

[F

[ ]

\*30001002013722\*



P7

TITLE PAGE

IDEOLOGY AND THE TRAINING OF HISTORY TEACHERS  
AT COLLEGES OF EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

JEFFREY ALEXANDER MANUEL

A minithesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of M. PHIL. in the Department  
of Philosophy of Education, University of the Western  
Cape

SUPERVISOR: Mr Graeme Bloch

FEBRUARY 1990



ABSTRACT

IDEOLOGY AND THE TRAINING OF HISTORY TEACHERS  
AT COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

M. PHIL. MINITHESIS

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION  
UNIVERSITY OF THE WESTERN CAPE

This dissertation is an attempt at locating the connections that there exist between ideology and education. To this end I have looked at the training of History teachers at Colleges of Education under the Department of Education and Culture in the House of Representatives.

My first move is an investigation into the conceptual frameworks within which the term ideology is located. This is done in Chapter One. In Chapter Two ideology is contextualized within the South African educational system. This is attempted by investigating the historical connections that there exist between ideology and education in South Africa. In other words, a brief History of Christian National Ideology with specific reference to the training of History teachers in South Africa, is attempted.

From this historical-theoretical analysis of ideology and History teacher training in South Africa, I proceed with an empirical and analytical critique of the current curricula prescribed for the training of History teachers. This is done in Chapter Three.

Chapter Four discusses the different positions in South African Historiography. These positions are discussed as different debates contesting the dominant Christian National Historiography on which the History curricula for teacher trainees are based.

The first four chapters are purely historical and empirical analysis. Chapter Five develops a more theoretical and philosophical argument concerning the democratization of History teacher training and the ideological underpinnings related to it. To this end a number of questions are raised concerning the philosophical and ideological underpinnings of such notions as democracy, autonomy, accountability and bureaucracy. The assumptions embedded in these notions and how they would affect democratic teacher training are unpacked in this chapter.

Given the attempts to democratize teacher training as set out in Chapter Five, the final chapter argues for ways in which the intellectuals at Colleges of Education can

contribute to the democratic process. The chapter sets out to have a closer look at the Gramscian conception of hegemony. I attempt at arguing that intellectuals at Colleges of Education can contribute to a new hegemony in South Africa. In this way they would contribute to new conceptions of ideology and its relationship to History teaching and the training of History teachers.

FEBRUARY 1990

ABSTRAK

IDEOLOGIE EN DIE OPLEIDING VAN GESKIEDENISONDERWYSERS  
AAN ONDERWYSKOLLEGES

M. PHIL. MINITESIS

DEPARTEMENT VAN FILOSOFIE VAN DIE OPVOEDING  
UNIVERSITEIT VAN WES-KAAPLAND

Hierdie dissertasie is 'n poging om die verband wat daar tussen ideologie en onderwys bestaan uit te lig. Ek het gevolglik die opleiding van Geskiedenisonderwysers aan onderwyskolleges wat ressorteer onder die Departement van Onderwys en Kultuur, Raad van Verteenwoordigers, in oënskou geneem.

My eerste stap is 'n ondersoek na die konseptuele raamwerk waarbinne die begrip "ideologie" voorkom. Dit word in Hoofstuk Een uiteengesit. In Hoofstuk Twee word ideologie gekontekstualiseer binne die Suid-Afrikaanse Onderwysstelsel. Derhalwe sal daar gekyk word na die historiese verband wat daar bestaal tussen ideologie en onderwys in Suid-Afrika. Met ander woorde, 'n kort oorsig van die Christelike Nasionale Ideologie met besondere verwysing na die opleiding van Geskiedenisonderwysers in Suid-Afrika.

Van hierdie histories-teoretiese analise van ideologie en onderwyseropleiding betreffende Geskiedenis in Suid-Afrika, begoog ek om die huidige kurrikula wat vir die opleiding van Geskiedenisonderwysers voorgeskryf is, empiries en analities te ondersoek. Dit word in Hoofstuk Drie gedoen.

Hoofstuk Vier bespreek die verskillende standpunte in die Suid-Afrikaanse Historiografie. Hierdie standpunte word bespreek in die vorm van verskillende debatte wat die dominante Christelike Nasionale Historiografie kontesteer waarop die Geskiedenis-kurrikula van student-onderwysers gebaseer is.

Die eerste vier hoofstukke is suiwer historiese en empiriese analises. Hoofstuk Vyf behels 'n meer teoretiese en filosofiese diskoers betreffende die demokratisering van onderwysopleiding van Geskiedenis en die ideologiese grondslae wat daarmee verband hou. In hierdie verband sal 'n aantal vrae gestel word betreffende die filosofiese en ideologiese grondslae van sulke aspekte soos demokrasie, outonomie, verantwoording en burokrasie. Die veronderstelling wat in hierdie aspekte ingebed is en hoe die demokratiese onderwyseropleiding affekteer, word in hierdie hoofstuk uitgelig.

Gegee die pogings om onderwyseropleiding te demokratiseer soos uiteengesit in Hoofstuk Vyf, word in die slothoofstuk betoog in hoe 'n mate die intellektueles by onderwyskolleges kan bydra om die demokratiese proses te bevorder. Die slothoofstuk beoog om dieper te kyk na die Gramsciaanse konsep van hegemonie. My betoog is dat intellektueles verbonde aan onderwyskolleges wel 'n wesenlike bydrae kan lewer om 'n nuwe hegemonie in Suid-Afrika daar te stel. Hierdeur kan hul bydra tot nuwe konsepsies van ideologie en sy verband met Geskiedenisonderdig en die opleiding van Geskiedenisonderwysers.

FEBRUARIE 1990

## DECLARATION

I declare that IDEOLOGY AND THE TRAINING OF HISTORY TEACHERS AT COLLEGES OF EDUCATION is my own work, that it has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university, and that all the sources I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by complete references.

JEFFREY ALEXANDER MANUEL

FEBRUARY 1990

SIGNED: .....

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the British Council for awarding me a Fellowship to pursue some of my research at the University of London - INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. I am also indebted to the Human Sciences Research Council who granted me a bursary, but are not considered to be responsible for anything I say.

Finally I wish to thank my wife and children for their sacrifices especially while I was in London.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACTS ..... ii

DECLARATION ..... viii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... ix

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... x

PREFACE ..... xii

\* CHAPTER ONE: Ideology - A Conceptual Framework and  
its Relation to Education ..... 1

CHAPTER TWO: Historical Connection Between Christian  
National Education and the Training of History  
Teachers ..... 11

\* CHAPTER THREE: A Critical Evaluation of the Senior \*  
Primary Diploma History Syllabus Prescribed for  
Teacher Trainees in the Department of Education  
and Culture: House of Representatives ..... 22

CHAPTER FOUR: Contesting the Christian National  
Education History Syllabus - Debates in South  
African Histrigraphy and its Effect on  
History Teacher Training at Colleges of  
Education in the Department of Education and  
Culture: House of Representatives ..... 40

CHAPTER FIVE: Can the Training of History Teachers  
at Colleges of Education be Democratized? ..... 52

\* CHAPTER SIX: How History Teacher Training Can  
Contribute to a New Hegemony in South  
Africa ..... 74

END NOTES ..... 84

BIBLIOGRAPHY ..... 89

ANNEXURES

## PREFACE

This dissertation is an attempt to contribute to the growing debate on the role of History in the school curriculum and how History teachers at Colleges of Education under the Department of Education and Culture are trained to pursue this role.

My central claim is that there exists a connection between ideology and education. This connection is, however, not a contingent connection in the current South African educational system. It is my contention that this connection has deep historical and political roots. To this end, History teachers have been used to maintain and entrench this connection in the schooling system in South Africa. The training at Colleges of Education has been planned and structured with this aim in mind: the aim of pursuing the connection between ideology and education. In this regard History should have a reproductive function: reproducing the dominant ruling class ideology in South Africa.

However, the connection between ideology and education is not as static and mechanistic as people would want it to be. I believe that this connection can be and has been contested. To this end the struggle for a new hegemony

in South Africa bears testimony. This research paper is an attempt to contribute towards this struggle. In this regard I believe History teachers at Colleges of Education have a unique role to play. Their conceptions of ideology and its connection to History teaching is crucial for the way they train our future History teachers. There exists an urgent need for History as a formal school subject to be taught in a critical fashion.

To this end, the educational aims of History teaching at schools must be defended. Educational aims such as developing the pupils' critical faculties and skills-based History teaching must be argued for. In arguing this we must accept that History indeed holds a place of prominence in liberal and liberating education. Otherwise this research could hardly be justified.

## CHAPTER ONE

IDEOLOGY - A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND ITS RELATION TO  
EDUCATION

In this chapter I will develop a conceptual framework of ideology. This framework will be the conceptual tool used to define ideology as used throughout the thesis.

## THE NOTION OF IDEOLOGY AND HOW IT IS RELATED TO EDUCATION

The notion of ideology and its relationship to education has occupied a central position in many debates in education. I will specifically attempt at locating the debate within the practice and theory surrounding teacher training, especially the training of History teachers at Colleges of Education under the Department of Education and Culture in the House of Representatives. My central question is: are History students at these Colleges of Education being trained to promote or reproduce an ideology? If so, what is the nature of this ideology in terms of the conceptual framework of ideology which will be expounded upon. What potential does there exist to rid teacher training of ideology? Must teacher training, in this case the training of History teachers, be related to ideology? These are questions that will be answered in later chapters. Let us first proceed to have a brief

look at what ideology is.

A major claim concerning the conceptual analysis of ideology is that ideology, an understanding of it, cannot be divorced from domination. The notion exists that there is a conceptual connection between ideology and domination. Historically, ideology has become embedded in political domination in South Africa. Evidence to this effect is suggested by the History of Afrikaner Nationalism as an ideology. This ideology was to reach its climax in 1948 when the Afrikaner National Party became the ruling political party in South Africa. This political domination has penetrated all spheres of South African society, including education. Educational practice in South Africa has strong ideological foundations which are related to domination. This is not only a conceptual relationship but also an historical one. I will develop this historical relationship in a later chapter. I will now proceed to look at some of the arguments relating to ideology and exactly what it is.

John Thompson in his work Studies in the Theory of Ideology, makes strong claims for the link between ideology and domination. In developing his concept of ideology, he rejects ideology as purely "a system of beliefs" (1).

He views this as too neutral a conception of ideology. A more critical conception is to view ideology as a form of domination. It is important at this early stage to explain my understanding of what is meant by domination and its connection to ideology. Domination in this connection does not only relate to the crude political domination generally understood by the term. Its finer meaning is underpinned by such notions as pervasiveness. Imbedded in this notion is the assumption that ideas and practices that pervade a given society and are accepted, are generally seen as forming part of the dominant ideology of that society. The concept domination pre-theoretically contains crude notions of political power and power-sharing. However, a more theoretical and analytical conception of domination would operate within a more defined and moderate framework. This framework should be informed by democratic notions and not by crude political ideologies. Furthermore, I do not see domination in this context gravitating towards control in one way or another. This would give domination an authoritarian connotation. Ideology and domination do not relate to this. It concerns developing a dominant "collective will" without co-ercion.

What is Althusser's response to this conception of ideology?

Althusser maintains that ideology could be beliefs found in social practices or institutions. He says that ideologies "always exist in an apparatus" (2). In the context of this research paper, apparatus would refer to official State policy and institutions concerned with teacher training.

In attempting to elaborate on my own conception of ideology and how it relates to the training of teachers, I will have a closer look at Althusser and his conceptions of schooling/education as part of the Ideological State Apparatus, hereafter referred to as the ISA.

