They had had this teacher so long that they could tell, just from the way she asked a question, what they were supposed to answer.[6]

We need to develop a learning process in which both students and teachers are critical agents in the act of knowing, to reject the dominant conception of teachers as technicians who implement materials and ideas produced elsewhere but who are not part of the process of conception themselves. We need to begin understanding teaching as intellectual labour. The writers of *What is History?* had hoped by including a range of materials and activities, that teachers would choose and adapt those which they felt best suited the needs of the particular students with whom they work. Perhaps in practice the range of activities is more confusing than empowering for teachers and the writers of the book would agree with the SACHED group that what is required is to begin a process of change involving teachers themselves in questioning their current practice and drawing up and supporting new definitions of practice. The Schools Council Project argues that "the key to effective curriculum development lies not so much in the production of materials as in the thinking and planning carried out by the teachers themselves".[7] Their experience has been that there is no real point in handing out materials unless teachers have thought their way towards how to use them. *What is History?* may be used to start such a process if teachers in a workshop situation are asked to work through some of the exercises themselves in order to experience the methodological approach.

This approach was used with a group of students in their final year of teacher training. The group spent some time working on the mystery of Mr T. Mofokeng and were asked at the end not only to comment on what they had learned about history from the activity but what they had learned about the **teaching** of history. In other words, both the social context (small groups) and the language and learning processes used by the student teachers were being emphasised for the "learners". They were being asked to make a connection between how they themselves used language as a tool for learning and how they viewed language use for their own stu-

dents in their classrooms. This is not to deny or de-emphasise developmental differences but to suggest that in the end we all learn in the same way and once teachers and student-teachers understand how they themselves develop their ability to think critically, they will be better placed to understand how to teach their own students.

Perhaps the process in the book needs to be make more explicit, not necessarily in the form of a separate guide for teachers, but integrated into the activities themselves. One approach I am presently attempting with history materials for the primary school is to outline what the writer believes about learning at the beginning of the booklet. I then go on to provide "information sheets" for teachers which will help teachers problematise the textbook content. Implicit in this provision of reading material is a view of teacher behaviour which suggests that good teachers are critical readers. Each activity in the booklet is preceeded by a statement of the purpose of that activity so that teacher and pupils, together, can assess what was learnt. The lesson procedure is then outlined in a number of steps. It is left to the teacher to select from a number of activities those which she regards as most useful for her particular class of pupils.

Given the important influence of one's own school experience on one's teacher behaviour these attempts at developing a different approach to history teaching may well influence some of the history teachers of the future. In a very real way teacher training begins in the classrooms now. Colin Biott provided the following anecdote to illustrate this point. A group of twelve students in their first term of a practical teaching skills component for a B.Ed Honours degree were analysing the processes of a discussion in which they had been involved. The analysis of one particular group member, Biott reports, was very impressive in that he seemed to have been able to conceptualise the features of the process as he saw it and to raise issues in a sophisticated manner. Afterwards this student said:

> Well, we used to do that at school when we were involved in the Schools Council Humanities Project. Someone used to come and interview us about the discussion and we used to analyse our lessons with the teacher. The same teacher used the same approach to analyse his A-level history lessons with us.

Biott goes on to argue that pupils who are being asked to share responsibility with their teachers for dialoguing about learning experiences and the teacher's role may have already acquired the disposition and the skills needed to become teachers of critical thinking. Different classroom practice now may begin to develop transformative history education tomorrow.

The SACHED article raises many other issues which have not been responded to here. It is hoped that both these articles on the *What is History?* booklet will initiate wider debate around the process and content of history education by students, their teachers, and those of us in universities committed to working with teachers to develop transformative and empowering teaching practices as part of the struggle for a democratic, non-racial and non-sexist education system.

Melanie Walker
University of Cape Town

Notes and References

1. D. Barnes, *From Communication to Curriculum* (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1976).
2. P. Garlake and A. Proctor, (eds.), *People Making History* (Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House, 1985).
3. F. Smith, *Reading Like a Writer* (Reading: Reading University Press, 1984).
4. J. Sachs, "The Constitution of Teachers' Knowledge: A Literature Review", *Discourse*, 7,2 (1987): 91.
5. K. Watson and B. Young, "Discourse for Learning in the Classroom", *Language Arts*, 63, 2 (1986).
6. B. Byars, *The TV Kid* (Harmondsworth: Puffin Books, 1979).
7. T. Goodson, "New Views of History - From Innovation to Implementation", in A. Dickinson and P.J. Lee, (eds.), *History Teaching and Historical Understanding* (London: Heineman, 1978).
8. C. Biott, "The Foundations of Classroom Action Research in Initial Teacher Training", *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 9, 2 (1983).

PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION, 1988, VOL. 10, NO. 1, 84 - 100

REPORT

"The People's History Workshop", University of the Witwatersrand, February 1987

The informal paper by Cynthia Kros which appears in this edition of *Perspectives in Education,* (as well as two papers by John Wright, and Carolyn Hamilton and Helen Webster which will appear in the November issue) were first given at the *People's History Workshop* in February 1987. This day-long session formed part of the triennial conference held by the History Workshop at Wits University and focused on the theory and practice of popularising history.[1]

The *People's History Workshop*, attended by academics, writers of popular history and teachers, reflected a shift of emphasis from the dominance of worker education in 1984, to alternative history for both children and adults three years later. Where textbook writing, school teaching and curriculum development had received short shrift in the previous Workshop, these now received thoughtful attention. Sessions on "Learning and teaching history", "The politics of popularising the precolonial past" and a panel discussion by representatives of unions and community organisations on "The politics of people's history" tried to address the crisis in school education. Presentations included visual extracts from a soon-to-be published alternative introduction to history.[2] Parallel workshops on "Write your own history" and the use of the visual in history attempted to balance discussion with practice on teaching methodology.

In the panel session, discussion centred around two main themes: the vital importance of "organisation before education" (from the unions), and a heated debate on the role of academics in popular history. The notion of "do-it-yourself" history was challenged. That way, argued one academic, lay the dangers of populist excesses.

These are on-going and unfinished debates. But clearly, popular or "people's" history is firmly on the agenda. While by no means a new craft - witness, as just one example, the vigorous existence of a "people's history" (or *volksgeskiedenis*) some three-quarters of a century ago[3] - it is only in recent years that academics have begun to take popular history seriously. There have been a number of influences on this process of professional participation in "people's history", and their effects have had some bearing on the themes taken up at both the 1984 and the 1987 History Workshops on popular or "people's" history.

The emergence and the rapid growth of the independent labour movement in the early 1970s has been a seminal influence on the recent drive to both radically reinterpret history and to make it accessible to working men and women. The late 1970s saw the production of various labour histories in several forms - in union newspapers, worker booklets, more substantial, glossy books, literacy magazines and grass-roots publications. In most cases, the writers had been trained, or greatly influenced, by the new school of radical historiography, which at the time was chal-

influenced, by the new school of radical historiography, which at the time was challenging the earlier, liberal paradigm which holds that apartheid is dysfunctional to modern industrial society. On the contrary, argued the radicals, the flourishing of apartheid was inextricably tied up with the development of capitalism and its accompanying class and national struggles, and they proceeded to demonstrate this to their readers.

While acknowledging the value of the radicals' intervention in popular history, John Wright, for example, took issue with their limited approach to the past.[4] For, in their concern to focus on the neglected area of the political economy of South Africa and the making of a black working class, pre-industrial history has been ignored, or at best given two-dimensional, static treatment. The careful work of the Africanist historians, who were deep in their various regional studies, were overlooked.[5] Discussions such as John Wright's will I believe, help to redress this balance.

Another important intellectual influence on popular history has been the focus on social history, the "hidden history" of the everyday lives of working men and women. Also known as "experimental history", it has sought to counter the perspective of the "Great Man" approach to history. Out of the careful, sensitive and detailed studies of the lives of ordinary people, has emerged the growing and fascinating craft of oral history. It is this pursuit of oral testimony of the individual as well as the examination of "popular memory", as Hamilton and Webster so suggestively demonstrated,[6] that can be used creatively in helping students and other members of the community themselves to reconstruct societies in precolonial times.

But the intellectual influences on popular history and worker education are only part of the picture. As important, has been the on-going educational crisis which came to a head with the tragedy of Soweto in 1976, and which has formed part of the mass mobilisation of the popular national movement. Out of this movement has emerged a call for "People's education for people's power", and for "people's history", as a counter to Bantu Education, and as a vision for an alternative education system. The challenge has raised crucial questions for education in general and, of course, for history too. Of central concern is the question of "people's", or as I prefer to call it, democratic education.

Bantu Education has taught every black adolescent one basic lesson - that the interpretation of history is a contested terrain. This is a reality of which the majority of white school students are unaware. In her paper, Cynthia Kros analysed the results of partial and distorted history teaching, and so demonstrates the importance of understanding just how deficient, and fundamentally **anti-intellectual**, has been the environment of white students. Clearly, it is not only the recipients of Bantu Education who have been the victims of the apartheid system.

She reminded us of the importance of holding on, in these transitional times, to a critical engagement in the study of history - of encouraging the development of the tools of research, selection and analytical skills, guarding against glib explanations or comfortable interpretions.

Kros's paper follows this report and provides a challenging counterpoint to the preceeding review of *What is History?*. The informal papers by Wright, and Hamilton and Webster are to be published in the November issue of this journal. These papers reflect some of the ongoing and perennial debates about popularizing history.

Popular history makes special demands. More than in any other craft, it is the audience that shapes the content. At the same time, there is the tension between the needs and expectations of the audiences (and there are several) and the ambiguous role of the writer/producer/intellectual (whether "organic" or relatively autonomous). What remains to be seen - and worked through - is whether this tension will continue to be a creative one.

Luli Callinicos
University of the Witwatersrand

Notes and References

1. Other papers presented were as follows: M. Gardiner, "The Possibilities of People's English for People's Power"; S. Krige, "History Textbook Writing"; Oral History Workshop, Grahamstown, "Towards a People's History of Grahamstown"; A. Mazel and P. Stewart, "Perpetual Poisoning of the Mind: A Consideration of the Treatment of the San and the Origins of South Africa's Black Population in South African School History Textbooks"; M. Thabane, "Africanist Historiography, Personal Reminiscences and Romanticisation of the Past"; R. Mason, "The Role of Archeology in Popular History"; and G. Bloch, "Teaching People's History: Some Reflections and Experiences".
2. The History Commission, *What is History?* (Johannesburg: Skotaville, 1987) (reviewed in this issue).
3. See, for example, I. Hofmeyer, "Popularising History: The Case of Gustav Preller", (paper presented at an African Studies Institute seminar, 10 August 1987).
4. J. Wright, "Popularising the Precolonial Past: Politics and Problems", *Perspectives in Education,* 10, 2 (November 1988), forthcoming.
5. Except for Bundy, major Africanists in the mid-seventies were still working on their theses. It was only at the previous Workshop in 1984 that Ravan Press launched the works of Beinart, Delius, Guy and Peires.
6. C. Hamilton and H. Webster, "Perspectives on the Production of Precolonial Education Materials", *Perspectives in Education* 10,2 (November 1988), forthcoming.

HISTORY WORKSHOP PAPER

The Making of Class: Beyond Model Curricula - A Preliminary Critique of the Presentation of History in South African Schools

In this paper I will argue that, although the formulation of new content in history curricula is an essential step in creating a more democratic education system, the importance of ensuring that students are also equipped with analytical skills should not be underestimated.

