

## **Chapter 6**

### **Education, Schooling and Apartheid Education**

The purpose of this chapter is two-fold. First, I intend to turn attention to ways of conceptualising education so that it may inform the way human rights (in) education may be viewed, on what bases and using what sort of theoretical framework. In this regard, the distinction between “schooling” and “education”, as well as between “reproduction” and “resistance” theories of schooling, provides useful points of departure. Second, using the above explorations as a background, in this chapter I also provide an account of apartheid education so as to note the ways in which human rights were influenced under apartheid education, as well as to show how "bodies" were positioned within it in terms of ‘race’, gender and sexual orientation. In Chapter 7, I use these to analyse principles and approaches to human rights (in) education, and the extent to which the post-apartheid South African educational policy and legislative texts promote human rights, and on what bases.

Analyses of apartheid education in South Africa have been informed centrally by the experiences of racism and abject repression. Ranging from the racial segregation of schools, the patent inequalities in educational provisions, the banning of educational organisations and information, the practices of discrimination in schools to misrecognition and nonrecognition of "black" views and experiences in the construction of knowledge (see Troup, 1977; Kallaway, 1986; Nkomo, 1990). Such expositions have been framed as responses to the unequal nature of education in South Africa, and it being centrally an exercise in apartheid indoctrination rather than education.

Morrow (1986) has argued that whilst analysis of education in South Africa usefully critiqued apartheid education, such critiques are more about schooling rather than education in South Africa. Morrow argues that schooling is about processes of socialisation, acculturation and development of skills that are

instrumentally linked to their use in social, political and economic life in society. In these accounts, the focus is on schooling, and not education. For Morrow, education is valuable in itself. It is linked to the development of human potential, the "liberation of the mind" and the pursuit of truth in the overall development of the human condition at large. Education, thus, may include the use of schools, but it does not equal schools and/or schooling. In this regard, then, analyses of apartheid education have been more about apartheid schooling rather than apartheid education. Following Morrow, as will be seen below, apartheid schooling was anti-educational. In chapter 7, I pick up on this distinction between schooling and education to also argue that it is more appropriate to talk about human rights education and not human rights schooling.

### **Some Dominant Approaches to Apartheid Education**

Arguably, approaches to analyses of apartheid schooling have been of three dominant types: philosophical interrogations of the framing of apartheid "education"; analyses of the links between apartheid schools and apartheid using mainly reproduction theories; and, accounts which use resistance theories that explored oppositions to apartheid schooling. It is only after 1990, when the transition away from apartheid began, that educational analyses in South Africa moved significantly in the areas of educational policies, laws, school quality and economics, and increasingly used empirical research to investigate school practices in the daily lives of schools (see Taylor, Muller and Vinjevoold, 2003; and Carrim, 2003, in this regard). I do not look at contributions to educational discourses from proponents of apartheid education here, since these have been justifications and legitimations of apartheid and apartheid schools and schooling.

Christie's and Collins's seminal article "*Bantu Education and the Reproduction of Apartheid Ideology*", which first appeared in 1979, is among the first articles to explicitly use reproduction theories to South African schools. Using the reproduction theoretical framework, particularly those of Althusser and Bowles and Gintis (see Giroux and Aronowitz, 1986 for an account of the Althusserian

and Bowles and Gintis approaches in reproduction theories), Christie and Collins argued that apartheid schooling is designed and motivated to ensure that "white" South Africans are schooled in order to take on managerial positions in society and to be dominant in economic, political and social arenas of South African society, whilst "black" South Africans were being schooled explicitly to take on menial, un/semi-skilled, inferiorised positions, particularly in the economy. For Christie and Collins, then, schooling under apartheid was meant to reproduce the conditions of apartheid capitalism and was, thus, a superstructural manipulation to bolster, promote, consolidate and reproduce white supremacy and dominance in South Africa. Christie's and Collins' argument was also intended to counter the claims of what they called "liberal" accounts of schooling under apartheid, which viewed apartheid schools as insular environments, unaffected by the social, political and economic structures of apartheid. For Christie and Collins, then, apartheid education was an ideology of apartheid and tied integrally to the maintenance and development of the system of apartheid.