The claim that education is part of the ISA is based on the notion that education reproduces the dominant ruling class ideology via its structures and institutions. This is a functionalist conception of ideology. It is furthermore structural functional, in that teacher training institutions, as one of the institutions within an educational system, perform a particular function. This notion of ideology assumes that the institutions reproduce the ruling class ideology. This argument might be logical, given the functionalist conception of ideology, but it may not necessarily be true. Why do I say this? It is because this type of argument has an historical materialist conception of ideology. It leaves



little or no space for human agency to operate. Educational institutions do not consciously or unconsciously reproduce State ruling class ideology. This is a too mechanical and static conception of how ideology operates. Embedded in this notion is the false assumption that institutions do not offer resistance to ideological forces. Leon Benade in his paper, "Is the Althusserian Notion of Education Adequate?", argues that Althusser fails to acknowledge the fact that "... the school has an in-built potential to accommodate and initiate certain vital functions" (3). I will, in a later chapter, explain what vital functions training colleges can "accommodate and initiate" in resisting the Althusserian notion of ideology. Let us have a look at some of the cruder aspects of Althusser's conception of ideology.

Althusser argues further that ideology operates only in classes. This has been contested by Goran Therborn in his work The Power of Ideology, the Ideology of Power (4).

This relationship between class and ideology has a materialist base and is crucially static. What space is there in this conception of ideology for education and democracy? Althusser in his explanation of the ISA views education as one of the main, if not the main, reproducer

of ruling class ideology.

Because Althusser's conception of ideology does not create space for human agency, it might have subtle if not overt elements of positivism about it. His conception of ideology would be what Gramsci terms "intellectual construction" (5). It could be seen as some form of social engineering. Social engineering refers to the notion that societies and human action can be planned and manipulated by prescribed formulae. This notion is based on the false assumption that human beings act according to fixed procedures. It leaves no space for human agency.

Locating ideology in classes can be seen as a very narrow conception of ideology. This is placing ideology in a very strict economic paradigm. This argument believes that people's ideas are formed by the class they belong to. In other words ideas are determined by economic conditions. In this instance Althusser stresses the materiality of ideology and the autonomy of levels in society. Levels referring to infrastructures in a society. This is what makes Althusser's conception of ideology deterministic. What are the counter arguments to this conception?

One counter argument is that society at large formulates

the ideas and beliefs of people. People determine their own ideology given their social experience. Althusser says no; people's ideology is determined by their economic conditions, by their position. This is a central claim of Althusser. It is based on the notion that ideas function within classes. This notion has serious consequences for education. What are they?

This notion of ideology assumes that these ideas cannot be challenged, cannot be changed by education. That ideology is lodged within the educational practice. How can this be dislodged? How can the materialist conception of ideology be moved away from? An attempt to find answers to these questions would be my next move.

The space for human agency and education can be found in Gramsci's conception of ideology. In viewing ideology as a social process, Gramsci argues that this process is not static and deterministic. This social process should eventually lead to the establishment of a new hegemony which would be the dominant ideology. This conception relating to domination, links up with Thompson's conception of ideology. Ideology is not static as in the Althusserian sense. As a social process it is seen as a dynamic force that can transform society. What are the implications for education?

The Gramscian conception of ideology can play a central role in transforming education. In developing this new ideology, Gramsci argues for a moral and intellectual transformation. This argument creates space for educationists to play a role in transforming society and contribute to the establishment of a new society. This is the intellectual's contribution to establishing a new ideology. What does Gramsci mean by this?

In developing his argument concerning the transformation of a society, Gramsci locates two types of intellectuals.

The traditional intellectual and the organic intellectual. The organic intellectual is viewed as one who plays a role in the extra-curricular/non-formal sector. Trade Union leaders are seen as examples of organic intellectuals. However, this does not imply that your organic intellectual is also not a traditional intellectual, a traditional intellectual being a person with a university or college education. Industry could have engineers, bank managers, architects and scientists who take on the role as organic intellectuals, although having a university education. How does this relate to my conceptual framework of ideology? Do these intellectuals have a role to play in developing people's ideas? These are crucial questions in understanding Gramsci's notion of ideology as a social experience. I will attempt a detailed answer to these questions when

dealing with the intellectuals at teacher training colleges. This will be answered also in the context of ideology being an intellectual tool for thinking.

I will now proceed to summarize this chapter by briefly looking again at what my conceptual framework of ideology is. Let us first look at what ideology should not be.

Ideology should not be just a system of beliefs. This is too neutral a conception of ideology. This is conceiving ideology to be a mere practice without any rigorous foundations related to domination or hegemony.

Ideology should not be seen as a static concept with a material base. This would be a too reductionist and determinist view of ideology. This argument endorses the idea that ideology is embedded in social classes and cannot be dislodged from it. This is what makes this conception of ideology static. Ideology is not the monopoly of a particular class. What then is my conceptual framework of ideology?

Ideology should be seen in its societal context.

Ideology should also be located within the politics of liberation. This means that ideas worked at and [ideals] worked towards should be aimed at creating a new hegemony

- countering the dominant ruling class ideology. There should be a connection between ideology and domination. Intellectuals cannot view ideology just as a system of beliefs. Intellectuals in this context meaning both the organic and traditional intellectual in the Gramscian sense. However, the traditional intellectual at teacher training colleges must also, via the training of the History students, contribute towards the "collective will" (6). I will argue that the college intellectuals will have to locate themselves in the "war of position" as defined by Antonio Gramsci. How this is to be done will be looked at in a later chapter. What would this new ideology be seen as?

This new conception of ideology must be non-dogmatic and non-static. It must be informed by social practice, including education. Education practice must inform ideology and not ideology influence education. This means that a practice acceptable to the majority should be worked towards. Not a conception conceived by an elitist minority parading as Ideologues and foisting it on all.

I will now proceed to look at how education, especially the training of History teachers in South Africa has been influenced by ideology. My next chapter will look briefly at the historical connection that has evolved between ideology and the training of History teachers.

## CHAPTER TWO

HISTORICAL CONNECTION BETWEEN CHRISTIAN NATIONAL  
EDUCATION AND THE TRAINING OF HISTORY TEACHERS

In this chapter I will show very briefly how teacher training in South Africa has evolved along a particular ideology of race, based on the principles of Christian National Education.

This will be looked at with specific reference to the training of History teachers.

Education in South Africa has since the colonial period been based on an ideology of race. The belief that people should be educated differently in terms of the colour of their skin.

During the colonial period missionaries played a leading role in education at the Cape. Different schools were then already established for different race groups that constituted the Cape population. Slave schools and Khoi-Khoi missionary schools are classical examples.

Teacher training was also affected by the missionary influences. The establishment of Zonnebloem Training School in Cape Town, and Anglican Missionary School and

Dower Memorial in Uitenhage, a Congregational Mission School, are two examples of this.

The Dutch Calvinist conception of society was nurtured along the frontiers of the Cape during the late seventeenth century and early eighteenth century. The Boer frontier communities were to have a profound influence on educational policy in South Africa in later years. This policy was to be called Christian National Education. Embedded in the notion of Christian National Education is the belief that people are ordained to be separated in terms of colour. This they believe is the will of God. Education policy should be part of this will of God. To give effect to the policy of Christian National Education a number of apartheid laws such as the Group Areas Act, the creation of Bantustans were to come into being. These were to form a structural, legal framework within which Christian National Education was to operate. To this end separate schools for separate populations in separate areas were to be built. This was the beginning of a township schooling system in Black areas which was to backfire on its architects in the Soweto Revolt of 1976.

The notion is consistent with the Calvinist conception of man and society that emerged during the religious reformation period in Europe and imported to the Cape



during the Dutch Colonial Rule. The Calvinist conception of Education is based on Christian principles of morality and purity. It views education as part of God's plan. Embedded in this notion is the false assumption that God has plans for different nations and peoples. The Calvinist believes that different people should be educated differently according to this plan. With the re-emergence of the Afrikaner during the twentieth century after a long period of British intervention the National Party was to resurrect this notion of Calvinism and education in 1948. This notion became officially known as Christian National Education.

On the question of History as a school subject and the reasons for teaching it, Article Six of the policy document concerning Christian National Education has this to say:

"We believe that history must be taught in the light of the divine revelation and must be seen as the fulfilment of God's decree (raadsplan) for the world and humanity. We believe that the great faith of creation, the FALL and Breaking of contract (bondsbreuk); the recreation of Christ Jesus and the end (completion - voleinding) of the world, are of world historical importance, and that Christ Jesus is the great turning point in world History. We believe that God had willed separate nations and peoples, and had given each separate nations and peoples its particular vocations and task and gifts. Youth can faithfully take over the task and vocation of the older generation only when it has acquired through instruction in history a true vision of the origin of the nation, and of the

direction of that heritage. We believe that next to the mother tongue, the patriotic (vaderlandse) history of the nation is the great means of cultivating love of one's own."  
(1)

This article has very subtle suggestions to justify racism in education. The suggestion "that God had willed separate nations" endowing them with different talents and tasks in life has covert underpinnings for justifying separation in education. Furthermore, the notion that History "is the great means of cultivating love of one's own" is another subtle way of advocating separatism and elitism. Embedded in the notion is the assumption that the aim of History is to develop nationalist, jingoistic feelings for "one's own" whatever that might mean. That this is a true assumption, especially in the case of South African History, is not necessarily a correct assumption. The aim of teaching History has a wide range of crucial areas. This will be explained in the next chapter when I look at the syllabus currently prescribed for History teacher trainees.

Referring to the training of History teachers, the Christian National Education policy places itself squarely in the paradigm of positivist educational theory. This is deduced from its reference to the scientific nature of the student's training.

Furthermore, it makes reference to the subject Pedagogic Science as an important subject for the trainee History

teacher. The Christian National Education policy states that:

"We believe that our substitutes must be properly trained for their task. At the institutions for the training of our teachers, attention must be given to the following claims: the young men and women must receive a scientifically and systematized Christian life and world view: they must be instructed in all the necessary secular sciences, but most particularly in pedagogic science. We believe that their training can and will succeed only if after proper selection they are placed under the guidance of men and women who are themselves of a convinced Christian National life view and have been brought up as such. We wish therefore to see the institutions for the training of our teachers as Christian and National institutions." (2)

This policy still exists today in education and the training of teachers in South Africa. And has been enunciated in research on teacher training in South Africa. Jacobus Willem Payne in his thesis "Die Opleiding van Hoërskool Onderwysers binne die Verband van Binnelandse Aangeleenthede en die Rol wat die Universiteit van Wes-Kaapland daarin Gespeel Het", quotes the work of two positivist educational theorists in support of the Christian National educational conception of education and teacher training. He quotes from the work of H.J.J. Bingle, et al, "Besinning en Verantwoording": "In die werk BESINNING EN VERANTWOORDING word gesê:

'Hierdie onderwyseropleiding moet 'n

Christelike-nasionale lewensbeskouing behels,  
plus al die ander hoë en noodsaaklike  
vereistes.' " (3)

This conception is reinforced in the quotation from  
E.C.C. Muller's work "Evaluering van 'n  
Begeleidingsinstrument in Onderwysopleiding":

"Benewens die vaardighede, kennis en houdings  
waaroor hy moet beskik, moet hy in die skool,  
soms daar buite, sy dagtaak met geloofsvertroue  
tegemoet gaan, met liefde aan God en aan sy  
naaste, uit liefde en eer tot God." (4)

These were the historical-theoretical foundations for an  
educational policy in South Africa concerning the  
training of History teachers. On the practical level  
laws were to be formulated that would make education  
racist/separate in terms of "separate nations" according  
to Christian National Education policy.

When the National Party came to power in 1948, concerted  
efforts were made to push legislation through parliament.

The idea was to make separate education legal. The  
Bantu Education Act of 1953, which resulted from the  
Eiselen Commission's report of 1951, removed control of  
all schools for 'Bantus' from the Education Departments  
of the Provinces and placed them under control of the  
Native Affairs Department. Schools were placed in the  
hands of 'Bantu' School Boards. Differential syllabuses  
for 'Bantu' schools were laid down. Similar legislation

was passed in 1963 concerning the education of so called coloured people. This legislation was to be officially known as The Coloured Persons' Education Act, No 47 of 1963. Control of so called Coloured education was removed from the Education Departments of the Province and placed in the hands of a Coloured Education Advisory Council.

These Acts were met with some militant responses from the disenfranchised teaching fraternity (5).

This Act had crucial implications for teacher training in South Africa. That in so much as education had always been separated covertly if not always overtly, these Education Acts would further entrench the Christian National Education policy in South Africa, thereby further legalizing education and the apartheid ideology.