My argument is, essentially, that currently students are cut off from an understanding of how history is made. They are never really in a position to pose questions or to challenge the images which overwhelm them daily. Contemporary ideology shapes both the presentation of history and their reception of it. They are rendered passive and this must undermine their potential for meaninging ful democratic participation in their society.

My focus, although it does shift now and then, is on white students, since my experience and observations have, thus far, been centred in the "white" education system. But there are serious problems in "white" education which must also be redressed in the interests of a democratic South Africa.

I begin by making some remarks on the academic debate that has grown up about the nature of history as a discipline and the status of historical facts and I ask whether or not the academic views of what constitutes history are useful in the classroom. I go on to look at some samples of Standard Ten writing, which I believe illustrate how ill-equipped students are, in many cases, to analyse events and phenomena in history. I then suggest what some of the ramifications could be for students' ability to make sense of the world and to think and act autonomously. I conclude with a few tentative remarks on the necessity for giving a great deal of thought to planned programmes of study.

I was brought up short by one of my colleagues while working on a textbook in the *History Alive* series. After lengthy debate on how to present content, he turned to me and said: "But you do believe that there are facts. Of course you do!!" His remark forced me towards a major reconsideration of my position. Was my caution in dealing with facts mere lip-service to a decade of training in history methodology?

There are probably few academic historians who would consciously identify themselves with the German historian von Ranke's objectives of more than a century ago. In 1830 he wrote: "The task of the historian is simply to show how it really was".[1] There are many who would argue that historians do have moral obligations, or at least that they are morally accountable. But, besides that, the nineteenth century scientific optimism behind the idea that arduous fact-gathering would deliver the truth has faded somewhat.

Since the height of their nineteenth century complacency historians, when they have felt so inclined, since they are not characteristically partial to theorising about their occupation, have debated the nature of history and the status of facts.

In a witty and acute set of lectures delivered in the 1960s, the eminent historian E.H.Carr claimed that the best metaphor for historical facts was fish swimming about in a vast ocean, which the historian sets out to catch.[2] Carr meant to highlight the difference between all possible facts and the ones that historians select and, with a bit of light-hearted cynicism, he suggested that historians generally catch the facts they want.

Carr was intent on showing that the comfortable distinction that is often made between "facts" and "interpretation" does not hold. They are inseparable in that from the outset the historian's approach is determined by a range of factors which affect not only how he or she sees the facts, but also determines which facts will seem significant.

In evaluating the validity of Carr's observations it may help to consider the course of recent historiography on, for example, the Anglo-Zulu War of 1879. In the last few years D.R. Morris's classic *The Washing of the Spears* has been challenged by several progressive historians who have shifted the blame for the war from the compulsion of maturing Zulus to "wash their spears in blood" onto the shoulders of various British officials for whom Zululand was an insuperable obstacle to Confederation and the successful consolidation of capitalism in southern Africa. Lately, these historians have begun to argue about the responsibility of the individual officials and their precise relationship to British Colonial Secretary, Lord Carnarvon and his Confederation Scheme.[3]

What may be observed from this rapidly expanding debate? Some of the historians involved argue with great moral passion, which von Ranke, with his dry prescription, would have found distinctly distasteful. Jeff Guy, for example, writes: "The (Anglo-Zulu) war was ... a calculated attack by the most powerful nation in the world, made to bring about certain changes in the social and political order in southern Africa. The British army (was turned) into Zululand, letting loose on men, women and children thousands of professional soldiers... They caused the death of perhaps ten thousand people and brought chaos and suffering to the lives of hundreds of thousands of others, starting a process of subjugation and oppression which is with us today".[4]

Guy and his fellow historians are selective, not so much in their deliberate disregard of evidence, as in what they choose to highlight or to see as relevant to the Zulu case. They do write from readily identifiable moral and political viewpoints. But they are able to engage each other and their critics in a debate, which appears to move forward, (although it may take the occasional step backwards) casting a greater light on nineteenth century British imperialism in southern Africa and on the Zulu kingdom, as it does so.[5]

Academic historians understand the processes involved. Perhaps an archaeological parallel is not out of place here. Historians also have to sort the finds from the debris and to try to establish how the artefacts fit into the wider matrix. Sometimes, although the risks are incalculable, they allow for hypotheses, assumptions and educated leaps in the dark.

Social historian Natalie Zemon Davis has compiled a fascinating case study of the French peasant of the sixteenth century, who successfully impersonated the long

absent villager, Martin Guerre, for several years before being exposed.[6] She uses the case to explore some of the ways sixteenth century French peasants may have tried to "refashion" their lives within considerable social and economic constraints. As she recounts the story, she self-consciously reveals her modus operandi. She poses questions, hypothesises on possible answers, surveys the available evidence and selects the most probable scenario. It is a scenario which not only answers to her criteria of probability but it must also conform to her central thesis about how French peasants tried to remake their lives under difficult circumstances. In the epilogue she confides to the reader: "I think I have uncovered the true face of the past - or has Pansette (nick-name of the redoubtable impostor) done it once again?"[7]

History, like archaeology, has tangible artefacts - documents, records, interviews and so on, but they are never complete or self-sufficient and they are always perceptions of reality relayed by a witness. There are always gaps which the historian must fill in. One might argue that there are rules about what counts as legitimate evidence but, even so, there is always that air of uncertainty captured by Zemon Davis; that deep subconscious fear that the historian has been duped by the representatives of the past.

This is all very well for academic discussion. But what about teaching students? Do we send them into the intellectual maze, telling them they may never get out, or, at any rate, that all exits may only be illusions? Or do we adopt a different persona as teachers once we have left the seminar room behind us and simply hand out the latest version of "the truth" for student consumption?

A few months ago, historian Colin Bundy was quoted by *The Star* newspaper as saying: "History as taught in South African schools... not only distorts the past, but maims it. In content it is exclusive, elitist and shallow; it is silent or misleading on the historical experience of the majority of South Africans".[8] I think Bundy is entirely right to highlight the "silences" in South African school history - the fish that have got away, mostly through the deliberate negligence of the fishermen, to continue in the E.H. Carr vein. But the notion of "the past" suggested by Bundy in this particular instance has von Ranke overtones of a solid and tangible "past", which simply awaits discovery and revelation by a more conscientious set of historians.

I want to argue that the iniquities in our school history amount to more than the "silences" and distortions in South African history brought about by omissions or inaccuracies in content. It is the way students are taught to regard the past and the discipline of history which ensures that they are usually fundamentally passive recipients of so-called historical knowledge and that, even when they sense that something is wrong, they do not know how to raise an effective challenge.

For three years I have tried to give my own second year college students an overview of Anglo-Zulu historiography, culminating in a decisive refutation of *The Washing of the Spears.* Students have become incensed with the "wicked" British imperialists and, although most of them are white, I believe this represents quite genuine indignation. I have sensed a fairly close identification with Guy's passage quoted above.

Then I have shown the, by now rather worn, copy of the film *Zulu* made in 1963. Ironically, in this film, it is the British soldiers whose manhood is forged in battle. Its viewpoint is from within the tiny camp at Rorke's Drift faced with wave after wave of "savage" Zulu warriors. Last year the students were given a pre-film tutorial exer-

cise which warned them of the film's bias. The students quickly became intensely involved in the film and there was general cheering every time a Zulu warrior was slain. At the end of the film one student remarked ingenuously: "That's the kind of movie I like - with lots of action".

Afterwards, at the next lecture, I asked them: "Who did you side with in the film yesterday?" There was a general chorus of "The British!", and then a deep, shamed silence. One student then called out: "But they **made** us, they **made** us side with the British!"

I was alarmed by the mass transfer of allegiance effected by a third rate movie which had lasted a couple of hours after my carefully structured course of several weeks on the Anglo-Zulu War. The students had been confronted with two versions of "the past" and they had accepted each one with vigorous emotional identification although they were diametrically opposed to each other. They explained this by claiming that they had been co-erced.

At the end of one college year, an evaluation form from one of the second year students asserted that: "Ms. Kros indoctrinated us (about the Anglo-Zulu War) with facts and slides". There were indications both from this remark and that quoted above that the students felt themselves to have been manipulated either by the film or by my lectures. They were able to express some of their feelings of passivity and helplessness but they could not identify the mechanisms of manipulation, without substantial guidance and they were unable to make a real choice between the two versions of "the past" with which they had been presented.

In the case of the South African Broadcasting Corporation's (SABC) *Shaka Zulu* and the earlier epic on the 1922 mineworkers' strike, academic historians waxed eloquent about distortions but many non-academic viewers enjoyed the series and thought of them as "true". Critic Willie Currie talks about the positioning of the viewer on the side of the profligate Henry Fynn in *Shaka Zulu*, but the question of viewpoint does not occur to most of the viewers.[9] Historian Julian Cobbing questions the evidence *Shaka Zulu* was based on, calling the Fynn diaries "a series of fantasy articles" written some time after Shaka's death, which were subsequently moulded for specific political purposes. Cobbing throws the whole question of Shaka's existence into doubt by asking the cardinal question, "What evidence is there beyond the Fynn diaries?"

Cobbing provocatively suggests that Shaka was really a weak, ineffectual king, caught up in the process of change and re-orientation, at about the furthest remove from "the vengeful, brutal and ambitious despot" Currie describes being shown on SABC TV.[10] But, this is a debate conducted on the review pages of *The Weekly Mail*, whose own survey suggests a somewhat elite readership.[11]

Janine Walker, reviewer for *The Star*, cannot understand the objections that have been made by some academics to *Shaka Zulu* and, in this respect, her perception is probably representative of a large segment of white TV viewers. Furthermore, to prove her point that *Shaka Zulu* does not project "a predictably racist view", to use Currie's phrase, Walker insists that black children "play Shaka" in the street.

Most viewers are not in a position to detect bias, standpoint or ideological subtleties. For them historical veracity is an elaboration of costume or scenic detail. A domestic servant says, for example, "I don't believe *Shaka* because he was a Zulu and on TV he speaks English". *The Star's* reviewer for TV 2, on which Shaka did

speak Zulu, concentrates his criticism on the inaccuracies in "tribal" dress and marriage customs.

Willie Currie tries to demonstrate how reform ideology is expressed through *Shaka Zulu*, by presenting a case for Zulu co-option. Counterposed to the "advantages" of "reform", Currie argues, are the images of savagery and devastation, which are the familiar TV images of present day Africa.[12]

Even if Currie's analysis is a little too cosily conspiratorial and the intentions behind the creation of *Shaka Zulu* amounted to no more than the ambition to create a "Black *Dallas*", as one wit has put it, the effect (just as it is with the "white" *Dallas*) is to project a certain mythologised world, tailored to entertain the fantasies of people who believe that they are witnessing the real world on a more exalted level than they experience it, and who accept the fundamental moral framework of the world they are being shown.

Why are people so easily seduced by visual images, even when they are as cliche ridden or simply as "hammy" as *Shaka Zulu* or *Zulu*? This is probably an important question to pose, since it is in its visual form that most adults encounter "history".