Responses to Christie's and Collins' analysis were based on arguments used by resistance theorists, and in this way educational debates in South Africa mirrored similar debates in other parts of the world (see Molteno, 1987; Hyslop, 1987). Using resistance theories, arguments against Christie and Collins suggested that Christie's and Collins' approach to apartheid schooling was structuralist, denied human agency and did not account for the ways in which apartheid schools were actively and continuously resisted. Christie and Collins were also seen to be underestimating the "cultural reproduction" (cf. Bourdieu, 1976, and see also Giroux and Aronowitz, 1986, for an account of Bourdieu's notion of schools as sites of and for cultural reproduction) that was also occurring in apartheid schools, as opposed to only an economic reproduction. In this regard, Christie and Collins were also seen as providing an economically reductionist account of apartheid schools and not taking into account the specificities of racism in apartheid schools, among other ideological forms of reproduction.

In 1984 Molteno explicitly applied resistance theories in his analysis of oppositions to apartheid schooling, in response to Christie and Collins. Molteno showed that rather than being only sites of reproduction of apartheid ideology, schools were also sites of resistance. "Black" learners and teachers in schools were not automatically reproducing apartheid in unthinking ways. They were actively and consciously making sense of what they were being subjected to, making meaning of these in their own terms and deciding on what strategies to use in their responses (see Woods, 1983, 1984 and Giddens, 1979, for useful accounts of the notions of human agency in respect to making meaning and adopting strategies in interactions within schools). In this way, Molteno showed that apartheid schooling is complex and involves many forms of human agency. Analyses of apartheid schooling, thus, could not simply assume that apartheid ideologies are unproblematically or easily reproduced in apartheid schooling.

Developing in a similar direction as Molteno, Hyslop (1987, 1989, and 1999) extended the analyses of apartheid schooling by looking at the constitutive features, contexts and history of resistances to apartheid schooling. Whilst Molteno's 1987 contribution focused on students' resistance (mainly in the Western Cape) to the 1980 school and consumer boycotts, Hyslop's work extended this type of analysis to other school actors and periods. Hyslop looked at teachers' resistance (1987), student protests (1999) as well as at the area of school governance (1989).

Whether based on reproduction or resistance theories or whether the analytical focus is on the macro location of schools in society or on interactions among human agents in schools, the consistent argument in all of these accounts was that apartheid schools and schooling were based on inequalities, violations of human rights, and were blatantly racist (see Nkomo, 1990).

Subsequently, in response to such developments, Christie (1986) produced the book *The Right to Learn* which extended her earlier analysis with Collins to include an exploration of "cultural reproduction" within apartheid schools. In this

regard, Christie notes the specificity of racism in apartheid schools (i.e. she does not reduce it to the economy) and sexism, showing the ways girls in apartheid schools were being schooled for domesticity and inferiorised positions in society as women. Also in 1986, Kallaway released the book entitled *Apartheid and Education* which deliberately provided both reproduction and resistance accounts of apartheid schooling in an attempt to balance structuralist and human agency forms of analyses.

Concurrently, a sustained critique of the philosophical assumptions of apartheid education was also developed. Arguing against "fundamental pedagogics", its pretences of being scientific and its conceptual inaccuracies, this philosophical critique of apartheid schooling showed that apartheid educational philosophy was unsound theoretically and conceptually indefensible, and, as being profoundly anti-educational. These critiques are documented in Beard's and Morrow's (1983) book entitled *Problems of Fundamental Pedagogics: Pedagogics and the Study of Education in South Africa*.

Since 1986, though, discourses of schooling and education in South Africa shifted from analysis of experiences under apartheid to a formulation of educational alternatives. This was most poignantly captured in the idea of a "people's education". People's education was a populist response to apartheid; it provided the basis for an alternative educational view which connoted the right to education as a matter of social justice. It argued for the need to have education based on the promotion and protection of human rights, the establishment of a unitary, non-racial, non-sexist and democratic educational system, one which is based on critical thinking and active participation of all school actors (see Carrim, 1990, Mashamba, 1990).

In light of the above, the following discussion looks at what the experiences of schooling were in relation to 'race', gender and sexual orientation. I discuss these in relation to 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> generation rights as well as notions of access,

marginalisation and invisibilisation, which were used in discussing the positioning of bodies under apartheid in Chapter 4.

## **Schooling Bodies and Reproducing Discrimination in Apartheid Education**

Following on the discussion on a theory of articulation and portraiture in Chapter 3, and the above account of analyses of apartheid education, this section explores what apartheid schooling meant in relation to 'race', gender and sexual orientation in the experiences of people who were in apartheid schools. As in Chapter 4, this section also uses the notions of "access", "marginalisation", and "invisibilisation" to discuss the ways in which bodies were positioned racially and in terms of gender and sexual orientation in apartheid schools. I also explore the implications of these positionings in terms of 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> generation rights.