Separate Education Departments were established to deal with the administration of teacher training for different population groups. In the case of church institutions such as Zonnebloem and Dower, they were to become quasi-state institutions. State syllabuses were officially prescribed and prescriptions for teacher training became more positivist in its nature. Standards differed from one population group to another. Standards in this context meant different levels of course

prescriptions and qualifications for entry and also curriculum content. This difference can be quantitatively demonstrated by the admission requirements applicable to the different population groups.

For admission to a so called Coloured Training School, the minimum entrance qualification was a Junior Certificate, whereas the entrance qualification to a Black training school was a Standard Six Certificate. This was to remain the case long after the Whites had to have a minimum qualification of Standard Ten to follow a teacher's course. The White Education Department did not have Training Schools which catered for students with a Junior Certificate, only Training Colleges which are post matric training institutions. The so called Coloured Education Department only reached this level in 1984 when the last of the Training Schools were upgraded to Training Colleges.

This historical connection between the Christian National Education policy and teacher training has not changed in terms of legislature. However, there were moves at different stages to change the course curricula in terms of entrance qualification and course programme pursued. In 1963 teacher trainees at so called coloured institutions with a matric certificate could follow a third year of specialized training which would lead to a

Primary Teachers' Diploma (P.T.D.). This was supposed to be an improvement upon the then existing two courses, namely, the Lower Primary Teachers' Certificate (L.P.T.C.) which were followed by both males and females with a Junior Certificate. This was a two-year course. Males were subsequently excluded from this course direction and had to have a Matriculation Certificate to follow a two-year course leading to the Primary Teachers' Certificate (P.T.C.).

In 1982 the whole structure of teacher training in Coloured education changed. The lower Primary Teachers' Certificate (L.P.T.C.) as a qualification was phased out. This was seen as a progressive step.

Schools that offered these courses were upgraded to Training Colleges. These were schools like Zonnebloem and Wesley. The Primary Teachers' Certificate (P.T.C.) and the Primary Teachers' Diploma (P.T.D.) as qualifications were replaced by a compulsory three-year course leading to what is known as a Diploma in Education. This would qualify the candidate to teach in the primary school at either the Junior Primary School level or the Senior Primary School level, depending on the course direction the student followed at college. Furthermore, the student could opt, given his results in his first year, for what is known as a Higher Diploma in

Education (H.D.E.) which starts in his second year of training. This is a four-year course which qualifies the student to teach at the Secondary Schools. The student who follows the Diploma in Education can do an optional fourth year, also leading to a Higher Education Diploma but with the qualification to teach specialized subjects in the Senior Primary School.

These structural changes were all made in the name of 'improvement of standards' in the teacher training programme of so called coloured students. However, the syllabus content prescriptions introduced in 1982 were a retrogressive step compared to standards that were applied to the Primary Education Diploma Course. (6)

Teacher training had by 1982 come a long way from 1812 when the missionaries at Genadendal trained boys with a Standard Four Certificate to become teachers (7). However, historically the basic philosophy of teacher training has still very overt missionary leanings. This has been seen to be quite evident in the Christian National Education policy statements relating to Christianity and race. The South African education planners inherited this thinking from its Dutch colonial ancestors. I will now proceed to look empirically at how this type of thinking has penetrated the History syllabus prescribed for teacher training at so called Coloured



Colleges of Education.

This I do in support of my argument that ideology, in this case Christian Nationalideology, influenced the training of History teachers in South Africa.

## CHAPTER THREE

A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE SENIOR PRIMARY DIPLOMA  
HISTORY SYLLABUS PRESCRIBED FOR TEACHER TRAINEES IN THE  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE: HOUSE OF  
REPRESENTATIVES

Having looked at the brief History of Christian National Education ideology and policy regarding the teaching of History, this chapter will attempt at having a critical look at the syllabus content, that is, the course outline for student teachers of History following the Senior Primary Diploma of Education at Colleges of Education under the House of Representatives - Department of Education and Culture. The syllabus discussed is officially entitled DIPLOMA IN EDUCATION SYLLABUS - HISTORY - SENIOR PRIMARY SPECIALIZATION SUBJECT - DEPARTMENT OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS - CAPE TOWN 1982.

I will attempt to analyse this syllabus by first attempting a theoretical exposition relating to the nature of the syllabus. This would be a preliminary critique of the general nature of the syllabus before attempting to look at the more detailed syllabus content.

I will then proceed with a more empirical and descriptive study of the syllabus. This will involve looking at the course content at different year levels

more critically. In this regard I will look at two aspects. First the content matter will be looked at and then the section referred to as Subject Didactics. A copy of this syllabus is attached to this dissertation as Annexure B.

#### THE NATURE OF THE SYLLABUS

This raises the question about which school of Historiography, that is, South African Historiography, this syllabus emanates from. This relates closely to ideology and more specifically the ideology of politics. It is this ideology of politics that will eventually determine the aims of teaching History in our schools. To this end the aim of History teaching could be overtly political in terms of indicating trust in the ruling governing party of the day and its policies, whatever they might be. This notion of History teaching is one currently practised by protagonists of Christian National Education. The aim of History teaching could also be more internationalist depending on the political ethos of the day. To this extent the aim of teaching History would be to promote international understanding rather than parochial nationalist sentiments. Furthermore, the aim of teaching History could have purely educational aims. In this regard the aim of teaching History would be for the pupil to require and develop certain critical

skills. The latter aim is one supported by the more progressive History teachers as opposed to the first one which entrenches the status quo and has more conservative support. The debate in Great Britain concerning the National Curriculum for History gravitated around these aims of teaching History (1).

The nature and scope of this syllabus is very conservative. This places it squarely in the school of Christian National Education Historiography. This is spelt out in the preamble to the syllabus under the heading AIMS. The ideology of Christian National Education is amplified in the third aim:

"... this subject provides the means of guiding the student to take his place as an adult member of the community and as a citizen of his country ..." (2)

From this particular aim the suggestion is made that History, that is the teaching and learning of History, must produce 'responsible members' of a society. This conception of what History teaching should aim at, is compatible with the fundamental principles of Christian National Education. The central idea revolves around "power and authority" and respect for it. This notion is further implied by the aim of History being to guide the student to adulthood. In this sense the student comes to respect 'power and authority' in his community and in his

country. Furthermore, the aim is to induce trust in the ruling class.

The nature of the syllabus does not have a radical disposition. It does not endorse the development of critical skills within the students. Is it that the students might start looking critically at the power and authoritative structure in their society? The syllabus further has the aim of developing good citizens by teaching students the History of their country. This aim is amplified in the official Senior Primary School syllabus:

"to lead the pupil to realize that the well-being of his country is the responsibility of each citizen." (3)

The notion of citizenship and what constitutes a citizen is very narrow. Embedded in this notion is the false assumption that citizens love their government and act responsibly towards it. This is an assumption that has been contested and will have to be rigorously worked through when reformulating the aims of History for a new South Africa. What does it mean to educate someone for citizenship? What constitutes a citizen? These are questions that will have to be answered. At the moment the student teacher is trained to pursue the aims as set out in the official syllabus and from which I have quoted.

It will be the responsibility of the primary school teacher to pursue this aim when teaching History at this level.

The nature of this syllabus also has strong tendencies towards the basic principles of fundamental pedagogics. This is also related to the concept of 'power and authority' being central issues in education:

"... the educand has to submit to the authority of the teacher as he in turns submits to that of the principal, the inspector and all along the line to the Minister." (4)

The structuralist nature of the syllabus is reflected in the way the syllabus is set out for the different year levels. The chronological progressive method has been applied in setting out the syllabus in strict chronological order. The second year syllabus picks up where the first year stopped and the third year picks up where it stopped in the second year. There is no thematic approach to the studying of History. The History, in terms of its nature and scope is broken down further in the first year. At this level the syllabus speaks of History Higher and History Elementary. This differentiation needs to be maintained so that students who did not follow History as a subject up to matric can opt for History elementary at college level. Those who

did History in matric do History Higher in first year. This differentiation should be reflected in the depth of factual detail that the students are required to study and in the type of questions and format of examination.

This type of structural approach reflects poorly on the architects of the syllabus. Their concept of what History is and what History ought to be perceived as, is questionable. Can one really speak of differentiation in the teaching of History and also the learning thereof? What is one's conception of the nature of History if one speaks of differentiation in the teaching of History?

However, in spite of having done elementary History at first year level, the students who follow the Senior Primary Diploma in Education are compelled to do History in their second year. Here there is no differentiation.

Let us now have a more empirical and analytical look at the syllabus content that is being prescribed for History student teachers. This will be dealt with in two parts. I will first focus on what is called the History Content Section. I will concentrate specifically on analysing the syllabus on South African History. I will then proceed to look at the subject didactics syllabus. This is where the students are taught how to teach History as a subject.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN HISTORY COURSE OUTLINE - a critique

The first year is spent looking at the Colonial period at the Cape in very structured terms.

After a brief study of pre-colonial History under the headings "Khoi-Khoi pastoral agriculturalist, San hunter gatherers", the student focuses on Dutch occupation and settlement at the Cape. This forms the central theme of the first year syllabus. Reference is also made to what the syllabus calls "voyages of discovery". In this context they refer to individuals such as Da Gama, Diaz and Da Almeida. Dutch settlement is also dealt with in terms of individuals. The central personalities that are studied are Van Riebeeck, Simon and William Adriaan van der Stel.

One is immediately confronted with the Euro-centric notion of South African History. Furthermore, the idea that History is about great individuals is also reflected in the structure of this course outline. The student has to learn the factual information about these individuals.

No emphasis is placed on, or space created for studying the emerging processes that were taking shape in South African History.



The content matter also suggests that South African History revolves around certain groups of people and persons. This assumption is further pursued in the second year where the emphasis is placed on British Settlement and certain British individuals.

The first year syllabus creates no space for a dialectical assessment of the processes that were emerging in South African History during this particular period. The emphasis is purely on knowing instead of understanding. The themes prescribed at first year level also perpetuates the myth that South African History started in 1652. This is compatible with current ruling class ideology. The obsession with race and ethnicity is also reflected in the first year syllabus under the heading "Intergroup Relations 1652 - 1795". Under this theme the students need to study the different racial groups that constituted the population of the Cape during this period. The implication of this theme is that groups need to be kept segregated from one another. Factors such as social heritage and different social traditions are given as reasons.

No reference is made to this period in terms of conquest.

The Dutch Settlement is rather seen in terms of occupation and discovery. The notion of conquest is

ignored throughout the syllabus content. The acquisition of land and its accompanying processes relating to labour acquisition by White settlers is interpreted as expansionism. This is dealt with under a heading such as "Colonial Expansion". These expansionist policies and the emergent themes of land and labour are not critically looked at. The assumption is that History is static, that there is no structural change in the social or economic order as a result of Historical processes. History is viewed purely as a succession of events. This is quite evident in the second year syllabus. The British colonial period is viewed predominantly from the point of view that governors succeeded one another at different times and had different policies to governing the Cape. The governors emphasised are Caledon, Cradock and Somerset. This prescription further perpetuates the false assumption that South African History is about White Settlement and its development. What emerges further in the syllabus at this level is the notion that South African History is a History of conflict between Boer and Brit. This notion occupies a central position in the second year syllabus. The Great Trek is prescribed in detail. Students need to study the causes and results of the Great Trek. The ruling class ideology relating to the English as a threat to the Boer communities is spelt out clearly in the syllabus:

- "5.1.1 The threats against the spiritual values of the frontier farmers.
- 5.1.2 The threats against their material well-being." (5)

No mention is made of the dispossession of land by the White settlers. The Mfecane is seen in terms of Black internal power struggles and the rise of powerful Black chieftains. No reference is made to the process of dispossession as a result of the expansionist policies of the White settlers.