Albert Speer, in his chilling and cathartic account of *The Slave State*, claims that Hitler himself would have failed if the "politically lukewarm intellectuals" (included in this term are the scientists, engineers and planners who participated in Hitler's economic programmes) had not made themselves available to him.[13] In trying to explain how it became possible for ordinary individuals to witness and even to enact great atrocities, Speer writes that "the moral sensitivity of the individual had gradually atrophied".[14] Perhaps we need to ask: How is "moral sensitivity" acquired and safeguarded against the kinds of ideological depredations alluded to above? Is it the responsibility of educators?

Italian marxist, Antonio Gramsci, in his reflections on education for democracy wrote, "Democracy, by definition ... must mean that every citizen can govern and that society places him, even if only abstractly in a general condition to achieve this".[15] I would like to pose this question: How can the teaching of history help to prepare students for genuine democratic participation?

In this next section I digress to a discussion of student treatment of the "world history" component of the present (1986) Standard Ten syllabus. Here, the content is less obviously objectionable than it is in the South African component. But I argue that inadequate analyses and a lack of historical understanding have debilitating effects on the way students think about the world, and on their ability to participate in a truly democratic society, on the level suggested by Gramsci.

My observations in this section are gleaned from a group of about 200 student examination essays. The pupils in question are mostly, although far from exclusively, white and they generally come from fairly well-off, middle class backgrounds. I would like to stress that, in my criticisms, I nowhere hold pupils, teachers or schools reponsible for defects in understanding and analysis. In many ways, given the considerable constraints they are working under, what the students have written represents a remarkable achievement.

The essays I discuss cover the following topics: Hitler's Rise to Power,The Origins of the Second World War, The Cold War in Europe.

Immediately apparent in the students' writings are the inroads that current government terminology has made. Beyond the terms lies a vast ideological hinterland. For example, various commentators have observed that the term "unrest" is

used in South African to neutralise descriptions of violence, to obfuscate the nature of events and, above all, to conceal the identity of the agency responsible for the "unrest". Students use the term "unrest" to describe Nazi fifth column activities in the Sudetenland immediately prior to Hitler's dismemberment of Czechoslovakia. The effect is the same as in the South African case. The sense of extensive violence, intimidation and corruption is glossed over. Students give no clear indication that they know what happened or who was really responsible. The same applies to discussions of pre-revolutionary Russia - Lenin comes to power on a wave of "unrest".

Probably the greatest casualty in the students' writings under review is "democracy", which is hardly surprising in a country where the concept of democracy has been so badly tampered with that many people (witness recent letters and phone-calls to *The Star)* are willing to accept the absurdity of an argument that severe repression of the press must be instituted to preserve press freedom.

The Weimar Republic which preceded Hitler's regime is frequently characterised as a "fragile democracy". "Democracy" in this context comes to assume an existence independent of people. Democracy is a machine which the people are required to master. The oft-cited phrase, "Democracy did not work!" reinforces this mechanistic impression and the implication is nearly always that it could not work. Its failure was somehow pre-determined. "The German people were not used to democracy", nearly every student goes on to say. The German people could not "work" democracy. The machine proved too complex for them and they harked back to their old ways. This perception proceeds, in some cases, directly from the textbooks in use at schools.

The textbook most commonly used in Private Schools makes the point that it was parliamentary experience which was lacking and suggests that it was the system of proportional representation which led to unwieldly party coalitions which were not conducive to democratic practice. But Breitenbach's is a dense analysis and it would be easy for the reader to carry away only the impression left by the sub-heading which is "Political Inexperience".[17]

A textbook written for English schools, although it subsequently goes on to qualify its statement, asserts under the subheading: "Weaknesses of the Republic", that "The Germans had no experience of living in a democracy".[18]

Perhaps surprisingly, A.N. Boyce's text, commonly used in English- speaking state schools, gives quite a clear and comprehensible account of how the economic depression affected each class in Germany, making them susceptible to the promises of National Socialism. But Boyce does talk of the "contagious ideas" of communism and manages to convey the impression that they were threatening enough to make National Socialism a preferable alternative, without saying how popular the communist party in Germany was. Later on Boyce writes a little carelessly of Weimar that "democracy was discredited".[19]

Nowhere are students asked to consider how "used" other people in Europe were to democracy (universal male suffrage was only granted in 1918 in England for example) or whether or not it is reasonable to suppose that it was the German people's unfamiliarity with democracy which accounted for the Weimar government's fragility. They are not directly confronted with the notion that parliamentary representative democracy might not be the highest form of democracy and that it may have constitutive flaws or limitations.

The arguments about Weimar are complex, "desperately" so according to the German historian, Golo Mann.[20] If we are to follow Mann's own analysis, we might say that the matric students have caught at part of the truth in their depiction of Weimar "democracy" as a concrete apparatus which existed independently of the people. Mann often uses the word "democracy" as a synonym for the doomed Weimar Republic but he is quite insistent, in his final analysis, that it was never a real democracy. Its government merely entrenched the power and privileges of landowners and employers, whereas the majority of Germans were workers. For Mann, Weimar's failure was bound up with the fact that it was not a democracy at all, but the feeble facsimile of the old monarchy, without even the advantage of a real king. There was no way, he argues, that constructed as it was, the Republic could withstand the economic and political crises of the late 1920s and early 1930s.

Mann's tendency to poetic allusion and stern moral judgements on the conditions of people's souls (Hitler's is unequivocally "black") is sometimes misleading. But it is important not to lose sight of the pervasive and profound analysis which snakes its way through his colourful text. In fact, much of his moral outrage proceeds directly from a careful and reasoned consideration of the events and the people who allowed Hitler to come to power.

In his moral vein, Mann talks of certain instincts such as "pan-German nationalism" and "anti-semitism", which may lie dormant at the bottom of a kind of national soul pool. But he is quite emphatic that it was not "the German soul" which brought Hitler to power as an embodiment of its longings, but a complex interplay of social, economic and individual circumstances. The richness of Mann's writing derives from his ability to generalise, to be sweepingly universal and yet to be able to pin-point the "forces of history" capable of activating dormant impulses or of twisting them into new shapes.

Students (and teachers) are served with the dregs of this kind of analysis so that their heads are filled with dangerous ideas of "impulses", and "national habits". Mann's point is that in Weimar Germany the people suffered because there was no real democracy, not because they found democracy too difficult to understand. But, the students hear only the insinuation that certain people (nations) are better suited to democracy than others.

Even more frightening, perhaps, but the obvious corollary to this manner of thinking about Weimar, is the way Hitler is frequently depicted, rising up out of the ruins of Weimar as "the strong man to save his country". One can detect what I call the "Rambo factor", partly inspired by film and TV dramas of the superhuman individual who takes on, not only the physical onslaught of his enemies but also the arsenal of the enemy's ideas and values. It is this factor which may be masquerading as the norm or the establishment. This is the theme of the conservative revolt in Reagan's America.

There are also parallels with contemporary politicians and notably with Ronald Reagan himself who is "Rambo" - not only because he has his own personal cowboy legacy but because he is still engaged in shoot-outs and "Star Wars" programmes. Hitler's and Reagan's economic policies are sometimes compared and then with approbation. This disturbing admiration is also the product of looking at political and economic policies in separate categories as suggested by the syllabus. There is no understanding of how "the political" and "the economic" might interact and influence each other and students are taught to judge economic policies, not by their morality,

but by their "success" within very narrow terms of reference. For example, rearmament which was an important aspect of Hitler's programme of industrial expansion, is often completely omitted in discussions of Hitler's "economic" policy, in favour of the splendid construction of "the unemployment problem". Almost universally missing from the students' analyses are suggestions that Nazi policies against women and Jews may have played their part in reducing the unemployment statistics.

In consideration of the Nazi state, students can give fairly comprehensive details which include the extension of rigid state control over education, and press censorship. There is rarely a flash of recognition, although to be fair, under the circumstances the students may have felt that it was inappropriate to express overt "political" opinions.[21]

There is no sense, except in a very few cases, that students really grasp the concept of totalitarianism, its material roots or its various manifestations. One may ask here if it is reasonable to expect a Standard Ten student to understand totalitarianism in this kind of comprehensive way. Some teachers think not. But it is worrying that students show themselves so absolutely unable to identify it.

There are signs that some students believe that a Nazi Germany minus the concentration camps would not have been morally objectionable. When I once stressed to my own matric students that any analysis of Nazi Germany ought to probe beyond a morbid fascination with the Death Camps to an understanding of the kind of society that tolerated them, it was I who was accused of being "fascist" and an "anti-semite".

No assertion is made here that twentieth century German history has deliberately been re-written to legitimate aspects of the South African state. The authors of some textbooks do not appear to have wrestled with the issues in the historiography. Boyce makes many references to standard works on the subjects he covers and sometimes poses questions that academic historians have asked. But these questions are almost always placed outside the text as supplementary material. The effect is to perpetuate the complacent distinction between "facts" and "interpretation", which means that the "interpretations" are probably discarded and the "facts" hungrily consumed. The contributors to the book edited by Breitenbach are by and large historians of high calibre themselves but the text is often difficult and its presentation sometimes very bland. Perhaps unwittingly, the authors of textbooks have created a situation in which questions are closed off and comparative analysis is not encouraged. Teachers may themselves lack adequate historical training and then there is the general cultural milieu which glorifies "Rambo"-Reagan and insists upon a fragmented political/economic approach.

In essays on the Second World War, a strong anti-appeasement line is taken by almost all the students, with active hostility displayed towards British prime minister Neville Chamberlain. At best, he is excused as a namby pamby, powerless in the face of evil genius. At worst, Chamberlain is portrayed as the real activator of Hitler's imperialist ambitions because of his insistence on "just doing nothing". Very few students cited the material limitations on Chamberlain, his electorate's war-weariness or the state of Britain's military resources, or even the distractions from Nazi Germany posed by Bolshevism. All of these points, except the last, are covered in Boyce's textbook and he uses the words of historian Martin Gilbert to suggest that our "hindsight" has made us judge Chamberlain too harshly. Yet, the

student analyses here concentrate, almost universally, on the individual, and it is the individual severed from her economic, political and ideological environment.

It is Chamberlain, not Hitler, who is the real villain and on whose shoulders responsibility for the outbreak of the Second World War is heaped. Chamberlain, the "playground paff" is ultimately more reprehensible than the bully boy. Does one read off this the insiduous effects of militarism on white South African society? Are these students really thinking, not of World War Two at all, but of taking up arms against "communists" or "terrorists", whom the students have come to understand must be checked by force before South Africa is swallowed up in the maws of Soviet imperialism?

It does not stop here. The cowardly Chamberlain is represented as an individual bereft of societal context, but paradoxically he is simultaneously represented as the personification of "Britain". Countries are homogenised and personalised so that students frequently substitute "Germany" for "Hitler" and "Britain" for "Chamberlain". Since students usually refer to these countries as "she" this kind of substitution can result in amusing gender confusion. "She (Germany/Hitler) is aggressive" or "She (Britain/Chamberlain) is selfish".

What emerges very strongly in the students' writing is the total failure to understand where power in society is located, to distinguish between those who have power and those who do not, (never mind about understanding the limitations on power and the niceties of class struggle). It is the kind of thinking that gives credence to the "anti-South African" rebuke delivered by government sources against the "rest of the world" or any of the government's critics. A letter writer to *The Star* responding favourably to increased censorship of the press states that she would be "patriotic" whatever the government.[22] While it is hard to believe that she would remain so steadfastly patriotic if the government in power were the African National Congress, her letter illustrates the common conflation of government-country-people that exists unchallenged in the minds of so many whites.