I first look at 'race' and argue that apartheid education provided access to education for "black" children on the basis of inequality, segregation and white supremacy. It ensured that South Africans were schooled in racial moulds. I also argue that girls in schools were subject to patriarchal forms of oppression, irrespective of which racial group of school they belonged to. In addition, I also show that there still is a dearth of documented accounts of gay or lesbian experiences in apartheid schools, and that this points significantly to the silencing and invisibilisation of sexual orientation in discourses about apartheid schooling.

### **Schooling within Racial Moulds**

There are three major features about apartheid schooling that needs to be foregrounded in capturing what it meant in positioning South Africans in racial terms. First, apartheid schools were segregated racially. Second, apartheid schools were provided for disproportionately on the basis of inequality. Third, resistance to apartheid schooling was able to transcend the structural racial segregation of apartheid schools.

Apartheid schooling was legitimated legislatively. The provision of education to South Africans in racially segregated schools was contained in the Education for Indians Act of 1969, the Education for Coloured People's Act of 1965, the Christian National Education Act of 1962 for "white" South Africans, and Bantu Education Act of 1953 (later to become the Education and Training Act of 1978) for Africans. In each instance the location of such racially defined schools was in a racially defined group area, and for a racially defined population group. This means that "white" schools were in "white" areas, catering for "white" South Africans; "Indian" schools in "Indian" areas and catering for "Indian" South Africans, and so on. Apartheid schools were thus segregated racially in terms of the people within them, where they were located, and the ways in which they were legislatively defined; ensuring that South Africans were schooled in "racial moulds" (the idea of racial moulds was used by Webster – 1985- in regard to labour in South Africa).

Many have pointed out (see Christie, 1990; Kallaway, 2002; Carrim, 1992, 1995 and Soudien, 1998) that the racial moulds (and moulding) of apartheid schools and schooling is a significant structural factor in accounting for the experiences of people in these environments. The racial segregation of schools ensure that social relations among people occur within racial groups, "coloured" teachers relate to "coloured" pupils in a "coloured" school in a "coloured" group area, and so on, preventing cross 'race' relations and possibilities for interactions. Thus, although there is ample evidence of resistance to apartheid schooling, the structural segregation of apartheid schools and its geographical basis and demographic implications have been serious constraints in the lives of people in these schools.

The casting of apartheid schools in racial moulds has a few implications for the ways bodies are positioned and the ways human rights are framed. Apartheid schools ensured that South Africans had access to schooling. But, they also ensured that such access would be racially circumscribed. This has meant that Other racial groups were either completely invisibilised or marginalised from any

given school. In the case of "black" schools, particularly during the 1980s and during the wake of the People's Education movement, as part of their resistance to apartheid and at the discretion of school principals, people who belonged to Other racial groups were enrolled into schools for which they were not designated (see Carrim, 1992). In other words, "blacks" ("Indians" and "Coloureds") would have access to African schools, but their experiences would be marginalised and invisibilised in the experiences of Africans. Also if African pupils would be found in a "coloured" school, they would be marginalised within it, for fear of repression from the apartheid state. In "white" schools the "black" presence would be marginalised in the form of them being gardeners, cleaners or "tea boys and girls" in the school (see Christie, 1986; 1990). By and large, though, casting apartheid schools in racial moulds has meant people being invisibilised from each other.

At the same time, the racial segregation of apartheid schooling has also meant that "black" South Africans were given access to education. As such, in a sense their 1<sup>st</sup> generation rights of access to education were provided even though they were not framed as "rights" to which "black" South Africans were entitled. However, this provision of education was perverted by the fact that such a right could only be exercised in prescribed spaces that are racially defined. As such, apartheid schooling provided for 1<sup>st</sup> generation human rights in education by perverting it.

The perversion of human rights in apartheid schooling is most starkly demonstrated in the iniquitous provisioning of educational resources and budgets for the differently defined schools. As is widely noted, and there is no need to recap those points in detail here, apartheid schools provided the least for African schools and most for "white" schools. In 1990, for every equivalent of US\$150 allocated to a "white" primary school child, the apartheid state provided US\$10 for an African child (see Nkomo, 1990). By 1994, when the democratic elections were held, the differences were similar (see Carrim & Enslin, 2002). Conditions of and for schooling in the racially cast school were, thus, qualitatively different and affected educational performances in an almost direct way. From not having libraries, laboratories, running water or functional toilets – particularly in African



schools – to high teacher:pupil ratios, no textbooks and under and/or unqualified teachers, schooling under apartheid was based on inequality and endured with suffering, anger and protest by "black" schools under apartheid.