A further assumption that South African History is a History of heroic Afrikaner leaders is also implicit in the content syllabus. Students are expected to study in detail Voortrekker leaders such as Piet Retief, Pretorius and Hendrick Potgieter. These leaders are to be juxtaposed with Black leaders such as Dingaan, Moshes and Malikatz. In the prescribed textbook covering this period, the Voortrekker leaders emerge as heroes and the Black leaders as villains. This is a central conception of South African History held by the ruling class ideology. The Great Trek is still held up as one of the singular most important events in the History of White Afrikaner South Africa. The student must study its results in the light of the establishment of the Boer republics in the north in 1852 and 1854. This is prescribed in the second year syllabus content under the heading "The Conventions". This refers to the

Bloemfontein and Sand River Conventions which ensured the establishment of the Orange River Republic and the South African Republic respectively.

These assumptions are also implicit in the third year syllabus content. The themes dealt with in the third year are crucial to understanding the economic development of South Africa and the related class and colour themes that emerged. However, the prescriptions are once again very structured and chronologically arranged. A central feature of the syllabus at this level is the clash between British Imperialism and Afrikaner Nationalism as personified by Cecil Rhodes and Paul Kruger. This is seen as the central result of the discovery of gold and a central reason for the Anglo-Boer War of 1899.

The assumption implicit in the syllabus at this level is that the discovery of diamonds and gold had an effect only on the White settler communities in South Africa. This myth is pursued in what students are expected to learn at this level. The syllabus prescribes that they study the ideals of Rhodes and Kruger in detail. Great emphasis is placed on the way the British intimidated the Boers during this period. The climax is the Anglo-Boer War. Students need to study this war in detail. The different phases of the war, highlighting Boer victories

and British atrocities, are emphasised. The myth that this is a "White man's" war is perpetuated by ignoring the role played by Blacks in this war.

A crucial period in South African History starting in 1902 is prescribed purely as negotiations between two White settler groups. This is dealt with under the heading "The Peace Treaty of Vereeniging". No reference is made to the rise of the African resistance movements. The impact of White settlement on African communities is ignored. The period 1902 - 1910 is studied by looking only briefly at the British policies in the two Republics and the events that led to Union. These are all seen as results of the discovery of gold. It is purely political in its content. This is in line with the Afrikaner Historiography that stresses the political, constitutional and cultural heritage of its ideology. It does not explore the social and economic structures of the past.

The syllabus is also structured along the capitalist ideology relating to great Men in History. From the first year to the third year emphasis is placed on the role played by the individual. This ignores the role played by the masses of ordinary people.

The third year syllabus, like the previous two years, has

no space for a theoretical and conceptual analysis of South Africa's past. Because of the examination structure at this year level, factual information as prescribed in the syllabus, becomes important to the student. The examination is an external examination set by the relevant State department. All students doing History at third year level for the Senior Primary Diploma in Education, need to sit for this examination. A student that passes this examination is seen as being qualified to teach History to primary school pupils. Owen van der Berg therefore correctly says that:

"Teacher training must also share some of the blame for producing teachers who still present History as a fixed body of knowledge needing to be learnt and regurgitated." (6)

The History prescribed for teacher trainees from the first year to the third year entrenches this notion of "fixed body of knowledge needing to be learnt and regurgitated". The emphasis is on testing the memory of the pupil instead of developing some skills. Students eventually teach what they were taught.

I will now proceed to look at how these students are trained to teach History. This will be done by means of a critical exposition of what is referred to in the syllabus and "Subject Didactics". This relates to the methods and techniques that need to be exposed to the

students that are being trained to teach History.

This programme has been drawn up by "experts", that is the "planners" of teacher training, more specifically History teacher training. These persons are also viewed as agents of the ruling class ideology and referred to as technocrats.

A central feature therefore of the Subject Didactics syllabus is its technicist character. The training programme is structured along mechanical lines. Implicit in this programme is a number of false notions.

The first notion which is very technical concerns the way students are trained to plan a History lesson. This is done under the heading "Notes of Lesson - written preparation". Implicit in this notion is the false assumption that a lesson written up as prescribed in terms of all the technical features, will ensure that the lesson will be well taught and well received by the pupils. In the second year syllabus a number of features are listed that must be included when writing up a History lesson: features such as "teaching and learning aids" that must be used, "The general and specific aim of the lesson", the time and duration of the lesson. These are technical features that are looked for when a student is evaluated. No space is made for developing critical

teaching skills.

Students are exposed to the traditional-orthodox teaching methods in History. This is the narrative method, the Socratic and biographical method. In the first year this is very briefly referred to. In the second year though, it is dealt with in more detail and tested.

A further technicist notion is the idea that physical conditions will improve teaching techniques. Students are therefore taught the characteristics of a good History classroom. That there should be sufficient lighting, sufficient chalkboard space, and so on, are all features emphasised under this theme. Personal characteristics are also seen as a possible way of improving teaching skills. The students are therefore taught the characteristics of a good History teacher. Some of the qualities emphasised are "diligence, devotion to work ... character and a sense of responsibility" (7).

It is presumptuous to argue that such qualities in a teacher will ensure a good History lesson: it might be a necessary quality, but not a sufficient requirement.

It is evident that the subject didactics syllabus is Positivist in its nature. It sets forward variables and predicts results. It assumes that if pupils are taken on



excursions their understanding of History will increase. In the third year the students are taught what factors in terms of the physical arrangements need to be considered when taking pupils on excursions.

In the third year syllabus students are briefly confronted with a more philosophical question relating to the teaching of History. This is dealt with under the heading "The Nature and Scope of History". Other than this, the general didactic syllabus suggests that a good History lesson depends on its technical features. In prescribing the theme on audio-visual material and the teaching of History, features such as the chalkboard, flannel board and the overhead projector are given great prominence.

Let us now compare the two elements of the official syllabus, that is, the content matter and the subject didactics.

There exists a serious anomaly between the subject didactics syllabus and the content matter syllabus. This is reflected in the volume of work and the mark allocation for the different sections. The student is supposed to be trained as a History teacher, as opposed to a professional Historian. However, the subject didactics paper only constitutes 25% of the total

syllabus at third year. The content papers constitute 75%. This is made up of two papers of two hours each, compared to one subject didactics paper of one and a half hours. This is evidence of the imbalance that exists in the syllabus prescribed for the training of History teachers at Colleges of Education.

How can the problems raised in this chapter relating to the training of History teachers at Colleges of Education under the Department of Education and Culture, be solved?

One way of attempting to solve the problem is to argue for a democratization of teacher training. This would involve locating teacher training at Colleges of Education within the politics of liberation. The politics of liberation is not a reformist strategy. The notion implies seeking political solutions to issues in society. Furthermore, it also implies that these political solutions should be a radical departure from the currently held political notion. What needs to be countered at this juncture in teacher training so as to "liberate" it politically is the whole notion of power and authority in education and its political underpinnings. History teacher training lacks autonomy because it is subjected to "experts" and "planners" whose interest is in conflict with many of those who are engaged in the practice of training History teachers.

This conflict and tension would only be resolved with a "... commitment to the politicization of educational planning" (8).

This lack of autonomy present in History teacher training is geared at maintaining the ruling class ideology. The State apparatus sees that via the teaching of History the ruling class ideology can be reproduced and entrenched. However, this has been contested in the South African Historiography. The next chapter will look briefly at how this has been contested and what effect, if any, it has had on the training of History teachers in terms of the prescribed syllabus.

## CHAPTER FOUR

CONTESTING THE CHRISTIAN NATIONAL EDUCATION HISTORY  
SYLLABUS - DEBATES IN SOUTH AFRICAN HISTORIOGRAPHY AND  
ITS EFFECT ON HISTORY TEACHER TRAINING AT COLLEGES OF  
EDUCATION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE:  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

This chapter attempts to look briefly at debates in South African Historiography and to offer some preliminary critique. More important, it is an attempt to look at what effect these debates have had on the training and teaching of History students at Colleges of Education in terms of the responses these debates have received. This attempt is to be seen in the light of the contention that the teaching and training of History students in terms of both content and method, as spelt out in a previous chapter, is part of what Althusser terms the Ideological State Apparatus (1). Furthermore, History as a subject has been one of the important forces used in applying the reproductive theory of education in the South African school system, via the training of their teachers.

History students and teachers have taken cognisance of these debates in South African Historiography and have debated these amongst themselves since the inception of separate education, and not as some would believe, only

since the Soweto Uprisings of 1976.

Let us look at some of the current debates and at how politically interested they are. This will introduce the kind of responses there have been to History teaching and training programmes.

It is Carr in his work, What is History?, who maintains that you need to "study the historian before you study the facts" (2).

An Historian, in terms of his politics, develops a particular analysis or in some cases, a theory, of history. Therefore no historiography is politically disinterested. The philosophy of History that an historian has is determined by ideological forces in terms of his/her politics. South African Historiography has wide-ranging ideological spectrums, ranging from Marxist-Revisionist analysis to Afrikaner Nationalist theory. Between these two extremes are located the liberal school of South African Historiography and the Africanist School. Let us have a brief critical look at these schools.

The revisionist school views South African History in terms of a class struggle. They interpret and understand South African History in Historical Materialist terms.

Central to their argument is the notion that the conflict in South African History relates to land and labour. Their interpretation has a strong materialist base, viewing South African History in purely economic terms. Proponents of the Revisionist school in the fifties and sixties were, amongst others, Edward Roux with his work Time Longer Than Rope (3), and Dora Taylor, writing under the pseudonym of N. Majeke, with her work The Role of the Missionaries in Conquest (4). The more recent revisionist theorists are F.R. Johnstone and Merle Lipton to name but two. This interpretation of History has been completely excluded from the official approach to the teaching and training of History students.

Criticism of the Revisionist approach includes viewing this interpretation of History as reductionist and functionalist, seeing it as a theory, and not an analysis, of South African History (5). However, Deborah Posel argues in her paper "Rethinking the Race-Class Debate in South African Historiography", that this type of criticism is purely liberalist in its nature and that the liberal school sees "... racial prejudice, rather than class struggle as the heart of the conflicts..." (6)

The liberal analysis of South African History has occupied a prominent place in the History departments of

many English medium South African universities, especially since 1976. To this end the work edited by Monica Wilson and Leonard Thompson, The Oxford History of South Africa (7) bears testimony. Other prominent historians in the liberal tradition are W.M. Macmillian and T.H.R. Davenport to name but two. Their notion is that the removal of racial discrimination which is all that South African History is about, will solve South Africa's political problems. This position has in turn been contested by the Revisionists. They argue that serious economic power relations still exist and would still exist, given the liberalist interpretation of South African History. This creates problems in the political power relations and other related areas of society, such as education.

The other two schools of thought in South African Historiography, namely, the Afrikaner Nationalist School which is based on the philosophy of Christian National Education, and the Africanist School, are diametrically in opposition to each other. The Afrikaner Nationalist opts to view South African History as a theory in terms of White supremacy. The Africanist historiographer views South African History as a struggle against this supremacy. These Africanists were mainly Black writers. However, Christopher Saunders, in his work The Making of South African Past - Major Historian on race and

class - speaks of some White Historians also as Africanist. He refers to them as "Liberal Africanist" and says: "They were Africanist in that they sought to show that Africans played an important role in South African History." (8)

There have been numerous calls by the Africanist Historians to expose the myths of Christian National Education History and rewrite South African History. Majeke writing in the introduction to her work The Role of the Missionaries in Conquest, says:

"For a people engaged in a liberatory struggle it is necessary to rewrite the History of the past. It is part of the very process of liberation to expose the distortions of History which are presented by the herrenvolk as truth and taught to the young in schools and universities" (9)

Articulations of this nature from Africanist Historians have resulted in it being coined more recently as People's History. This concept of History can loosely be defined as a History of South Africa written from a radical, non-establishment point of view. Its intention is to serve as a counterweight to the enormous pile of conventional South African History which chronicles the country's story through the activities of political leaders and heroes from the enfranchised group. The History syllabus for the training of History teachers at Colleges of Education is a classic example of



conventional South African History. People's History is History 'from the bottom up', concentrating on the disenfranchised, on those people connected with mass movements of protest and resistance.