The Cold War is a vast and complex subject which has vexed the minds of some of the world's most competent intellectuals. The USA and the USSR are such multi-faceted entities that it is extraordinarily difficult to locate the source of power and decision-making, once one tries to penetrate the "military- industrial complex" rhetoric. And yet "communism" is such an old bogey in South Africa (it was used to discredit Bishop Colenso's championing of the Zulu cause in the 1880s) that it seems essential to provide students with some means of assessing the reality of "evil" communism.[23]

In the student answers the Cold War is frequently defined as "a clash of ideologies" (meaning "ideas"). These are elaborated as "capitalism" vs "communism". "Democracy" is sometimes used interchangably with "capitalism" but never with "communism". In most cases, the students may as well have written "good" vs "evil" or even "Luke Skywalker" vs "Darth Vadar". Boyce could very well be made to bear the brunt of this "good vs evil" moralising since this is what he has to say about the origins of the Cold War: "There was basically a conflict of irreconcilable ideologies. In the USA a liberal democracy, private capitalism and the pursuit of business profit flourish. The USSR is a totalitarian state, a one party state which forcibly suppresses all critics of its socialist policies".[24] But perhaps Boyce may plead in mitigation that he too has been a victim of the anti-communist paranoia that has enjoyed such a long reign in South Africa.

Many students did attempt to ascribe some motives to Stalin's post-second World War expansion into Eastern Europe, but overall there was the sense that communism insidiously crept over the face of beleaguered Europe. Interestingly enough, when it comes to the real evil of communism, it is not personalised. Stalin is not so much Darth Vadar as the embodiment of the dark force.

Common is the fatalistic phrase "an iron curtain **fell** (my emphasis) across Eastern Europe", which is, of course, culled from Winston Churchill's famous visionary speech of 1946.[25] Churchill, the anti-appeasement leader, is "democracy's" guru and guardian angel. His motives are never considered. He is not a politician but transcends the bonds of time and place.

In the discussion thus far I hope I have stressed that, in the student writings under discussion, there is a lack of analysis beyond simplistic racial/national typifications or descriptions of personality. The basic tools for historical understanding are absent - historical individuals are not contextualised within their specific periods and societies, which is why they so often slip their historical shackles and make their way into the present. Students are unable to identify political viewpoints, either of the historical actors themselves or of those who are telling their story. They do not know how to weigh up and evaluate reasons and causes or to determine the validity of evidence, or even to sense that evidence is necessary. Is it surprising that few people listen to Julian Cobbing's admonitions about taking the Fynn diaries too seriously? Or that even fewer will understand Willie Currie's points about how *Shaka Zulu* is played through the reform strategy filter?

Antonio Gramsci criticised the distinction between "sterile instruction" and "creative education" that was made by the architects of the educational reforms introduced in Italy in the early 1920s. Gramsci's objective was to expose the rhetoric about creativity and freedom as dangerously misleading and likely to reproduce class distinctions with a mass of skilled and unskilled workers on the one hand and the "lukewarm intellectuals", who would serve Fascism so well, on the other. Gramsci was criticising an educational system that took shape under Mussolini, but some of his caveats are well worth noting, as is the fact that he was ultimately concerned with the question of how intellectuals were to be provided from the working class. Gramsci wrote: "The new curriculum presupposes that formal logic is something you already possess when you think, but does not explain how it is to be acquired...".[26]

While Gramsci thought that many logical skills could be acquired through the painstaking study of Latin grammar, I would prefer to think that they can be taught in history courses. They are skills which I would argue can contribute to the students' ability to understand their society and to rise above their passive acceptance of the status quo. These remarks may appear to contradict those I have made above where I have cavilled at the students' haphazard mixtures of past and present. When I, in the company of much more illustrious historians and social theorists, argue for the "relevance" of history or make ambitious claims for the power of history to enlighten people about how their society works, I do not mean that we should rudely knock down the barriers between past and present. On the contrary, it helps our understanding of the present if we try to come to terms with the past as the past and to follow and critically examine the processes of both change and continuity. I have noted that in the student writings I scrutinised there are often curious chronological displacements. The students seem to have very little conception of

what life was like in the 1930s in Germany, for example, and I do not know if pasting a time-chart on the ceilings of South Africa's classrooms, as one inspector suggested, will really remedy this deficiency. I turn now to consider this aspect in more detail. If we return to a consideration of the dominant presentation of South African history, let us ask once again if it is the content that is so misleading and distorting? Of course it is, to a certain extent, but the real harm is done by the repression of questions, debate and opportunities for analysis.

The Kimberley Mine Museum might serve to illuminate this aspect of my argument. Here we might observe that it is not simply the absence of black representation in that city's history which is problematic. The old compound has not yet been resurrected alongside the quaint old curiosity shops and "the oldest house in Kimberley", but clay models have appeared as part of one of the exhibits, which suggest that blacks did much of the digging and other back-breaking manual work while the whites sorted the diamonds and supervised black workers. But how did blacks reach this point? Nowhere is that question posed or even suggested.

It is further displaced by chronological confusion. The clay models are of small production units, probably representative of the situation in the 1860s and '70s. They are surrounded by beautifully reproduced photographs on the walls from the 1890s. There is not a date to be seen anywhere or any suggestion of choronological development. Perhaps this is because such intrusions might diffuse the aesthetic impact. But, the effect is to deny the processes of development, change and social differentiation. The denial is so complete, precisely because questions of process and development do not occur to most of the museum's visitors.

It may be noted that working class whites are more or less denied a place in Kimberley's history too and even Barney Barnato's Company which was swallowed up by De Beers is hardly mentioned in the museum, even in the hall devoted to Barnato. He is represented, rather fondly and idiosyncratically, as the "Cockney" Jew who somehow made good and then fell over the side of a boat.[27]

The message is clear - In the beginning was De Beers! All questions of evolution are anathema. The Divine Order must be accepted in good faith and, just as with other fundamentalist religions, success in this case is guaranteed by the total ban on questions, especially those which relate to origins or social inequalities.

Denis Hirson's recent autobiography *The House Next Door to Africa* has a wonderful satirical account of how South African school history leaves a confused trail of Voortrekkers fecklessly "turning lions into shoes" and warring tribes in "an empty interior" in the minds of most students.

In one sentence the "tribes" are metamorphosed into mine-workers. "The marauding tribes, who are the cause of the Kaffir Wars and later become Natives and Bantu, line up for health inspection and go down to work in the mines".[28] Hirson puts his finger on what is wrong with South African school history. This is precisely the point. How did the tribesmen **become** workers? Or to go one step further: What are some of the explanations historians provide for the processes of proletarianisation? How and why were they accomplished?

Some individuals and representatives of organisations have called recently for histories of the African National Congress (ANC) or of the Pan African Congress (PAC) or of Sharpeville or June 1976. This call is completely understandable as a response to the stubborn silence that the South African school syllabuses have maintained on these subjects, although in the last few years some of the state ex-

aminers have relented to the extent of posing one or two one-word answer questions on the history of resistance in South Africa, for example: "The most important champion of rights for Indians in South Africa was..."[29]

But the ANC and the PAC and the long history of resistance in South Africa cannot be extracted from the processes of capitalist consolidation and the development of the state. It is not possible to understand how an organisation such as the ANC evolved or to evaluate its changing strategies without knowing about its historical antecedents as well as its social and political context. It is just as valuable to understand what the nature of the impact of resistance has been on the establishment of capitalism in South Africa and on the particular form that the state has come to assume. The "history from below" approach has begun to indicate how long, difficult and uneven the road to white supremacy in South Africa has been.

But school history tends to be concertined so viciously that it produces as monotonous and meaningless a melody as the undiscerning ear detects from the squash box playing "sakkie sakkie". The questions are omitted, there is no analysis; for many students there is no significance. Strains from the dominant culture waft through their minds. How do they challenge them? How are the melodies reworked, if indeed it is melody we are after?

History is elusive. It comes to us via a complex process of sifting, sorting and selective presentation. It is probably unwise to plunge students into all of its complexities at once, but they must begin to understand how history is made; that its conclusions are fluid and open to debate and that it is not the closed book represented by the ponderous textbook of any political persuasion or the false glamour and sensation of *Shaka Zulu*. They ought not, like my second year college students, still be asking me by this stage: "Can I write what I think happened or will you penalise me?", "How much will facts count in the exam?" or "But, what's the **right** answer?" This is not to say that they should not be asking the first and last questions, or even the middle one if they are sceptical about my "open minded" approach, but they should not be in a position where they have to defer to me as the ultimate authority on these matters.

Gramsci outlined a course for all students so that they could reach "scholastic maturity".[30] Gramsci meant much more than an abstract academic standard; he hoped to see students reach a position from which they could understand how their lives were governed and to be able to challenge the mechanisms of power. Gramsci's proposed programme was rigorous and may well have been influenced by personal suffering and the immense struggle he had for an education, as his translator suggests.[31] But several of his points are worth noting, including his observation that scholastic discipline is not innate, even the habit of sitting at a desk reading for hours at a stretch is learned and does not proceed from natural inclination. This vision is not that far removed from Vusi Khanyile who seemed to stress that the call for people's education was not for "academically inferior education" and who said: "People's education demands ultimate discipline, dedication and hard work".[32]

How do we ensure that students develop "a capacity for moral and intellectual creativity, autonomy and initiative", which is Gramsci's ideal for the "mature scholar"? He went so far as to argue that it is the student's "mastery of method" which finally enables him to make his own personal discovery of "truths" that others have come upon as well as "new truths".[33] This presupposes a course of intellectual development; some sort of planned learning process. If we accept this then the

teacher has to play an interventionist role, which does not mean that it is necessarily an authoritarian one. To argue for direction and active teaching does not, I think, automatically undermine democratic ideas. There are certainly many issues to thrash out in this arena but there are precedents in education literature.

I was struck by what a black Wits student said to me recently: "Bantu Education arrested our **development**. It deprived us of the **techniques**". (my emphases) That set me to thinking. Perhaps it is not that Bantu Education tried to teach people to despise their own history that is so terrible, but that it prevented them from knowing how to go about exposing the myths and fallacies which they knew to be there.