Such racial moulds of apartheid schools were, however, transgressed, though not overcome or transcended, in resistances to apartheid schooling. Student and teacher organisations, parent bodies and professional associations forged links across group areas, over the racial divides and throughout the country in educational campaigns in resistances to apartheid and apartheid schooling. Two examples would suffice. In 1980, all "black" schools nationally boycotted schools in protest against detentions of student leaders, the celebration of apartheid anniversaries and in support of consumer boycotts (see Molteno, 1987). During 1986, during the State of Emergency, many "black" schools across the country, across group areas, were converted to "operational zones" for the apartheid police and army (cf. Nekhwevha, 2000). What is of importance in these forms of resistances to apartheid schooling is that it went beyond and across racial segregation in the alliances and linkages that were formed. They, thus, represent the human agency of people within apartheid schools and them not being totally controlled by it. However, whilst they were able to do so in political protest and action, they were not able to transform the structural racial segregation of schools, their geographical locations or their demographic profiles. Apartheid schools structurally constrained the extent to which education in South Africa could be deracialised as much as they provided the constitutive conditions for resistance to it.

The 1976 Soweto Student Uprising provides some indication of the "in-use" curriculum in African schools, and by extrapolation probably in other schools. The 1976 uprisings were protests sparked off against the imposition of Afrikaans as a medium of instruction in primarily African schools. This indicates that the knowledge taught in apartheid classrooms attempted to legitimate the views of Afrikanerdom and white supremacy. This is supported, though, by analyses of history textbooks in apartheid schools which reveal that the history taught were

representations of "white" supremacy, "black" inferiority and with distinct inflections to suit racial, ethnic and tribal defined groups (NEPI, 1993). Thus, apartheid history textbooks promoted Afrikaner nationalism, and were at the same time tailored to include "Indian", "coloured", "Zulu", Tswana", Xhosa", etc. symbolism and imagery (Cross, 1999). It has also been noted that apartheid schooling was authoritarian, teacher dominated and promoted rote learning tendencies (NEPI, 1993; Kallaway, 1986 and Christie, 1986).

### **Patriarchal Schooling Under Apartheid**

Interestingly, the rate of access of girls in apartheid schools was historically and consistently almost equal to boys, with the access rate of girls in education ranging from 48% to 53% in relation to boys (see Truscott, 1994). This also being the case across all racial groups. South African girls' 1<sup>st</sup> generation rights in relation to access to education were met under apartheid. However, apartheid schools and schooling were deeply patriarchal and sexist (Christie, 1986).

The patriarchal dominance in apartheid schools was reflected in school management structures being dominated by men, unequal conditions and benefit of work, sexist staff relations, treatment of girls in classrooms, subject choices given to girls, sexual harassment of girl pupils and drop-out rates of girls at secondary school levels. There is a relatively large, and still developing, body of literature of women's experiences in apartheid schools (Wolpe *et al*, 1997). I only draw on some of them here to demonstrate the patriarchal aspects of schooling under apartheid.

Management positions in schools and the educational bureaucracy were firmly in the control of men, and particularly "white" Afrikaner men. Women only occupied fewer than 10% of school management positions, and of these most were in primary schools (Truscott, 1994). Women teachers were also paid less than their male counterparts, did not enjoy the same benefits, including a housing subsidy and pension (Truscott, 1994; Sebakwane, 1997; Wolpe *et al*, 1997). In

addition, women teachers were also concentrated in lower grade teaching and not in mathematics and the sciences (Truscott, 1994; Christie, 1986; Wolpe *et al*, 1997).

Girls' performances were equal to, if not better than, boys at primary school level and decreased significantly by the time they reached high school (Truscott, 1994; Wolpe, *et al*, 1997; Christie, 1986). Girl pupil experiences indicate that they were channelled into subject areas away from the sciences which were dominated by male preferences. Girls were also expected to take on subordinate roles in relation to boys and subjected to sexual harassment and oppression, resulting often in the silencing and/or withdrawal of girls in schools (Christie, 1986; Wolpe *et al*, 1997).

Apartheid schools also spatially segregated people along gender lines (see Unterhalter, 2002). Separate boys' and girls' lines in assemblies, outside classrooms, girls' and boys' groups in classrooms and boys' and girls' spaces in the sporting fields, were also dominated by patriarchal assumptions: girls relegated to smaller, marginalised, domesticated spaces, and boys taking over most of the spaces and in greater visibility (see Karlsson, 2002).