Given these brief functional descriptions of the main schools of thought in South African Historiography, it is obvious that, except for the Afrikaner Nationalist theory, there exists a distinct dichotomy between what is being researched and debated at university and what is being prescribed and taught at school and teacher training colleges. All interpretations other than that of Afrikaner Nationalism are seen as too revolutionary and therefore in terms of the Althusserian thesis of Ideological State Apparatus "... the severe regime of Afrikaner Nationalist historiography has dominated History in schools ... "(10).

Despite the efforts to reproduce the dominant state ideology through the teaching of South African History in schools, there have been attempts to resist this. The struggle against the dominant ruling ideology has included an informal response whereby progressive teachers, with the pupils, have created structures to facilitate the teaching of History other than that which is prescribed by the State syllabus. As a result of this, many pupils, when given the choice, have opted out

of doing History as a formal subject at school. This is evident in the large numbers of students who do History at an elementary level in their first year at teacher training college. History as a formal classroom subject at Senior School level has been on the decline. This decline in interest in History at Senior School level is suggested by the evidence amongst first year History students at Colleges of Education. The majority of these students opt for History Elementary at first year level, implying that they did not do History as a matric subject. In an attempt to remedy this situation and also as a response to the progressive debates in South African Historiography, Peter Kallaway and others devised the HISTORY ALIVE series for Standards Nine and Ten. No such textbook has been devised for college students.

In this series of textbooks, Kallaway attempts to present History in the form of processes rather than clinical chronological events. He attempts to provide the pupil with an understanding of how historical processes have influenced events in the past, the emphasis being more on the process than the event. When dealing, for example, with the discovery of diamonds and gold in South Africa, the book provides an insight into the economic processes which were to give rise to capitalism in South Africa. The whole process is seen in the context of an Industrial Revolution in South Africa. The facts concerning who

found the first diamond, and where, are not over-emphasised as in traditional South African History textbooks. In this way Kallaway seeks "to provide only a small part of the foundation from which to build a new History in our schools" (11).

Community-based organizations such as civic bodies and extra-parliamentary activist groups have also responded to these debates. They have over the years raised the level of consciousness, concerning South African History, of many students outside the formal classroom situation. There has been serious discourse on the nature of South African History within these community-based organizations, studying not only the History of South Africa, but also the historian, as Carr recommends.

During the crisis of 1985 there was a national response to South African Historiography. This resulted in a serious call for a People's History. How did this call affect teacher training colleges and schools? Let us first look at a brief History of this appeal.

The call for People's History was formalised by the National Education Crisis Committee (N.E.C.C.) as being an integral part of their programme (12). In October 1987 the National Education Crisis Committee published a teachers' workbook on the teaching of History entitled

What is History? (13). It used as its source material examples of text from People's History. This was welcomed by the Africanist Historiographer as a contribution to the field of South African Historiography. This type of History programme became formal practice at some universities. Some History departments started including People's History as part of their course structure. Education departments at the universities started preparing their prospective History teachers to teach People's History. Colleges of Education, however, did not respond in such formal terms.

The dicotomy still exists between what is formally prescribed and what is informally taught. Lecturers in History departments at Colleges of Education have responded, however, by the creation of an official organization called the History Lecturers Association. This body has committed itself to the formal establishment of a type of History other than the current Christian National Education History being taught at colleges.

Problems that Colleges of Education have had with their responses to the debate relating to People's History, is that some proponents have been too romantic and simplistic as to what is understood by People's History. What needs still to be developed is a sound theoretical foundation as to exactly what People's History is. There

needs to be a sustaining of such works by the National Education Crisis Committee's What is History?.

Questions that still need to be confronted are, amongst others: How can People's History be included at Colleges of Education, given the constraints within which they operate? What are the other conceptual frameworks that "People's History" is to be informed by, other than those stated in the earlier definition of People's History. In the formulation of the concept of People's History and how it should be taught and practised, a History needs to be devised that is not simply a glorification of a people or persons, whatever the colour. History should be bent more towards analysing than glorifying persons and events.

People's History is viewed by some as being political activism and not making any serious contribution to the Historiography of South Africa. It is also seen by some as not being altogether in the Africanist tradition in terms of research and dialectic, but being merely political rhetoric. However, political analysts see People's History as a necessary, if not sufficient contribution to the political conscientization of people.

The emergence of People's History projects is seen as a necessary stage in the struggle to mobilize the people and narrow the support of the ruling class. It is a matter of expediency more than official, dogmatic policy.

Furthermore, the repressive State Apparatus has prevented People's History from developing into a refined scholarly discipline. Detention and banishment of the architects of People's History has contributed towards this. People's History thus remains still very much in its crude stage with a potential for critical scholarly refinement.

The History syllabus at Colleges of Education and how politically interested it is to be construed, will be based on Kallaway's notion that: "There is, in the end, no such thing as objective History or History that is not informed by ideological perspectives." (14) This, however, no way condones the current History syllabus based on Christian National Education "ideological perspectives". The notion of "ideological perspectives" is informed by those conceptual frameworks analysed in Chapter One.

This chapter serves as one of the many challenges to the way South African History can be taught at Colleges of Education. I have also attempted to highlight the different schools in South African Historiography. To this end I hoped to point out the differences governing the relationships between the schools of thought about South African History. The relationship between these schools of thought in searching for common ground

concerning their conception of South African History is of crucial importance in securing a new History of South Africa for our schools and colleges.

I will now move on to a more theoretical and analytical exposition as to how the training of History teachers at Colleges of Education can be democratized. I will attempt too to look at how constraints to the democratization of History teacher training can be approached and overcome.

## CHAPTER FIVE

CAN THE TRAINING OF HISTORY TEACHERS AT COLLEGES OF  
EDUCATION BE DEMOCRATIZED?

This chapter will look critically at whether teacher training, especially the training of History teachers at Colleges of Education, can be democratized. That is, whether it can be dislocated from the repressive State apparatus; whether Colleges of Education can become autonomous, free of bureaucratic control. This is attempted in the light of the notion that History teacher training in South Africa serves to perpetuate a particular ideology.

Central questions that will be argued in this chapter are:

- i. On what democratic principles should a legitimate State be based so as to make the training of History teachers democratic?
- ii. To what extent will the practice of History teacher training be affected, given these democratic principles? Will it be autonomous?
- iii. Can History teacher training be a force in the democratization of education?
- iv. What is the relationship between bureaucracy and the democratization of History teacher training?



Let us proceed to have a critical look at question one. The notion is that the current practice of History teacher training is undemocratic because, amongst other reasons, it is accountable to an illegitimate State. The argument goes that History teacher training would be democratic if it was accountable to a legitimate State. What is a legitimate and illegitimate State? Legitimacy in this context is defined in terms of democracy. Democracy characterised by what? I will try to argue that a democracy characterized by both its procedures and goals will ensure a legitimate State with democratic educational practices. Let us have a closer look at this notion.

A pre-theoretical notion of democracy relates to concepts such as majority rule, equal opportunity, freedom and justice. It is also viewed as a set of political-social arrangements. Central to this arrangement is the principle of equality. Equality though, as a democratic principle is not an end in itself. Theoretically the notion of democracy should look at the procedures applied in achieving this equality, the achievement of equality being its goal. For a State to be legitimate and its institutions to be accountable to it, its democratic principles should be characterized in terms of both its means, that is the procedures, and its ends, that is, the

goals. A brief look will now be taken at what democratic theorists have said in this regard.

Democratic theorists, in attempting to define democracy, have emerged with different and at times incompatible notions of democracy. Central to Benn and Peter's definition of democracy is the idea that it is "a safeguard against the abuse of power" (1). Lively speaks of democracy as a principle of "political equality" (2). He further defined democracy in terms of "ends that need to be maximised" (3). Macpherson argues that democracy can also be seen in terms of "human equality" (4). He speaks of the goal of democracy as being: "The full and free development of the essential human capacities of all the members of the society." (5)

Other theorists have characterized democracy purely in terms of its being a particular method. Most notable in this regard has been Schumpeter. Central to the theory of democracy for him is that it is a particular political method or certain type of institutional arrangement. These are different theoretical notions of democracy. How would a legitimate State be defined in terms of these notions of democracy? I will now proceed to explain this.

A legitimate State should be defined in terms of its

democratic principles. In this regard Lively speaks of political equality as a democratic principle. Democratic principles are applied to democratic procedures to achieve democratic goals. These procedures concern the level of participation that people have in the democratic process. In the case of History teacher training it relates to the system and method of History teacher training programmes. Democratic principles based on a democracy that is characterized by both procedure and goals are important for the legitimate State that wishes to democratize History teacher training. Let us have a closer look at this notion.

For a State to seek accountability from its institutions it will have to be a legitimate State. This legitimate State must have a democracy characterized by both procedures and goals. If its democracy is viewed only in terms of its goals it could be that it views democratic procedures as being contingently connected to democracy, that is, they are accidental and not necessary. This is unacceptable and would not make a State legitimate. Similarly, if the State views democracy as being characterized only in terms of its procedures, viewing democratic goals as accidental, then it cannot claim to be legitimate. In this regard Schumpeter views these goals not only as unimportant but also unrealistic (6). To him democracy is clearly just a method, a procedure.

This also represents the contemporary theory of democracy. What type of democracy would make a system legitimate?

For a democratic arrangement that would make a system legitimate both democracy as a procedure and democracy as a goal is important. Democracy must be characterized as having both means and ends. Bentham and Mill (7), however, see democracy purely as a method in terms of being representative of the people's interest. Central to this theory is the claim that participation is to be nominal as a procedure. The ultimate is more important, namely, that governments should protect the interest of the governed. However, this needs to be contested. It is important that people have a say as to what interests are to be protected and represented. Also how they are to be protected and represented is important for democracy. This type of arrangement would render a system legitimate and its institutions accountable. Democracy should not only be seen as an end in itself, but the means should also be seen as a characteristic of democracy, that is, its procedures. Let us look at the connection that exists between democracy as a procedure and democracy as goals.

There exists a conceptual connection between democracy as procedure and democracy as goals in the establishment of

a legitimate State. The one can determine the other. The means can determine the end. This is important for a true democracy to evolve. Lively says that "the cure for the ills of democracy is more democracy". (8)

Democracy must not only be democratic in terms of certain methods and procedures. Central to its theory must also be the establishment and implementation of certain goals.

Allow me to quote Macpherson in this regard:

"Democracy has very generally been taken to mean something more than a system of government. Democracy in this broader sense has always contained an ideal of human equality, not just equality of opportunity to climb the class ladder but such was an equality where no class was able to dominate or live at the expense of others." (9)

The conceptual connection that exists between democracy as a procedure and as a goal is an arrangement that would secure a legitimate State. Deviation from this arrangement could narrow the notion of democracy. The Western Liberal notion of democracy is an example of this deviation. The procedures are fairly democratic. However, its goals do not always comply with what we understand to be democratic (10). For a state to be legitimate then, it needs to take cognisance of democracy as both a procedure and a goal.

What about the South African State? South Africa is

viewed as an illegitimate State because it does not prescribe to any of these conceptions of democracy. Institutions such as Colleges of Education do not see themselves as being accountable to such an illegitimate State but rather to a legitimate State based on a democratic arrangement argued for in this chapter. Such a democratic political arrangement could ensure a democratic teacher training arrangement at Colleges of Education. This brings me to my second question in this chapter.

Given this new democratic arrangement and the legitimate State, to what extent will the current practice of History teacher training be affected in terms of accountability and autonomy?

The notion of accountability is closely related to autonomy. One view of this relationship is that under a democratic system there should be more autonomy given and less accountability demanded. This notion assumes that democracy creates more freedom, more autonomy and less accountability. Education if it is to be democratic, and in this regard History teacher training, should be autonomous. These assumptions might be correct, but not necessarily true.