Cynthia Kros
Johannesburg College of Education

Notes and References

1. Von Ranke quoted in E.H. Carr, *What is History*, (London: Macmillan, 1961).
2. *Ibid.*, 23.
3. For example, Cope's criticisms of Etherington's thesis that Shepstone converted Carnarvon to his way of thinking; R. Cope, "Local Imperatives and Imperial Policy: The sources of Lord Carnarvon's South African Confederation Policy" (Paper presented at the African Studies Seminar, University of the Witwatersrand, 20 October 1986).
4. J Guy, "The Invasion of Zululand", Chapter 3, *The Destruction of the Zulu Kingdom*, (London: Longmans, 1979).
5. The "occasional step backwards" might refer to Cope's argument in which he accepted some part of older theories and disputed Etherington's ideas, (see note 3 above), notably on the grounds that Etherington had made a hypothetical leap and did not have evidence to support his view.
6. N.Z. Davis, *The Return of Martin Guerre* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985).
7. *Ibid.*, 125.
8. *The Star*, 8 December 1986.
9. *The Weekly Mail* (Johannesburg), 9 October to 16 October and 21 November to 27 November 1986.
10. Julian Cobbing in a letter published in *The Weekly Mail*, 7 November to 13 November 1986.
11. *The Weekly Mail* survey published in 9 October to 16 October 1986 noted that "two thirds of *The Mail*'s readers have a university degree and half of these have a post-graduate degree as well".
12. *The Weekly Mail*, 21 November to 27 November 1986.
13. A. Speer, *The Slave State: Heinrich Himmler's Masterplan for SS Supremacy* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1981), 5.
14. *Ibid.*, 7.
15. A. Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (London: Lawrence and Wishart), 1976.
16. By "constraints" I mean to refer to the present examination system, the "syllabus and textbooks fixation" that it breeds, the system of inspection and and the hierarchical structures both beyond and within schools, all of which need detailed analyses of their own.
17. J.J. Breitenbach, (ed.), *South Africa in the Modern World 1910-1970* (Pietermaritzburg: Shooter and Shuter, 1974), 78-9.
18. P. Lane, *Europe in the Twentieth Century* (London: Batford Press, 1978), 32.
19. A.N. Boyce, *Europe and South Africa, Part Two: A History for Standard 10* (Johannesburg: Juta, 1974), 46.
20. G. Mann, *The History of Germany Since 1789* (New York: Praeger, 1968).
21. Students are taught that it is inappropriate in history to express one's own personal "political" views; this might inhibit some observations about certain similarities between the German and South African states. It might be noted here that when comparisons between the Nazi states and the South African one have been made they are shallow and might easily be overturned by critics who simply assert

that in South Africa there is no policy of genocide. This is a difficult point and needs much discussion.

22. *The Star*, 13 December 1986.
23. *The Times of Natal* called Colenso "an agent of socialistic society".
24. Boyce, 99.
25. Churchill's famous "Iron Curtain" speech was delivered at a university in Missouri in 1946. He talked about the curtain "descending".
26. Gramsci, 42.
27. I owe these insights to Alan Mabin.
28. D. Hirson, *The House Next Door to Africa* (Cape Town and Johannesburg: Philip, 1986), 46-9.
29. National Senior Certificate, History Higher Grade, November 1985, 7.
30. Gramsci, 33.
31. See translator's notes for edition cited above.
32. *The Star*, 8 December 1986.
33. Gramsci, 33.

PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION, 1988, VOL. 10, NO. 1, 101 - 106

REPORT

"Kenton-on-the-Rocks": The Kenton Conference, Salt Rock, Natal, November 1987

Kenton as commentary

Kenton is the name for an annual conference with a unique and perversely enduring influence upon the life and times of the non-Afrikaner education debate in this country. Indeed, it has these days become the occasion for dramatic stagings of intellectual fashions and innovations within this debate. This leads some academics to treat each successive *Kenton* as a kind of collective oracle pronouncing upon the most fashionable discursive styles for the coming year. This construal unfortunately expresses more our hopes for guidance than a guided reality, but it touches upon a deep nerve of insecurity that snakes through the history of the *Kenton* conference and plugs into its origin.

Kenton was first convened in 1974 out of an overwhelming desire to escape the marsh of powerlessness and indirection that English speaking educationists had been floundering around in probably since the onslaught of apartheid education in 1953, and certainly since 1967 and the resegregation of the open universities. Progressively locked out of both the national policy debate and local administrative decision-making, the non-Afrikaner educationists were, and felt themselves to be, effectively peripheralised, ignored and silenced by the state, and indulgently left to get on with it. By the early 1970's, no-one outside of the academy knew what English educationists thought, and no-one cared- not the Afrikaner academics who were framing policy, not the state, and especially not the new wave of black activists who were positively eschewing anything white let alone English. In this comfortable claustrophobia the germ of *Kenton* grew and flourished.

Kenton 1974 was an intellectual haven constructed to foster a "community of shared concerns" in Peter Hunter's careful words.The haven soon came to include most non-Afrikaner English speaking and so-called black universities. With some exceptions, *Kenton* still bears the shape of that ethnic imprint today. It has also in one way or another remained a haven. Mogamed Ajam, relative new boy at *Kenton 1987*, could say with some eloquence that he found it "an oasis of relief and restoration of body and spirit in a rapidly expanding scrub land of discipline-specific gatherings". Such sentiments sustain not only the participants but the virtuality of *Kenton*. To deny *Kenton* its provenance in such sustenance would surely be uncharitable, particualarly given the unremitting abrasive realities of education in apartheid capitalist South Africa. But between 1974 and the middle of the 1980's much had also changed, and the "shared concerns" had become as much a point of contestation and confusion as they were of commonality and consolation.

True to form, the name "Kenton-on-the-Rocks" suggested a new round of felt-powerlessness, if leavened by gallow's humour, having this time as much to do with pervasive disillusionment about the relevance of conventional academia to the wider political struggle as to *Kenton*'s own particular trajectory. For the first time, educational activists came not only to visit and to pontificate but for some of the time to stay and participate. This was the highlight of the conference for many academics. For others, the activists represented implicit political interference in their academic priorities. Many construals of the activists' position that I overheard were overly crude, premature and uncharitable. To understand this at all I had to remind myself that *Kenton* was, to its regulars at any rate, academic turf; these activists, purveying a different authority, were distinctly, if guiltily, resented by some. Less easy to understand was the fact that *Kenton* represented unfamiliar terrain for the activists, and that their encounter with the subtle, barbed processes of authorisation and exclusion constituting *Kenton* would have to be uncomfortable at first despite the gentility of the activists in question.

Uncomfortable it was for new academics to *Kenton* too, incidentally: Many new people felt silenced and excluded by the seemingly arrogant conviviality that made the surface discourse of *Kenton* appear so easy, so urbane, so inacessible.

More disturbing than the spectre of political pressure for me was the premonition that academia, far from staggering under the yoke of the struggle, could, much more easily and insidiously, domesticate the activists and co-opt them into the academy's uniquely knowledge-driven view of politics. In this context, the importation of pukka (non- *Kenton*, non-education) academics into the conference was all the more notable for having passed, by contrast, completely unnoticed by most *Kenton* participants, so recognisably did they play the conference game. Evidently academic canons, however foreign, could be shared with far greater ease than explicitly political ones, however compatible.

Academic standards were high. In the first session Roy Williams attempted a sustained critique of the power processes of *Kenton*, a time-honoured tradition which was too abstract, too unfamiliar, and which came too early on in the conference. The lack of connection epitomized in many ways the intellectual's dilemma, if not that of a community of educationists in search of being regarded as relevant. The next day saw the first input by the activists in the form of a taxonomy of intellectuals. The anxiety amongst some of the academics to be seen to belong to one of the "correct" categories was not edifying. There followed a number of penetrating papers on the Natal situation with some double sessions splitting the flow of the emergent conversation. The consideration of farm schools by Johann Graaff was an acute analysis of a changing policy, a model of what educationists do best. Was this apparent to the activists? It was difficult to tell. Insofar as it wasn't, I suspect that the link between policy and strategy was not made explicit enough.

The afternoon saw historians Linda Chisholm and Peter Kallaway doing what they do best, exhaustively reconstructing the particularities of important byways of our educational past. Peter Kallaway explicitly tried to relate these lessons to people's education, but the 19th century was a long way away, in both time and political comparability, and in any case how could a strategically-pressed movement even hear the careful lessons that Kallaway had to give? Here was another version of the intellectual's dilemma, true, but it also signified the re-emergence of an old

Kenton commonality, the perennial anguish about how to make an impact on the wider educational scene, throwing us together once again in our powerlessness.

Sunday saw specific intitiatives at the universities of Natal, Wits and Cape Town trying to persuade their colleagues that they had found an answer to the political conundrum. This met with some sympathy and much skepticism. The achingly direct statements by the Natal student activists and a case study by Crispin Hemson that followed reminded us once again of our joint incapacity to intervene in the day-to-day brutality of the system.

Against the normal run of conferences, the final session on Monday morning struck and sustained a high note. The tangled threads of academia and politics, powerlessness and authority, commitment and autonomy, were blended in impressive ways in the formal papers by Jim Cochrane, Mastin Prinsloo and Richard Aitken as well as in the comments by Tony Saddington, Wally Morrow and especially Elda Lyster. And then the conference was over for another year.

Recollections in tranquility are not always accurate. *Kenton* as a conference engenders a strange intensity and a paradoxical sense of belonging out of all proportion to its ostensible relevance and contribution. It is a site for airing, exploring and combating commentaries; it is not a site for forging commitment, something that it is dreadfully easy to mock in this kind of forum.

In the end, it is more comfortable for academics and activists to stay on their own sides of the fence. It certainly makes for greater "hygienic clarity" in Michael Dale's icy phrase. The easy cut and thrust of *Kenton* might even encourage such discursively reinforced polarities and their endless permutations that we mistake so often for progress. Perhaps expectations have always been too high for *Kenton* . After all, it is not really a body equivalent or alternative to the *South African Association for the Advancement of Education.* But at this point in time, it's all there is, and that fact of our educational life itself requires commentary.

Joe Muller
University of the Witwatersrand

Kenton '87: Struggle as a site of education?

"Kenton-on-the-Rocks" was a tightly packed, long and demanding conference which turned in, at the end of its three days, an unexpectedly ambiguous judgement on the current position of education.

Constructed as a sequence of exchanges between education and the progressive left, it set out towards an assessment of current academic practice as it figures in the narrative of the struggle. Such journeys are neither easy-going, nor light, and at an early point the discussions took on a tone more generally found in courts of law or church synods. In the midst of the severe and earnest exhortations there was little space for the familiar ironies and irreverences of the *Kenton* scene. Jokes and witticisms were confined to silent posters on the wall or kept out of earshot at the bar or the beach.

In the generalised judicial style there was something routine, even ritualistic. The voice of the struggle gave its magisterial pronouncements on what would, and would not, do in education; and the petty vagabonds and layabouts (the academics) gave ready confessions and swore to lead the upright life.

Not that the bench was overly severe. At *Kenton '86* they had ruled that the choice must be made between the academic and the activist life (no fence sitters allowed), and as a result, had produced a not inconsiderable crisis. But at *Kenton '87* that decision was rescinded and the figure of the "academic activist" was held to be acceptable - even honourable. They went further, "Left Liberals" could be tolerated; but there were limits to even their liberality.

For their principal tasks the academics were instructed, in the resonant style of the synod, to study the examples of the community and worker organisations (the exemplary "mass-based democratic movement") and told to "go ye and do likewise" in your own community.

Under such firm guidance, academic practice had a hard time of it trying to show the capacity of its organisation and the resolution of its will. The Education Policy Units at Wits and Natal pressed the claim of new approaches to the university/community link. Not Habermas and mandarin theory, but Foucault, Dreyfuss, and the liberating cynicism of the masses; not intellectual charity for the needy but growth experiences for all. The more traditional extension programmes, ever ready to confess to flaw and weakness, sought saving virtues in special programmes for the struggle.

Once more the auditors from the community were generous and tolerant, taking the opportunity to do a little teaching and extension work themselves.

The upshot of this main theme (it might even be termed a text) was plain to all: The practices of education, in its character, functions, and significances, are to be defined through the terms of the struggle; and the identity, meaning and value of the work of individuals is to come out of approved, participatory, democratic relationships with approved organisations.