Apartheid schooling was patriarchal, whilst it was racist. In regard to female experiences in apartheid schools, their 1<sup>st</sup> generation rights of access to schooling was met but these were impacted upon by their experiences of marginalisation, inferiorisation and subordination in schools. In this light, female experiences of apartheid schooling violated their 2<sup>nd</sup> generation social and political rights, and economic rights in the case of female teachers, and their 1<sup>st</sup> generation rights in regard to security and safety. The violations of these rights of females, it is important to keep in mind, were consistent across the racial barriers of apartheid schools.

Most accounts of female participation in resistances in schools indicate that actions of women teachers and pupils were "subsumed" within the overall anti-

apartheid struggles and did not address women's issues and experiences in schools specifically (Patel, 1989; Barnes and Haya, 2002). It is only by the 1990s when educational alternatives were being explored that feminists in South Africa (Patel, 1989) began to increasingly specify issues pertaining to women particularly, both in the context of education and more widely.

### **Heterosexist Schooling Under Apartheid**

There is very little work done on the heterosexism in apartheid schooling, and there are none about gay and lesbian experiences, either of teachers or pupils. Nel's (2003) recently completed Master's dissertation, notes that right up until 1998 there was no entry on the School Registers, Subject Catalogues or Records of dissertations and theses that deal with gay and lesbian experiences in South African education. Gay and lesbian experiences under apartheid schooling remain silenced and invisibilised. Even in the account of Simon Nkoli's life in Chapter 4, Simon does not provide us with enough details of his experiences in apartheid schools. We do know that Simon was secretary of COSAS and that his appointment to this office was questioned because of his gayness. We also know that Simon resisted this move to silence him and render him invisible within COSAS. But, we do not know enough about what Simon may have experienced when he was in school in Sebokeng. Given, however, the COSAS experience Simon records, we can assume that a homophobic, heterosexist view in all likelihood prevailed among the school boys who were members of COSAS, and that such views played themselves out in their daily experiences of schools. We do not, however, have any account of gay or lesbian teacher or pupil experiences of apartheid schooling.

The work of both Randall (1982) and Morrell (1994), nonetheless, demonstrate the way in which masculinities are constructed in mainly "white", private schools in the midlands of KwaZulu-Natal. Randall and Morrell show that masculinities in these all boys' schools were framed by heterosexist, patriarchal assumptions and which promoted male aggression and homophobia. Recently, Thompson (2000) in

a B Ed (honours) project, confirmed Randall and Morrell's findings by showing that masculinities in a boys', private school in Johannesburg is constructed in ways that are patriarchal, heterosexist and homophobic, and which intersect with 'race' promoting 'race' based sexual stereotypes at the same time (like for example "blacks" are promiscuous and homosexuality is unAfrican). On the basis of such studies one can assume that apartheid schooling was heterosexist as it was patriarchal and racist. Gay and lesbian experiences of apartheid schooling, however, are invisibilised, silenced and absent.

My purpose in the chapter has been to contextualise the discussion up until now to schooling under apartheid in particular. I have shown that schooling under apartheid was racist, patriarchal and heterosexist, with the latter being supported by inferences more than documented evidence. In each instance, though, apartheid provided for the 1<sup>st</sup> generation rights of access to education for "black" people, women, and gays and lesbians. However, in the case of 'race', such 1<sup>st</sup> generation rights were perverted by the ways in which they were to be exercised. In relation to gender, women's 2<sup>nd</sup> generation rights were denied and their 1<sup>st</sup> generation rights to security were violated. Given the silence and absence of accounts of gay and lesbian experiences in apartheid schools, one can only infer that there may have been experiences of violations, but like "black" people and women, gays and lesbians did have access to schools. Human rights provisions under apartheid schooling, then, were complex and contradictory in relation to "black" people, women, and gays and lesbians. They were recognised and provided with 1<sup>st</sup> generation rights of access to education. But, they were simultaneously misrecognised, marginalised and inferiorised once given access. Although resistances to apartheid schooling have been prominent, they have not been able to change the segregation geographically and demographically established by apartheid, and, it seems, neither have issues and experiences of women, and gays and lesbians in apartheid schooling been adequately and specifically addressed in the anti-apartheid struggles, as they seemed to have been subsumed within it and its emphasis on 'race' and forms of nationalism. Given this background of schooling under apartheid, the following chapter looks at what the principles of

human rights education may entail in order to ascertain how human rights are framed in the current South African education and training system.