How autonomous can education really be? Let us have a

closer look at the concept of autonomy. Is autonomy similar to being self-reliant or self determining? Are there different notions of autonomy? Richard Lindley in his work entitled Autonomy attempts to answer some of these questions. He sees autonomy as "... both mastery over one's self and one's self not being subservient to others" (11). He argues further that autonomy promotes negative liberty. Imbedded in this notion is the assumption that autonomy will allow a person freedom without any interference. Another notion of autonomy promoted by Kant is the relationship between rationality and autonomy. Autonomy is equated with rationality. Underlining this relationship is the claim that to be fully autonomous one has to be a rational human being. This claim has been countered. It has been argued that rationality might be a necessary requirement for being autonomous, but not always a sufficient requirement. To this end William Mills has argued for the importance of critical rational enquiry as a central feature of autonomy. Autonomy has also been equated with happiness. All these notions of autonomy relate to personal autonomy. Let us now have a look at institutional autonomy.

If one argues for absolute autonomy for History teacher training, you are arguing for freedom without some form of interference. This is what Berlin calls Negative

Liberty. Negative Liberty has no problem with absolute autonomy. It assumes that people and institutions are autonomous. It has the capacity to handle its freedom. (12) Macpherson, however, warns against this type of liberty when he says:

"There must be interference to protect me from interference: interference from State to protect me from interference by other individuals." (13)

This is what is termed Positive Liberty.

This form of liberty can prevent anarchy. It is a form of autonomy from possible exploitation. In the training of History teachers, licence will then be issued by the legitimate State. This would grant colleges the autonomy to operate free of undemocratic forces and decentralizing control. Not control in the positivist sense. It will be control based on the principles of participatory democracy. Given this new arrangement in terms of accountability and autonomy at Colleges of Education, can the training of History teachers be a force in the democratization of Education?

In answering this question I will explain what is understood by the democratization of education. Is it the same as education for democratic participation? If it is, then are Colleges of Education educating their



students for democratic participation? Does it have the potential for educating for democratic participation? Are there any constraints? Let us have a look at some of the answers to these questions.

In explaining what is understood by democratization of education, the question immediately arises whether education in this context refers to education as practice or education as theory or both. I would say both. Education as practice and education as theory are conceptually connected, not contingently. The one informs the other and vice versa. My next move is to establish whether education as practice and theory could be democratic or subjected to democratic principles. Let us first look at the democratization of education as practice.

One of the basic principles of classical democracy is the principle of equality. Can this principle be unreservedly applied in the educative relationships that exist in the training of History teachers? Can true equality exist in education as practice? What are the educative relationships in classrooms? There are two views as answers to these questions. This creates a dilemma for the democratization of education as practice. Both views have strong arguments.

View one maintains that the democratic principle of equality must be applied in the classroom situation. View two maintains that this is untenable. There is an unequal relationship between student and teacher.

The proponents of view one argue that in democratizing education the practice must be democratic. That is education as practice. This means that power relations in the classroom are neutralized. Pupils and teachers are equals. This notion of democratic education is based on the assumption that pupils also have rights and that space must be created in the classroom for these rights to be democratically exercised. Furthermore, the defenders of view one view this as democracy in education and education for democracy. Democracy in education views educative relationships only as being democratic if it is a relationship of equals.

The defenders of view two do not assume that pupils have no rights. They argue that pupils are not mature enough to exercise these rights. Pupils should be prepared for and taught democratic practice. This notion of the democratization of education is based on the idea that the relationship between teacher and pupil cannot be equalized. Educative relationships cannot be relationships between equals because no person can contribute to another person's education unless that

person knows or understands something that the other does not. This notion has been contested as being elitist and technicist. This notion assumes that educators are the only rational beings and "experts" in the educative relationship. (14)

How can this dilemma be resolved? Both views may be necessarily true, but both cannot be correct. View one is true in terms of the principle of equality and in terms of pupils' rights. View two is also true given the rational inequality that there might exist in a classroom. These are incompatible positions on the notion of educative relationship and democratic classroom practice. Both these notions can be rendered correct in as much as only one may be true. In acknowledging the pupil's rights you should also acknowledge his rational ability to execute that right. This would make view two correct. However, how does one measure rationality? What would be the criteria? Would it be age? Gender? Race? This dilemma of view two could render view one correct. Is there a way out of this dilemma?

A way out of this dilemma is for educational practice, in striving to be democratic, to create space for human agency to develop in the educative relationships. In the training of History teachers one can through the educative relationship develop democratic agents. Under

this type of arrangement, History teacher training practice, although it cannot in itself be democratic, can contribute to democracy. Another way out of the dilemma is the solution suggested by Alan Reid and Bill Whittingham. In a paper entitled "The Constitutional Classroom: A Political Education for Democracy", they argue that democratic classroom arrangements can contribute to political education. A central feature of this arrangement is "the process of creating discourse" (15). Power relations are clearly defined so that neither the teacher's nor the pupil's power is arbitrary, authoritarian or unlimited.

From this exposition by Reid and Whittingham democratization of education is education for democratic participation. This should be the practice in the training of History teachers at Colleges of Education. Space can be created by both staff and students for such a practice. In this regard Neville Alexander says:

"Clearly, there is room for educational practice to lead the way out of the unresolved tension between our recognition of the reality that teachers/educators are different from their students by virtue of their theoretical knowledge on the one hand, and our warning on the other hand against the 'demagogy' of pseudo-participatory methods. We have to find ways of avoiding the catch 22 situation in which educators might begin to feel that anything they did might be either too 'egalitarian or too authoritarian'." (16)

What potential does there exist for Colleges of Education to be democratized so that it can pursue democratic practices? This will be the next question to be looked at critically.

The potential for democratic practices in History teacher training at Colleges of Education can be located in the relationship between bureaucracy and History teacher training. In analysing the potential for the democratization of History teacher training at Colleges of Education, I will attempt to answer the question whether bureaucracy is an obstacle in the democratization of History teacher training at Colleges of Education.

Central to my question concerning bureaucracy as an obstruction to democratic teacher training is that in as much as bureaucracy in terms of its traditional meaning might be a reactionary force given its political connotations, it still remains a central feature of any modern State. However, it is in this very political context that bureaucracy needs to be addressed in terms of obstructing democratic teacher training. The problem confronting democratic teacher training and the bureaucracy obstructing it is a political problem, not an educational problem per se.

Bureaucracy therefore needs to be subjected to democratic political control to ensure that it does not create obstacles for democratic teacher training. This can be achieved by applying the participatory theory of democracy which will ensure the democratization of bureaucracy which in turn will aid and abet the democratization of teacher training.

Bureaucracy in terms of a working definition in the context of teacher training in South Africa refers to State bureaucracy and its normal traditional features. It is a bureaucracy that is authoritative, centralized and hierarchal in its nature. It has strongly overt political leanings, always serving the dominant ideology. A bureaucracy that traditionally represents and implements State policies. This is what I understand by bureaucracy in the traditional sense and also in the South African political context. It is a system of control in teacher training that is reactionary and obstructionist. To answer the question whether bureaucracy is an obstruction to the democratization of teacher training, I would say that in terms of my definition of bureaucracy, it is an obstruction to the democratization of teacher training.

There exist serious tensions between bureaucracy and democratic teacher training in South Africa. The problem confronting us though concerns ways of

overcoming these tensions because for good or for evil, bureaucracy will always be with us. Beetham maintains that bureaucracy is "... rooted in the most distinctive feature of the modern world". (17)

In the process of democratizing teacher training there will be some kind of administration and organization. However, this type of organization and administration would be contrary to the traditional conception of bureaucracy in terms of control and manipulation. This type of administration concerns a bureaucracy that would be "... necessary to the administrative requirements of a democratic order". (18)

It would be a bureaucracy aiding and abetting the democratization of teacher training. In this context bureaucracy can play the role of a transformative agent. I will attempt to show how bureaucracy as an obstruction to teacher training can be transformed into a progressive force.

The political nature of bureaucracy needs to be addressed when viewing bureaucracy as an obstruction to the democratization of teacher training.

Bureaucracy as an anti-democratic force in the South African educational system creates political tensions

between democratic teacher training and bureaucrats. What we are thus experiencing in teacher training is bureaucratic rule with overt political leanings. In obstructing democratic teacher training, bureaucracy is not to be seen as an educational problem but a political problem. These are both the result of a particular ideology. This needs to be solved by political means. South Africa is not experiencing an educational crisis. (19) How is bureaucracy then to be addressed in a political context, given the constraints it places on teacher training?

The democratization of teacher training needs to go together with the democratization of the State, that is, political democratization. There is thus a conceptual connection between political democratization and democratization of teacher training. I cannot see how democratic teacher training can take place in an anti-democratic State. This conceptual connection is implied in the following statement:

"The struggle for people's education can only be finally won when we have won the struggle for people's power." (20)

Implicit in this statement is the assumption that democratic educational practices will only follow once a democratic political structure has been established. This is a correct assumption, if not always true.



Given the democratic political structures, therefore, the State bureaucracy in terms of being elitist and serving sectional political interest, will no longer exist. Bureaucracies that were formerly based on principles of centralization and hierarchical authority will be replaced by a bureaucracy where the central principle will be the principle of participation. Decentralization of power and authority would not only take place vertically because this will have the element of hierarchal structure, but will also be spread horizontally so as to broaden the democratic base and support the participatory theory related to the new bureaucracy. This type of political bureaucracy would be supportive in the democratization of teacher training. No longer will it be obstructionist, but progressive. Democratic teacher training would for example in the training of History teachers involve staff and students being consulted in the drawing up of syllabus and course structure. This conception is central to People's Education:

"For us, People's Education for People's Power entails in a nutshell the following: the democratization of education, involving a cross-section of the community in decisions on the content and quality of education." (21)

This type of bureaucracy that accompanies this type of teacher training is not elitist. It does not serve

sectional political interest or ideology. Its authority is not vested in a centralized power structure. Central to this new type of bureaucracy would be the "general interest" of the people that needs to be served. Authentic representatives would be elected to serve on these new structures and not appointed or selected as in the traditional case of bureaucratic officials currently concerned with teacher training. They will not be State functionaries as we know them today. They will be accountable to the people they represent. This type of bureaucracy is thus democratic in that the participatory theory of democracy is being applied. In this context bureaucracy cannot be seen as an obstruction to democratic teacher training. It serves rather in support of organizing teacher training against anti-democratic forces, be it from the far left or far right:

"... the democratic ideals need, in practice, some defense against anti-democratic manoeuvres and this makes organization necessary." (22)

Bureaucracy in not being obstructionist, should be subjected to democratic control as opposed to manipulative, sectional control as in the traditional Weberian sense of bureaucracy. It should be of a participatory liberatory nature as opposed to being restrictive and geared towards control, as in the case of South African teacher training today. It was this participatory nature of bureaucracy that Lenin feared was

not emerging in the Soviet Union after 1917, when by early 1921 he characterized the Soviet Union as "a workers State with bureaucratic distortions" (22). He feared that bureaucracy in terms of democratic control was not being implemented. Lenin admitted that the Communists in terms of bureaucracy "are not directing, they were being directed" (24).

Central to my claim relating to bureaucracy as an obstruction to democratic teacher training, is that in so much as bureaucracy in terms of South African teacher training course structures is diametrically opposed to democracy, it still remains a central feature of any modern society or large organisation. However, what is needed for bureaucratic control of teacher training is that it be subjected to democratic procedures and principles. This could be achieved if the bureaucracy embedded in teacher training is addressed in terms of its political nature. This could be done by opting for a participatory model of democracy and thus subjecting bureaucracy to democratic control:

.. if we wish to enhance liberal democracy, and lighten the 'dark side' of bureaucratization, then greater direct participation should be our direction of travel." (25)

In this way the potential exists for bureaucracy to be democratized and play an important role in the

democratization of teacher training.

A further notion that is being debated at present concerning bureaucracy and teacher training, is the "free enterprise" solution. A central feature of this notion is that the private sector should take over teacher training from the State bureaucratic machinery.

Replacing the State bureaucracy with private sector bureaucracy will not solve the problem that democratic teacher training has with bureaucracy. The "private enterprise" solution will be a type of democracy based on elitism with strong leanings towards the capitalist model of democracy. This will have crucial implications for the training of teachers, especially History teachers. History will be taught from a capitalist perspective. In this regard the bureaucracy controlling teacher training will also be structured along traditional lines. It will also be an obstruction to democratic teacher training just as the State bureaucracy is. Transferring teacher training from State control to private control would purely be a case of changing bureaucratic rulers. The only solution to this is, to reiterate my central claim, a political solution. Bureaucracy as a technicist feature of teacher training should be viewed as a political problem and be addressed as such.