A central exchange (recalled from memory) ran like this:

Peter Kallaway (from the floor to the panel): "Well, I'm not sure what you make of the work I do. I mean I start where I think there is something interesting and important. No one else can really make that judgement. And I work away in my own patch until the work is, kind of, full blown and finished. And then I present it. I mean, I don't know what you make of that."

Spokesperson: "Oh yes - we appreciate that."

The due process of hearings, appeals and judgements occupied the front benches of the conference, but it was by no means all that was taking place. What had seemed at the outset to be "fringe" papers began, slowly, to construct another narrative about educational practice (another text?). Its starting point was not so much the progress of the struggle but the brute facts of the dominance of the state and its allies. *Kenton '86* had thought the road to the state was open, but *Kenton '87* took a long hard look, not only at specific roadblocks, but at the general mobilisation under the New Right.

In consequence people spent time looking for "spaces", forgotten or "released" areas in which work was possible. Rob Morrell argued for "reform" - a word excised from the vocabulary since at least 1985; Johan Graaff left the main roads and went into the farm schools; Blade Nzimande looked into the Inkatha curriculum and noted the distance between its vocabulary and that of the democratic movement. (Bill Freund wondered whether it could or should be appropriated by the left or whether it should be contested. "Can Shaka become a hero of the struggle?") The teacher organisations spoke of being caught between a struggle with their members and "the struggle" itself.

And then, seemingly out of nowhere, came the historians, Linda Chisholm and Peter Kallaway speaking in a long, hot, post- lunch session, of their researches into girls' reformatories and industrial schools for blacks. Freund, in a marvellously urbane and acute commentary, spoke of their contribution to "a richer history of the school", and, in a phrase, set the form of the counter-text of the conference.

The main text laid down the position of education-in-the-struggle; the counter text (of spaces and strategies and histories) built up an account of the struggle-in-education. The difference between the two was, as the deconstructionists have it, everything. What the historians framed was an understanding of the struggle as a long slow process of transformation working its way through multiple forms, multiple sites and multiple strategies, with unexpected significances and identities. It was different to the text of the swift, albeit painful, transition to a new world which "the struggle" had produced.

Everyone at *Kenton* owns the phrase "site of struggle" (so old now that it wasn't used once at Salt Rock) but what the twin texts showed us was the ambiguity at the centre of the terms. Does the site belong to education, or to the struggle? Who owns the property? Who defines the boundaries and who sets the practices? In the end *Kenton* wasn't sure.

Such quibbles may seem idle, not to say typically academic, but the issues are not trivial. On these recognitions turn the central questions of educational discourse. Such discourse is, of course, historically, socially and politically contextualised, but does that mean that educational practice is collapsed into political practice? Does one add one's educational weight to the pressure of events and act under the direction of the movement or does educational practice specify some goods, internal to itself, which cannot without violence be given up to political practice? Are we working for a "richer history of the school" or for a stronger organisation of the front lines?

The final morning produced two sharp counterpoints to the themes which had constructed themselves. Richard Aitken's exploration of the relations between powerlessness, articulacy and education, through the text of an individual student

letter, added deeper resonances and dimensions to both the political and the educational struggle, showing (to my mind) the impossibilities of conflating or of separating them. And Mastin Prinsloo, with a deft comment from Elda Lyster, showed just how the perspectives of history change one's attachments to the struggle - because they reshape who the activists are and what it is that they do. Yesterday's hallowed proponent of front-line action, Paulo Freire, turned under Prinsloo's analysis into the half-conscious exponent of North American modernisation ideology. Worse still, in Lyster's comment, he became a monologuing banker. History, it seems, reconstructs the front line, year by year, always. Kallaways's throwaway lines on C.T. Loram made the point the other way round: A dangerous radical to the Natal colonists, a father of Bantu Education to his later historians. For a moment it began to seem as if "the struggle" might be an episode in the modernization drama, rather than the other way round.

Kenton '86, after its own internal struggle, decided to stay (at least while it was still on-the-Jukskei) inside its own "discursive space" and refused to "issue a statement" on the struggle. *Kenton '87* worked hard at the business of strategic planning for education-in-the-struggle but left the rocks with more sense of the long-term forms of the struggle in education than clear plans for the front line.

Tony Morphet
University of Cape Town

PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION, VOL. 10, NO. 1, 107 - 114

REVIEW

Adult Education and Socialist Pedagogy.

By FRANK YOUNGMAN, Radical Forum on Adult Education Series, Jo Campling (ed.), Croom Helm, London (1986). ISBN 0 7099 2911 0. 273 pages.

The revival of Marxist scholarship in the past two decades, and particularly the critical insights into education which its many strands have been able to provide, has taught us much about schooling, cultural processes and socialization. But there are two great absences which the tradition, at least in its mainstream, English-language productions, has failed by and large to engage: First, there is the level of the actual processes of human learning, which is concerned with essentially psychological problems within the processes of teaching and learning. In the absence of an available and rigorous Marxist psychology of education, this domain has long been colonised and conceptually regulated by the non-dialectical, non-materialist mainstream of western psychology. Secondly, there is the question of the theoretical integration of such process questions in education with the major insights, whether structuralist, culturalist or both, that contemporary Marxism offers the education terrain.

The major importance of Frank Youngman's book is the extremely systematic and politically committed contribution it makes to the removal of these absences. It is the first work I have come across which engages the problems of pedagogy from first principles within a rigorous Marxist framework. It is painstakingly argued, largely within a classical dialectical materialist problematic, and must become a central reference point and text for scholars, educators and activists who grapple continuously with the educational tasks of socialist struggle.

One particular audience must read this book: Educational psychologists who, by virtue of the relative theoretical isolation of their discipline struggle to contextualise a focused concern with the learner in socio-political structures and practices, will find here many starting points for the rigorous elaboration of Marxist psychological insights.

Prospective readers should not be misled by the book's seemingly specialised concern with the education of adults. *Adult Education and Socialist Pedagogy* is a curious title. Working on the terrain that it does, it contributes to the resolution of **general** problems in education and Marxist educational theory. At various points in the text, one gets the sense that Youngman adds artificial comments on adult education only because he is perhaps writing a dissertation for an adult education degree, or he is constrained by the overall title of Jo Campling's series. Despite its title, despite major concerns that it has with adult literacy teaching or case studies in adult education, its theoretical impact is not really only nor indeed centrally about

adult education, although it has a massive contribution to offer there. Rather, Youngman's argument must be read as having an overall relevance for education, as applicable to the general questions of pre-school education as it is to the education of adults.

The argument can be divided into three parts. In the first half of the book (Chapters 1-3), Youngman is concerned to develop nine principles that he argues are central to a Marxist approach to (adult) education. Chapters 4 and 5 then bring these principles to bear in critique of major pedagogical approaches in psychological theory and of Paulo Freire's pedagogy. The final substantive chapter (Chapter 6) attempts to develop Youngman's own positive theorisation of adult pedagogy.

The development of Youngman's nine principles of Marxist pedagogy is the strongest part of the book. Chapter 1 first argues the undesirability of exclusively structural or cultural approaches to schooling in society, and advances Marxism as an endeavor to overcome these tendencies:

> it is undeniable that achieving a comprehensive exposition of the dialectical unity of the structural and the cultural, the objective and the subjective, is a long-standing problem within the Marxist tradition. Nevertheless, it remains a central goal...[1]

This commitment leads to a comprehensive overview of the elements of the political economy of education, based on concepts that Youngman regards as fundamental to a Marxist analysis. A strong commitment to a classical Marxist position is apparent in the treatment of modes and forces of production, class, the state, imperialism, and the base-superstructure metaphor, although there is some confusion in Youngman's treatment of this metaphor in the book: In this chapter, he is insistent that education is firmly located within the superstructure of society, while later in the book he approves of Raymond Williams's suggestion that the ideological terrain must be seen to be entailed within the **social** relations of production contained within the base. The role of education in society is then contextualised within this political economy, and the place of education within socialist struggle against capitalism is established.

The next chapter develops the less familiar Marxist terrain of learning. Through an exposition of Marx and Engels' dialectical materialist epistemology and philosophy of mind, the concept of praxis ("human activity and creativity in the processes of historical development"),[2] is established as the distinctive element in Marxist approaches to learning. Accounts of human nature, ideology and ideological struggle, fetishism and alienation, as they have been conceived in the classical Marxist tradition, then further consolidate Youngman's argument that learning, or the transformation of consciousness, is embedded in social praxis. Gramsci's concept of hegemony is employed to complete this section of the argument. Learning and teaching are firmly established by Youngman as social activities which must entail active struggle in the "war of position" against capitalist domination.

Now it needs to be said that the chapter thus far suffers from an apparent unwillingness to engage with more recent, and perhaps less classical, Marxist writing on ideology, hegemony and education (it does mention Althusser, but far too cursorily). Youngman's careful and systematic argument does provide a solid weight to his claims, of that there is no doubt, but one is left with a sense of the absence of very rich contemporary Marxist debates in the field Youngman is tackling here.

A consideration of Soviet psychology completes the concerns of Chapter 2. It is one of the ironies of Soviet scholarship that, while its political, economic and

sociological contributions have not been as innovative as western Marxist productions, in the field of psychology, it is Soviet theorists such as Pavlov, Vygotskii, Luria and Leontiev who have produced a much more exciting and innovative Marxist psychology than anything the west has to offer (particularly with regard to neuropsychology and developmental psychology). Youngman draws on these theorists to argue convincingly that the skills and cognitive capacities of people are never fixed, but can be actively developed and transformed in the context of social transformation. His conclusion that cognitive activity is of social origin rounds off nicely the Marxist account of learning and development he has offered in this chapter. But, in the light of his major concern with the process of education, there is a strange and inexplicable omission. Vygotskii's concept of the **zone of proximal development** posits the existence of a terrain of dialogue, bounded by the material conditions of a learner's cognitive activity, within which meaningful teaching occurs. Youngman, in failing to incorporate this concept in his argument, has missed perhaps the most crucial contribution that Soviet psychology can make to the concerns of *Adult Education and Socialist Pedagogy*.

This section of the argument culminates in the nine principles of a Marxist approach to (adult) education which Youngman offers in Chapter 3. He derives them carefully from his earlier arguments on Marxist political economy, philosophy and psychology, and they are indeed a major conceptual contribution to Marxist praxis in education. They are worth summarising here:[3]

Principle One: "Marxist materialism is dialectical and historical ... hence ... human mental behaviour is ... distinguished by its social and cultural nature".

Principle Two: "... people have an immense capacity for learning. Intelligence is not a static innate characteristic".

Principle Three: Human cognition originates in social relations, which are external and "mediated by mental tools, especially language...".

Principle Four: "The mode of production and its accompanying social relationships are the context in which consciousness is formed".

Principle Five: Changes in the conditions of life (especially the mode of production) can transform cognition and consciousness, that is, "both the content and the form of thought".

Principle Six: "The specific determinant of consciousness is praxis ... thus people are the conscious agents of social change within the constraints of historically constructed objective conditions".

Principle Seven: "Knowledge is a social product". Thus, ideas and beliefs arise out of activity and struggle.

Principle Eight: Challenging hegemony is a practical task: "Transformation of consciousness requires both a change in ideas and a change in the conditions which produce these ideas".

Principle Nine: Intellectuals have an educational role to play in helping dominated classes develop counter-hegemonic struggles.

Youngman thus sets out a clear theoretical conception of what would constitute a Marxist pedagogy. The chapter is an important contribution to be considered, elaborated and debated within future Marxist theorisations of teaching and learning. As a culmination of the first half of the book it constitutes in my view the most important contribution that *Adult Education and Socialist Pedagogy* makes to educational theory.

Chapter 4 brings these principles to bear on "orthodox" pedagogical approaches derived from mainstream psychology, namely behaviourism, humanistic psychology and American cognitive psychology. While the critique offered in each case is incisive, involving a statement of how each approach is, despite appearances, incompatible with Marxism, the chapter is nonetheless disappointing. It fails to go substantially beyond the well-worn and very general criticisms that "radical psychologists" usually trot out against mainstream educational psychology. Precisely how, say, behaviourism or Bruner's cognitive psychology undermines socialist struggle in education (as is implied) is not carefully analysed. Hence, the chapter ends up by providing only a few polemic pointers rather than the systematic critique of orthodox educational psychology which Youngman's approach must entail.

Youngman then proceeds into a careful analysis of the strengths and weaknesses, vis-a-vis Marxist theory and political practice, of the work of Paulo Freire in adult literacy teaching. He paints a vivid picture of Freire's ambiguous relationship to Marxism and to socialist struggles, which he locates in Freire's idealist conceptions of democracy and social change. At the same time, he shows how Freire's pedagogy, as it developed in his writings, increasingly embodied the rigorous Marxist pedagogical principles which Youngman has set out earlier and which must be a central reference point for Marxist educationists. In the end, argues Youngman, Freire is trapped in an inability or an unwillingness to recognise and to confront, educationally speaking, the ideological construction of the common-sense of a working-class or a peasantry:

> My argument is that there is a populist and liberal element in Freire's thinking that pulls him towards an uncritical faith in 'the people' and makes him ambivalent about saying outright that educators can have theoretical understanding superior to that of the learners and which is, in fact, the indispensable condition of the development of critical consciousness.[4]

We are left with a critical but sympathetic Marxist reading of Freire, which clearly points to Freire's potential for informing a Marxist pedagogy, but also makes apparent his weaknesses in this regard.

The final chapter does not seek to do more than flesh out a conception of socialist pedagogy for future elaboration and debate, and as such it might disappoint. Youngman draws together the strands of his previous arguments, and sets out a clear and complex set of criteria for what might constitute a properly socialist pedagogy:

1. The starting point of learning must be the everyday experience and problems of students.
2. The forms of language used in teaching must not be divorced from the wider so cial processes of domination and subordination.
3. Collective social relations must structure teaching and learning.
4. Teaching techniques, which are not in themselves guarantees of anti-authoritarian praxis, must be judged against the purpose, nature and social context of the knowledge they must convey.
5. Evaluation must be diagnostic, collective and educational in its own right.
6. Teaching and learning must be contextualised in production and political action.

Not that these criteria are necessarily new, but Youngman derives them carefully from his arguments earlier in the book, and therefore manages to give them a substance which they do not always have elsewhere.

The final part of the chapter sets three case studies of adult education which, for Youngman, demonstrate the socialist pedagogical principles which he has developed and argued for in the book. Drawn from China, Portugal and Kenya, they constitute a disappointing conclusion to the book. This is not to say that the historical instances are not exemplars of socialist pedagogy, but rather that Youngman's presentation of them, perhaps for reasons of space, is no more than piecemeal history. The nine principles advanced earlier operate as a kind of checklist to determine what should be included in these accounts, and the case studies are weakened as a result. Perhaps Youngman would have done better to have elaborated only one, and more fully, in order to demonstrate his arguments in relation to concrete historical struggles in education.

While on the subject of concrete historical struggles, there is a disappointing lack for South African, and indeed any African, readers. The national question in Marxism and the question of national democratic struggles and their relationship to socialist objectives are not broached at all by Youngman. As a Marxist theorist and educationist embedded in the events, politics and social context of Gaberone in the 1980s, he exhibits a puzzling, almost ironic, gap in his theory, no matter what his position on national democratic struggle might be.

Another irony, although this time not of Youngman's making: *Adult Education and Socialist Pedagogy* retails in excess of R80.00 in South African bookshops!

But these quibbles aside, Youngman's book makes a major contribution to the Marxist theorisation of process questions in education, and it must be prescribed reading for serious students of educational and social transformation in South Africa.

Ian Moll
University of the Witwatersrand

Notes and References

1. F. Youngman, *Adult Education and Socialist Pedagogy* (London: Croom Helm, 1986), 10.
2. *Ibid.*, 55.
3. The nine principles are drawn from *ibid.*, 95 - 97.
4. *Ibid.*, 179.

REVIEW

Adult Education and Socialist Pedagogy

In the last decade of political mobilisation in South Africa, several educational programmes have developed in order to support and assist the organised opposition in its struggle against apartheid. Various worker education and literacy teaching programmes exist today and are run either by the trade union and grass roots organisations or by independent educational institutions and agencies. This development has thrown to the fore important questions as to the nature, role and organisational form that such progressive non formal education programmes should take. The debate is still fresh and new and tends to revolve around the potential and limitations of formal education in the struggle against capitalism. Yet, adult education is very peculiar and different from formal education and calls for a more specific analysis altogether.

Youngman's book written from Botswana, and published in England as part of a series on "Radical Adult Education" is one of the first serious and systematic attempts to address this question of how adult education can contribute to the revolutionary socialist transformation of society. By attempting to develop a coherent socialist pedagogy within adult education Youngman's book fills an important gap in the Marxist literature which, up to now, has been remarkably thin on the theory and practice of socialist pedagogy.

Youngman's book stands as a very accessible, simple and comprehensive textbook that all those concerned with adult education should read and absorb. The book covers interesting ground by giving the reader an introductory presentation of the basic issues and concepts of Marxist philosophy, social theory and psychology in order to formulate a socialist pedagogy that is consonant with socialist politics. Youngman insists on the need for political and theoretical consistency so that political theory and educational practices remain united. What he urges be avoided at all costs is eclecticism that makes educational practices ambiguous and contradictory. Although giving the reader a valuable reminder, to my mind, Youngman could also have mentioned the opposite danger, namely dogmatic inflexibility and the rigid application of theoretical educational principles.

In his first chapter, Youngman explains the usefulness of the political economy approach to the study of adult education which analyses the significance of educational issues within their broader political and economic context. While agreeing that education should be seen as a site of cultural and ideological reproduction for the maintenance of the status quo Youngman warns against any reductionist trap and argues that education should also be seen as a site of resistance and opposition. According to him, educational realities are the result of the pressures developing from the different interest groups concerned about education in society. The corollary of this position is that educational struggles can only succeed if they are linked to other forms of struggle for economic and political power.

This first chapter, like many others in the book, introduces the topic well but has the weakness of remaining at the level of abstractions and generalities. For example, it is never explained concretely how progressive adult education program-

mes can affect, or be affected by, the socio-political structures. But, more fundamentally, Youngman offers a poor interpretation of the concept of the "political economy" which, for me should be linked to a Marxist **theory of social change**. Such a concept should help in analysing the various contradictions of a particular social formation and its structures in order to identify the various cracks available to the oppressed groups to further their struggle for radical social change. Unfortunately, Youngman doesn't do that when he analyses the potential of adult education and its impact on the balance of class forces in society.

The second chapter reviews what Youngman regards as the most relevant concepts of Marxist philosophy and social theory such as dialectical materialism, the social dimensions of knowledge and power, "praxis". This discussion leads, in Chapter 3, to the formulation of a set of theoretical principles as guidelines for a Marxist approach to adult education. Although enlightening, these principles are no substitute for a comprehensive Marxist theory of learning and such a Marxist theory of learning is seriously needed at the moment. Youngman's principles remain useful, though, for the purpose of his two next chapters.

In Chapter 4, these Marxist principles are used as a basis from which to criticize three different approaches to adult learning; the behaviourist, the humanist and the cognitive development models. Youngman presents their various theoretical assumptions and shows how these inform their educational practices. His criticisms concentrate on the reductionist, idealist and a-social characteristics of these models and expose their internal contradictions. However enlightening, these critiques could have gained more weight had they been accompanied by concrete denunciations of particular educational programmes. The chapter ends by warning correctly against the tendency by many educationists to adopt an eclectic approach to learning theory and adopting, as a result, contradictory educational practices.

Chapter 5 deals with the radical Freirean approach to adult learning which is criticised precisely for its eclectic theoretical inadequacies and contradictory practices. According to Youngman, Freire's view of the nature and goals of a revolutionary society is very vague and ambiguous because, deep at heart, Freire is a humanist Christian who doesn't feel at ease with Marx's class analysis and emphasis on the determining influence of structures. In the same vein, Freire underplays the important role of theory in developing people's critical consciousness; people, on their own, won't develop a critical understanding of their position unless they are assisted by those who have accumulated some theoretical knowledge. Yet, Freire underplays the vital contribution of teachers and instead argues in an idealist manner for an equal dialogue between teachers and students. According to Youngman, Freire's philosophical and theoretical eclecticism has led both liberal and radical educators to use Freire's educational approach for their own different ideological purposes. But in the end, Freire's approach is recognised as of some use for the basis of a socialist pedagogy.

The last chapter which attempts to translate the principles of a socialist pedagogy into concrete educational practices is, to my mind, the most interesting one. However, Youngman skims too quickly over important issues that he makes sound remarkably easy and unproblematic. For instance, his discussion of the curriculum content of socialist adult education is much too short and simple. The reader is told that political and general socialist education, which should promote the development of a political awareness and an independent critical mind, can be linked to the strug-

gles of the workplace and the community. This unity of theory and practice is indeed an important principle but what is more vital and problematic is how this principle gets translated into pedagogical programmes, and that is where Youngman remains remarkably silent and/or reveals a lack of experience and practicality. There are often disagreements among progressive scholars and political leaders (witness the on-going tension existing in South Africa today among radical intellectuals and the leaders of trade union and political organisations). These disagreements are both about the nature of society and its political and economic crisis, about the viability of certain political alliances and strategies and about the nature and organisational form that progressive non formal education should take.

How independent/accountable should educational agencies in charge of worker education and literacy teaching be in relation to trade union and political organisations? How do these programmes promote critical debate and avoid the danger of a dogmatic transmission of "the line"? What kind of skills and knowledge are needed by the oppressed to advance their struggle for radical social change? How can these agencies be organised to develop programmes that are democratically-controlled and effective at promoting democracy at work or in the community? How will the ruling class react and respond to this progressive education? All these and more questions are being confronted by many educational and political organisations in South Africa today and unfortunately Youngman's case studies are of little help in that regard.

In the last section of the book, Youngman relates three case studies of progressive adult education programmes that developed at a period of crisis in China, Portugal and Kenya. His presentation isn't very analytical nor does it problematise any of these questions raised above. The reader is not told what concrete pedagogical problems they encountered, what impact they had on the balance of class forces in these societies and what lessons were derived from these educational experiments. However, these case studies are well used to test the nine socialist-inspired educational principles that Youngman identified earlier and become interesting inspiration for educationists of a socialist inclination. At the end, Youngman states that his work is only a starting point for the further development of a socialist pedagogy and encourages other scholars to study the ways in which the practice of socialist education can be developed and combine critical research and critical action. Such a book is definitely a very valuable start to the dialectics needed to develop a socialist pedagogy and, to my mind, educationists and leaders of grass-roots organisations in South Africa are well placed and experienced enough to take up the challenge contained in Youngman's book.