In this chapter I have attempted to provide answers relating to the questions concerning the democratization of teacher training. Issues such as autonomy, accountability and bureaucracy and how they effect teacher training, especially the training of History teachers at Colleges of Education under the Department of Education and Culture in the House of Representatives, have been raised.

I will now finally proceed to argue how educators at Colleges of Education involved with training History teachers can contribute to a new hegemony in South Africa, a hegemony based on the democratic procedures and goals argued for in this chapter.

## CHAPTER SIX

HOW HISTORY TEACHER TRAINING CAN CONTRIBUTE TO A NEW  
IDEOLOGY IN SOUTH AFRICA

In this final chapter I will elaborate on a few claims that were made in the first chapter. These claims concern the role of College intellectuals and their contribution to a new hegemony. This will also further develop the central argument of this thesis concerning ideology and the training of History teachers at Colleges of Education. These moves are also made in support of my claim in Chapter One that College intellectuals can contribute to the "collective will" via the training of History teachers. I will develop this further by claiming that in this way College intellectuals are contributing to what Gramsci calls "the war of position".

This will be developed in more detail at a later stage in the chapter. Let us now proceed to look at how College intellectuals involved with History teacher training can contribute to a new hegemony. Intellectuals in this context is meant traditional intellectuals in the Gramscian sense as developed in the first chapter. It also refers to Educators at Colleges of Education.

Educators can either maintain or contribute to changing the current theory and practice relating to the training

of History teachers at Colleges of Education. In attempting to contribute to changing the current practice and theory of History teacher training, College intellectuals will have to position themselves in the politics of Liberation. How is this done?

Educators at Colleges cannot change the current practices by educational means only. Education can make a contribution to this change. This is done by confronting the ruling class ideology in terms of its educational policies. In this case Christian National Education. Through their political positioning, that is, their position in the politics of Liberation, which is indicated by their conception of the nature and aims of History teacher training, college intellectuals can contribute to the disarticulation of ruling class ideology. This political positioning of the College intellectuals vis à vis their conception of the nature and aims of History teacher training might be seen as an insufficient criterion for determining their political position, but is nevertheless a necessary criterion in the context of History teacher training and its contribution to a new hegemony. By disarticulating the ruling class ideology, intellectuals should at the same time re-articulate a new ideology regarding the training of History teachers. In this way education, specifically the training of History teachers, can contribute to a new

hegemony in South Africa. This hegemony would have a non-reductionist conception of ideology, a hegemony that:

"... is not to be found in a purely instrumental alliance between classes through which the class demands of the allied classes are articulated to those of the fundamental class...

... hegemony involves the creation of a higher synthesis, so that all its elements fuse in a 'collective will' which becomes the new protagonist of political action ..." (1)

Having claimed that intellectuals at Colleges must contribute towards the new hegemony and having defined this new hegemony, I will now attempt to argue how intellectuals at Colleges can disarticulate the current ruling class ideology and by implication re-articulate a new ideology based on the principle of "collective will".

The notion that there is a conceptual connection between knowledge and power (power in this sense meaning to have the monopoly to dominate), is a materialist and determinist notion. It is materialist in that it has a class base. Knowledge is vested in a particular class. In this case the class that holds power. Embedded in this notion is the false assumption that people who have knowledge (knowledge in this sense meaning informally or formally acquired education), also have or should have power over persons with no knowledge. The converse of this assumption is also false. The people with power are not necessarily more knowledgable than the people without



power. Another false assumption embedded in this notion of knowledge and power, is the idea of authority. It assumes that people with knowledge and power also have authority and should be respected for it.

These notions are supported by the current ruling class ideology. The evidence suggests very strongly as shown in Chapters Two and Three that these notions must be taught to the student via the teaching of History. One of the aims of History in the Senior Primary Diploma in Education is to inculcate in the student the respect for power and authority. This is in theory. In practice, the Educators, "the lecturers" at Colleges of Education, in some cases, are seen and see themselves as an "elitist" group. The educative relations between educator and student are crudely defined in terms of knowledge and power. In this sense the "lecturer", the intellectual, is viewed by the crude Marxist as serving the interest of the ruling capitalist class by maintaining such relationships. How can the intellectuals at Colleges dislodge themselves from this position and disarticulate the ruling class ideology? I will argue that one way of dislodging themselves from this position is to contribute to what Gramsci calls the "war of position". What does this mean?

This means the evolution of a new strategy. This

strategy would involve new social formations. These social formations would re-articulate a new ideology. This would be what Gramsci calls the "war of position", which is "... a strategy of building up a broad bloc of varied social forces, unified by a common conception of the world..." (2)

How can intellectuals at Colleges of Education contribute to the "war of position" and what is the nature of the contribution?

Given the particular position of the intellectuals at Colleges of Education in relation to their students, emphasis should be placed on the "collective will" of these positions, instead of their class positions. The "collective will" in this instance would be their "common conception" of democracy and the need for it in educational practice. In this case History teacher training. The "collective will" becomes a particular ideology and transcends class barriers concerning power and authority. It involves establishing a new hegemony at Colleges of Education as defined earlier in this chapter. Attempts in this direction have already started with the establishment of a History Lecturers' Association in May 1989. One of the aims of the association as set out in the constitution is to "Encourage the teaching of History as a means of

preparation and advancement towards a non-racial democratic South Africa" (3). Intellectuals in articulating this "collective will" in their theory and practice of History teacher training, become part of the social protagonists "which will function as the protagonist of political action during that hegemony's entire duration" (4)

The social protagonists are "the masses" (5).

Educators at Colleges of Education in becoming part of the social protagonist become part of "the masses". They are no longer an "elitist" group in the traditional capitalist sense. Human action now becomes your prime movers in History. This is also how both educators and students of History can escape the traditional "chains" of History and modify their historical positions. This is when the self-will transcends into a higher synthesis than pure mechanical manipulation that is presently practised at Colleges of Education in their training of History teachers. Transcending into a higher synthesis is when a particular ideology is developed that includes space for all types of human action involved in the training of History teachers. This alliance of groups at Colleges of Education should have as its aim the contribution to a new hegemonic group and so doing contribute to the "war of position". What will the

nature of this contribution be?

The contribution of intellectuals to the "war of position" in terms of training History teachers should not be seen as a reformist strategy. Intellectuals, in making their contribution, should take up a critical non-technicist position to ruling Christian National Education ideology. This position must be a radical departure from the positivist educational theory concerning the training of History teachers. The strategy to contribute to the "war of position" can also not be seen as reformist or some type of social engineering because the "war of position" is by implication a critical realignment of social groups bent on fundamental change. It is not an alignment of classes where one class has the intention of dominating or manipulating the other. This is social engineering.

To summarise, I have argued that intellectuals at Colleges of Education in training History students can help to establish a new hegemony. This is based on my claim that these intellectuals can contribute to the "war of position" by disarticulating current ruling class ideology pertaining to the training of History teachers. In this way they are re-articulating a new ideology for the training of History teachers at Colleges of Education.

## CONCLUSION

In this thesis I have tried to argue for a new approach to the training of History teachers. The thrust of my argument is that History students at Colleges of Education under the Department of Education and Culture in the House of Representatives are currently being trained to take their place in an educational system in South Africa with overt Christian National Education foundations. This argument of course also holds for all other educational departments in South Africa. The undemocratic ideological foundations of this educational system is suggested by its theoretical underpinnings relating to racism and political authoritarianism.

One of my central claims in this thesis has been to suggest that History and in particular educators of History teachers, has a crucial role to play in dislodging these undemocratic ideological foundations of Christian National Education. I do, however, concede that this role cannot be over-simplified. I have tried to argue that such a task has crucial political overtones. In other words, the change from an undemocratic educational practice to a democratic educational practice is fundamentally a political change.

Teacher training and the current ideology underpinning it will remain pretty much entrenched if there is not a move towards political democracy. This is to reiterate one of my other claims in this paper: that South Africa is not experiencing an educational crisis as such but a political crisis. One way in which the educator of History teachers can help address this crisis is to locate the training of History teachers in the politics of Liberation. New conceptions of History relating to its aims and purpose needs to be debated. There should be a rigorous analysis of what is currently being conceived as the role of the History teacher in South African schools. To this end the History teachers should research and debate the democratic principles and procedures that they would be informed by in attempting to conceptualize their new frameworks relating to the role of the History teacher and how they should be trained.

The agenda for this debate is a matter of urgency. A crucial item on the agenda would be the question of values and its relationship to History and historical understanding. Questions that would have to be answered are: Does History seek to sustain or devalue tradition, heritage or culture? Does History assume that there are shared values waiting to be defined? Does History require us to believe that a society's values are always

valuable?

John Slater in a special professorial lecture in the Institute of Education at the university of London, entitled "The Politics of History Teaching - A Humanity Dehumanized?" says that:

"If History seeks to guarantee any of these things, it ceases to be History and becomes indoctrination." (1)

Answers to these questions will have a profound influence on the way we train our future History teachers at Colleges of Education.

In conclusion I wish to express the hope that this research paper will contribute to the growing debate in South Africa about ideology and education, especially the function of History and History teachers. In as much as I do also concede that this project is not a sufficient contribution, I do however see it as a necessary contribution to the debate concerning ideology and its connection with education. Furthermore, it is my hope that this project will also contribute towards constructing the new values and new kind of consciousness that will characterize the new society in South Africa. History teachers find themselves at the juncture where the new and the old are doing battle. Their contribution towards this battle remains crucial.

## END NOTES

## CHAPTER ONE

- ✓ 1 J. Thompson: Studies in the Theory of Ideology, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1984, p 4
- ✓ 2 L. Althusser: "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus" in B. Cosin, Education: Structure and Society, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1972, p 267
- 3 L. Benade: "Is the Althusserian Notion of Education Adequate?" in Educational Philosophy and Theory, Johannesburg, Witwatersrand University, 1987, p 46
- 4 For a detailed, analytical critique of Althusser's concept of ideology, see the work of G. Therborn, The Power of Ideology - The Ideology of Power, Göteborg, Verso Edition 1980, pp 1-15
- 5 Gramsci uses this term to describe the way social scientists operate in trying to define how society works. This type of operation is viewed as very technicist and positivist.
- 6 The concept of the "collective will" as used by Gramsci relates to the idea of creating a broad base social alliance which will contest the ruling class ideology. In the final chapter I attempt to explain the conception of the "war of position" which develops out of Gramsci's concept of the "collective will".