Francine de Clercq
University of Bophutatswana

REVIEW

Handbook of Play Therapy

Edited by CHARLES E. SCHAEFER and KEVIN O'CONNOR, John Wiley and Sons, New York (1985). ISBN 0 471 09462 5. 489 pages.

This book is written for the behavioural scientist and clinician concerned with applying helping skills towards the amelioration of emotional difficulties in children. To this end, theoretical formulations, empirical data and practical recommendations are given. Conventional approaches to play therapy as well as new directions and innovative techniques are discussed. The book does an effective job of describing the "state-of-the-art" of play therapy today.

Handbook of Play Therapy is interdisciplinary in approach, eclectic in theory, and comprehensive in scope. Firstly, an overview of major theoretical approaches - psychoanalytic and non-directive - is given. A second major section discusses developmental stages of play, with recommendations for applied therapeutic strategies. The final section presents a variety of innovative play therapy techniques, settings and practices with guidelines on using play therapy to remediate specific childhood disorder.

Handbook of Play Therapy uses current research and blends theory and practice in an integrated way. Because there is a paucity of resource material in the field of play therapy this book should be informative and clinically useful for psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and educators at varying levels of training and experience. The two articles on using play therapy with learning disabled children and play therapy for mentally retarded and developmentally disabled children represent a unique contribution and will be invaluable to the educational psychologist and those in the field of special education. Educators will benefit from reading the articles on play therapy with children of divorced parents and play therapy with the agressive child.

Handbook of Play Therapy does a very effective job of relating the latest tools, techniques and theoretical advances in play therapy within the grasp of practitioners and students alike. The contributions of twenty five authorities from the fields of psychiatry, psychology, social work and related disciplines offer a holistic view. The *Handbook* provides a valuable synthesizing and framework and as a sourcebook of concepts, techniques and applications should be a landmark volume in this field.

Joyce Hickson
University of the Witwatersrand

REVIEW

How Children Fail
How Children Learn

By JOHN HOLT, revised editions, Penguin, Harmondsworth (1984). ISBN 0 14 022570 6; ISBN 0 14 022571 4. 320 pages and 308 pages

The work of the "progressive educationists" and "deschoolers" of the 1960s and 1970s has been fairly thoroughly critiqued by left academics. This work has been described as "an implicit affirmation of the deepest characteristics of the existing order",[1] and as "a modern form of conservatism".[2] To bring the matter closer to home, at a recent conference of liberal and left educators, a speaker was laughingly rebuked for "sounding like the old deschoolers from the sixties".[3] It is true that writers like Neill, Postman, Weingartner and Holt did not place their writing firmly enough in socio-political contexts. They seemed to prefer anecdote to analysis; the personal to the political. It is also true that because they "lacked a solid power base" progressive teachers have "isolated themselves within a professional ideology" and not organised themselves.[4] However, the reappearance on local bookshelves of two of the most influential books of this movement compels one, I believe, to qualify these denunciations.

Shortly before his death John Holt revised and expanded his two most famous books - *How Children Fail* and *How Children Learn* (first published in 1964 and 1967). Each book is now approximately twice the length of its predecessor, with additions to the otherwise untouched original text clearly marked.

Like all the "progressive educators" of the time, Holt believed that most children are desperately unhappy in school most of the time. Society labels these children as "failures". Children fail in school for three reasons, Holt said; boredom, confusion and fear. They are bored because what is taught in schools is irrelevant to their lives. They are confused because they are badly taught. They are afraid of failure. These three factors can all be designated "bad teaching". The readers of this journal may find it sobering to consider university and college teaching in this light. *How Children Fail* is devoted to describing some of the strategies used by children to avoid having to face up to that failure. I have personally either carried out or observed in universities every strategy Holt mentions; from avoiding being asked questions by averting the eyes, to asking intelligent- sounding questions to appear knowledgeable, to justifying ignorance by ridiculing what is to be learnt. Karl Muller detailed high-school students who do not even know whether they understand something or not.[5] The same can be said of university students. No-one wants to be exposed as a fool. As we academics have learnt painfully, to have one's ideas attacked is like having one's person attacked.

Holt was concerned about the brutal and gentle cohesion of schooling. This works on both physical and psychological levels. Schools, he said, make students neurotic and less intelligent. This is surely true of universities. Why, otherwise, are the majority of out-patients of Fort England mental hospital in Grahamstown university students? Why, otherwise, do so many students who behave intelligently outside the seminar room, appear (and know that they appear) stupid in it? The answer lies in the fact that schools and universities do not teach, encourage or reward intelligent behaviour.

The "deschoolers'" influence is apparent in the rhetoric of tertiary educators. Many of us criticise the notion of a curriculum of knowledge, exams and testing, programmed instruction, left/right brain theories, etc. We argue for student participation, open-ended syllabuses, equality between staff and students, and so on. And yet, few of us would pass the evaluations we make of our own students. Would it be an exaggeration to apply this quotation to our liberal universities?

> [There is a] widespread dislike, distrust and fear of children [students] so intense that it would not be far off the mark to call it hatred.[6]

We hypocritically demand that they show (pretend) that they are "serious students".

Schooling, said Holt, is a racket. Schools (and universities) encourage mystification and unreal instead of real learning. Only in Institutions of Learning do we find teaching without learning, and grading without knowledge. It is true that in desperation Holt sometimes said that schools are irredeemable, but mostly he was optimistic about the changes that can happen in teaching with serious consideration of how people learn. *How Children Learn* is devoted to this investigation.

> Of two ways of looking at children now growing in fashion, seeing them as monsters of evil who must be beaten into submission, or as little two-legged walking computers whom we can program into geniuses, it is hard to know which is worse, and does more harm. I write this book to oppose both of them.[7]

"All I am saying in this book", he says, "can be summed up in two words - Trust Children. Nothing could be more simple - or more difficult".

While they must obviously be "politicised" and manipulated to fit the South African situation, it seems that there are three good reasons why the "deschoolers" should be sympathetically re-read by left academics. First, our students read them under the covers anyway. Secondly, these are excellent models of clear, popular and humorous writing. And thirdly, if we are really interested in the democratic pedagogy of a people's education, it is worth seriously considering thinkers who have considered those notions seriously before us.

It is perhaps time to stop confusing first-name cordiality with democracy.

Stephen Appel
University of the Witwatersrand

Notes and References

1. H. Gintis, "Towards a Political Economy of Education: A Radical Critique of Ivan Illich's 'Deschooling Society'", *Harvard Educational Review*, 42, 1 (1972): 95.
2. R. Sharp and A. Green, *Education and Social Control: A Study in Progressive Primary Education* (London: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1975), xiii.
3. Comment at *Kenton-at-Helderfontein* conference, Johannesburg, Novermber 1987.
4. T. Gordon, *Democracy in One School? Progressive Education and Reconstruction* (London: Falmer Press, 1986), 47.
5. K. Muller, "The Practice of School Science", (M.Ed. thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1986).
6. J. Holt, *How Children Fail* (Harmonsworth: Penguin, 1982), 287.
7. Holt, *How Children Learn* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983), 21.

Notes on contributors

Chris Breen is an associate professor, specializing in maths education, at the University of Cape Town. He was also a proposed defence witness for the Tobias trial.

Bill Nasson lectures in the Department of Economic History, University of Cape Town. He was educated at the Universities of Hull, York and Cambridge. His research interests include education and South African social and oral history.

Charlie Nwandula completed his M.Ed. at the Department of Education, Wits, in 1987. Until he joined the Development Bank of South Africa as Project Leader of the Human Resources Development Department in 1987, he was a teacher at Namedi High School in Soweto.

Frans Meijers has conducted extensive research and published widely on various aspects of the relationship between educational policy and capitalism. He is author of the book, *The Future of Adult Education: Power, Interests and Policy* (Baarn, Anthos, 1987) and co-author, with Manuela du Bois-Reymond and others, of a book concerned with providing a socio-historical reconstruction of the "massification debate": *Search of a Modern Pedagogical Norm* (Amersfoort, Leuven: ACCO, 1986). His principal concern at Leiden University, where he is currently based, is a research project on Youth and Work. The results of his work on youth training schemes in the Netherlands are to be published shortly in the *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth.*

Perspectives in Education

Faculty of Education,
University of the Witwatersrand,
PO Wits, Johannesburg 2050,
South Africa.

Subscription Form

Two issues annually

	Individuals	Institutions	Students
Home	R20	R50	R15
UK & Europe	£10	£25	
USA & Canada	$25	$50	
Austr & New Z	$25	$50	

Name: .....

Address: .....

.....

.....Code: .....

I wish to subscribe to Perspectives in Education for volume . .

and enclose my subscription of R .....

Cheques, etc., should be made payable to:
Perspectives in Education

Signed: .....

Date: .....

Notes for Contributors

1. Contributions should be typed, double-spaced, on one side of an A4 sheet only. Three copies should be submitted and one retained. The manuscript should already be corrected to the style of *Perspectives in Education*.
2. Title, author's name, full postal address and a biographical note should be typed on a separate sheet.
3. An abstract of 100-200 words should also be typed on a separate sheet.
4. **TEXT**: First paragraph of article and after sub-headings to begin flush with left margin. Succeeding paragraphs indent 4 spaces. No spacing between paragraphs. Sub-headings in lower-case, indented 4 spaces, with their relative importance (A,B) indicated in pencil in the margin. Dates thus: 1 January 1988. Double quotation marks only (except for "quotes 'within' quotes") to be used; and all quotations of more than 40 words to be indented both sides and without quotation marks. Abbreviations to be given in full at first, then written without points (DET, INSET).
5. **NOTES AND REFERENCES**: These are always at end of text, in order of appearance and numbered. (.. at schools".7) No separate bibliography to be given.

   For a reference to a book:

   1. P. Kallaway, (ed.), *Apartheid and Education: The Education of Black South Africans* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1984), 2-5.

   For a journal reference:

   2. A. Simon and P. Beard, "Discriminatory Factors Affecting Woman Teachers in Natal", *Perspectives in Education*, 9,1 (July 1986): 59.

   For a reference to a chapter in a collection:

   3. F. Chikane, "Children in Turmoil: The Effects of the Unrest on Township Children", in S. Burman and P. Reynolds, (eds.), *Growing up in a Divided Society: The Contexts of Childhood in South Africa* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1987), 20.

   For reference to work listed directly preceeding:

   4. *Ibid.*, 21.

   Unpublished sources:

   5. N. Nook to Mann, 1 July 1857, Antioch College Archives.

   Published government reports:

   6. *South African Native Affairs Commission Report, 1903-1905* (Cape Town, 1905), 71.

   Newspapers:

   7. *The Star*, 3 September 1986.

   Unpublished theses and papers:

   8. M. Cross, "Capital, State, Missionaries, and the Foundations of a Segregated Schooling System on the Witwatersrand, 1900-1924" (M.Ed. thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1985), 1.

Contributions should be sent to The Editors at the Faculty of Education, University of the Witwatersrand, P O Wits, Johannesburg 2050, South Africa; but may also be submitted through any of the Associate Editors.