## CHAPTER TWO

- 1 Quoted in H. Cluckman, "The Philosophy of Education Underlying the Teaching of Pedagogy in Afrikaans Teacher Training", unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Witwatersrand University, Johannesburg, 1976, p 27
- 2 op cit, p 29
- 3 Quoted in J. Payne, "Hoërskool Onderwysers binne die Verband van Binnelandse Aangeleenthede en die Rol wat die Universiteit van Wes-Kaapland daarin gespeel het - 'n Kritiese Historiese Oorsig", unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of the Western Cape, Bellville, 1984, p 79
- 4 op cit p 80
- 5 For a detailed analysis of these responses see the works of
  - a R. Van Der Ross, The Rise and Decline of Apartheid - A Study of Political Movements Among the Coloured People of South Africa: 1880 - 1985, Bellville, Tafelberg, 1986, Chapter 17
  - b N. Ormond, "The Collaboration Connection from CAC to CPTA (VI)", in the Educational Journal, Vol LIX No 2, March 1989



- 6 Not only was the standard a come down, the syllabus content and in this case the History syllabus, reinforced Christian National Education thinking. This syllabus will be more critically looked at in the next chapter.
- 7 For a more detailed exposition of this teacher training programme see J. Payne, op cit p 39

### CHAPTER THREE

- 1 A national curriculum for History was proposed by the Education Ministry in April 1989. The then Secretary for Education was Mr Baker. By September 1989 a working party had produced an interim report on a national curriculum for History in British schools. The proposal and subsequent report received widespread response. Especially under attack were the aims of teaching History as set out in the interim report by the working party. I had the privilege of participating in the debates around this report at the Institute of Education at the University of London.
- 2 Quoted from official syllabus for History teacher trainees: Diploma in Education Syllabus, History, Senior Primary - Specialization Subject, Department of Internal Affairs, Cape Town, 1982
- 3 Quoted from official syllabus for Senior Primary: Education Bulletin, Department of Internal Affairs, Vol 17, No SP.1/82, Cape Town, 1 January 1982
- 4 G. Braam: "Pressures - A College Perspective" in Interchange, A Journal for Colleges of Education, Vol 1 No 1, May-June 1987, p 12
- 5 Quoted from official syllabus for History teacher trainees: Diploma in Education Syllabus, History, Senior Primary - Specialization Subject, Department of Internal Affairs, Cape Town, 1982, p 12
- 6 O. Van Der Berg and P. Buckland: Beyond the History Syllabus: Constraints and Opportunities, Pietermaritzburg, Shuter and Shooter, p 5
- 7 Diploma in Education Syllabus, History, Senior Primary - Specialization Subject, Department of Internal Affairs, Cape Town, 1982, p 14
- 8 P. Buckland: "Towards a non-Technicist Approach to Education Planning in South Africa", in Morrow W. (ed) The Proceedings of the Kenton Conference 1985, Bellville, University of the Western Cape Education Faculty, 1986, p 217

## CHAPTER FOUR

- 1 L. Althusser: "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus" in B. Cosin, Education: Structure and Society, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1972
- 2 E. Carr: What is History?, Cambridge, Penguin Publication, 1961, p 23
- 3 E. Roux: Time Longer than Rope, A History of the Black Man's Struggle for Freedom in South Africa, Machison, Wisconsin University Press, 2nd ed, 1964
- 4 N. Majeke: The Role of the Missionaries in Conquest, Cumberwood, APDUSA, 1966
- 5 The concept of theory as opposed to an analysis is used in the positivist sense here.
- 6 D. Posel: "Rethinking the 'Race-Class' debate in South African Historiography" in Social Dynamics, Johannesburg, 1982, p 51
- 7 M. Wilson and L. Thompson (eds): The Oxford History of South Africa, 2 Volumes, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1971
- 8 C. Saunders: The Making of the South African Past: Major Historians on Race and Class, Cape Town, David Phillip, 1988, p 143
- 9 op cit, N. Majeke, pp 1-2
- 10 P. Kallaway: "History Alive - A Response" in Wectu Newsletter, No 12, June 1988, p 14
- 11 op cit p 16
- 12 The National Education Crisis Committee was officially launched in Durban in March 1986. For a more detailed exposition of its programme see the paper of Z. Sisulu, "People's Education for People's Power" in People's Education, a Collection of Articles December 1986 to May 1987, Bellville, University of the Western Cape, 1987
- 13 What is History? is a work-book of exercises on material relating to People's History. The book was commissioned by the National Education Crisis Committee (NECC)
- 14 P. Kallaway: "From Mass Education to Bantu to People's Education, Preliminary Notes" in Education and the State, Cape Town, University of Cape Town, 1987, p 44

## CHAPTER FIVE

- 1 S. Benn and R. Peters: Social Principles and the Democratic State, London, Allen and Unwin, 1959, p 351
- 2 J. Lively: Democracy, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1975, p 146
- 3 op cit p 49

- 4 C. Macpherson: The Real World of Democracy,  
Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1966
- 5 op cit p 49
- 6 There are a number of other theorists like Dahl,  
Berelson, Sartori and Eckstein who share Shumpeter's  
views concerning the goals of democracy as being  
unrealistic and that basically there are really no  
democratic ideals or goals.
- 7 Beetham and J. Mill is one example.  
Different democratic theorists see democracy as  
procedure or goal. I do not think it necessary here  
to give an exposition of each theorist's view.
- 8 J. Lively: Democracy, Oxford, Basil Blackwell,  
1975, p 149
- 9 C. Macpherson: The Real World of Democracy,  
Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1966, p 22
- 10 Macpherson also views the Communist variant of  
democracy as democratic only in terms of its means.  
It is just a system, a procedure. It is not a  
democracy in a broader sense, as in the case of the  
liberal variant.
- 11 R. Lindley: Autonomy, London, Macmillan, 1986,  
p 79
- 12 For a more detailed exposition of Negative Liberty,  
see I. Berlin: Four Essays on Liberty, Oxford,  
Oxford University Press, 1969
- 13 C. Macpherson: Democratic Theory: Essays on  
Retrieval, Oxford, Oxford University Press,  
1973, pp 117-118
- 14 For a more critical analysis of these views see  
Wally Morrow: "Democratic Schooling and the  
Continental Nuisance", University of the Western  
Cape, 1986
- 15 A. Reid and B. Whittingham: "The Constitutional  
Classroom - a Political Education for Democracy",  
York, York University, 1984, p 4
- 16 N. Alexander: "Liberation Pedagogy in the South  
African Context", Unpublished paper, p 21  
(Keynote address delivered on Wednesday 3 August at  
the Conference of the Media Resource Centre,  
Department of Education, University of Natal  
(Durban) on the theme of "Experiential Learning in  
Formal and Non-Formal Education" held 3 - 5 August  
1988.)
- 17 D. Beetham: Bureaucracy, Oxford, Oxford  
University Press, 1987, p 50
- 18 op cit p 111
- 19 This is a misconception that is held by many people.  
It is also in the Positivist mould of Educational  
Theory. This is very typical of South Africa who  
believes that the problems in education can be  
solved by their technocrats, "experts" and "social  
engineers". It is also true, that consistent with  
the Positivist Educational theory they would be

- inclined towards bureaucratic rule that controls and manipulates. This creates political tensions in teacher training.
- 20 Z. Sisulu: "People's Education for People's Power" (Keynote address, National Educational Crisis Committee Meeting, 29 March 1980), in People's Education - A Collection of Articles from December 1985 - May 1987, University of the Western Cape, 1987, p 35
- 21 E. Molobi: "South Africa: Education under Apartheid" (Keynote address, Conference on United States Initiatives for Education and Training of south Africans and Namibians, Michigan State University, 23 November 1986), in People's Education - A Collection of Articles from December 1985 - May 1987, University of Western Cape, 1987, p 77
- 22 W. Morrow: "Democratic Schooling and the Continental Nuisance", Bellville, University of the Western Cape, 1986, p 9
- 23 D. McLennan: "Politics" in D. McLellan (ed): Marx: The First Hundred Years, London, Oxford University Press, 1983, p 170
- 24 op cit p 172
- 25 C. Pollitt: "Democracy and Bureaucracy", in H. David and C. Pollitt (eds): New Forms of Democracy, London, Oxford University Press, 1987, p 189

#### CHAPTER SIX

- 1 C. Mouffe: "Hegemony and Ideology in Gramsci" in C. Mouffe (ed): Gramsci and Marxist Theory, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979, p 185
- 2 R. Simon: Gramsci's Political Thought - An Introduction, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1982, p 24
- 3 Quoted from "Constitution of History Lecturers' Association: Aims", point 1.1
- 4 op cit, C. Mouffe, p 185
- 5 For a detailed development of this argument, see A. Sassoon: F. Gramsci: A New Concept of Politics (Bibliography) and the Expansion of Democracy
- 6 J. Slater: "The Politics of History Teaching - a Humanity Dehumanized", Special Professional Lecture, London, Institute of Education, University of London, 1988, p 16

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- N. Alexander: "Liberation Pedagogy in the South African Context", (Keynote address delivered on Wednesday 3 August at the Conference of the Media Resource Centre, Department of Education, University of Natal (Durban) on the theme of "Experiential Learning in Formal and Non-Formal Education")
- L. Althusser: "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus" in B. Cosin, Education: Structure and Society, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1972
- D. Beetham: Bureaucracy, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1987
- L. Benade: "Is the Althusserian Notion of Education Adequate?" in Educational Philosophy and Theory, Johannesburg, Witwatersrand University, 1987
- S. Benn and R. Peters: Social Principles and the Democratic State, London, Allen and Unwin, 1959
- I. Berlin: Four Essays on Liberty, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1969
- G. Braam: "Pressures - A College Perspective" in Interchange, A Journal for Colleges of Education, Vol 1 No 1, Salt River, 1987,
- P. Buckland: "Towards a non-Technicist Approach to Education Planning in South Africa", in Morrow W. (ed) The Proceedings of the Kenton Conference 1985, Bellville, University of the Western Cape Education Faculty, 1986
- E. Carr: What is History?, Cambridge, Penguin Publication, 1961
- H. Cluckman: "The Philosophy of Education Underlying the Teaching of Pedagogy in Afrikaans Teacher Training", unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Witwatersrand University, Johannesburg, 1976
- D. Held and C. Pollitt (eds): New Forms of Democracy, London, Oxford University Press, 1987
- P. Kallaway: "From Mass Education to Bantu to People's Education, Preliminary Notes" in Education and the State, Cape Town, University of Cape Town, 1987
- P. Kallaway: "History Alive - A Response" in Wectu Newsletter, No 12, June 1988
- R. Lindley: Autonomy, London, Macmillan Press, 1986
- J. Lively: Democracy, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1975
- C. Macpherson: The Real World of Democracy, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1966
- C. Macpherson: Democratic Theory: Essays on Retrieval, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1973
- N. Majeke: The Role of the Missionaries in Conquest, Cumberland, APDUSA Publication, 1966
- D. McLennan (ed): Marx: The First Hundred Years, London, Oxford University Press, 1983

- D. McLennan: Marxism After Marx: An Introduction, London, Macmillan Press, 1980
- E. Molobi: "South Africa: Education under Apartheid" (Keynote address, Conference on United States Initiatives for Education and Training of south Africans and Namibians, Michigan State University, 23 November 1986), in People's Education - A Collection of Articles from December 1985 - May 1987, University of Western Cape, 1987, p 77
- W. Morrow: "Democratic Schooling and the Continental Nuisance", Unpublished paper, Bellville, 1987
- W. Morrow: The Proceedings of the Kenton Conference 1985, Bellville, University of the Western Cape, 1986
- C. Mouffe: "Hegemony and Ideology in Gramsci" in C. Mouffe (ed): Gramsci and Marxist Theory, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979
- N. Ormond: "The Collaboration Connection from CAC to CPTA (VI)", in the Educational Journal, Vol LIX No 2, March 1989
- J. Payne: "Die Opleiding van Hoërskool Onderwysers binne die Verband van Binnelandse Aangeleenthede en die Rol wat die Universiteit van Wes-Kaapland daarin gespeel het - 'n Kritiese Historiese Oorsig", unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of the Western Cape, 1984
- D. Posel: "Rethinking the 'Race-Class' debate in South African Historiography" in Social Dynamics, Johannesburg, 1982
- A. Reid and B. Whittingham: "The Constitutional Classroom - a Political Education for Democracy", York, York University, 1984, p 4
- E. Roux: Time Longer than Rope, A History of the Black Man's Struggle for Freedom in South Africa, Madison, Wisconsin University Press, 2nd edition, 1964
- A. Sassoon: F. Gramsci: A New Concept of Politics (Bibliography) and the Expansion of Democracy
- C. Saunders: The Making of the South African Past: Major Historians on Race and Class, Cape Town, David Phillip, 1988
- J. Schumpeter: "The Two Concepts of Democracy", in A. Quinton (ed): Political Philosophy, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1967
- M. Seliger: The Marxist Conception of Ideology - A Critical Essay, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1977
- R. Simon: Gramsci's Political Thought - An Introduction, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1982, p 24



- Z. Sisulu: "People's Education for People's Power" (Keynote address, National Educational Crisis Committee Meeting, 29 March 1980), in People's Education - A Collection of Articles from December 1985 - May 1987, University of the Western Cape, 1987
- G. Therborn: The Power of Ideology - The Ideology of Power, Göteborg, Verso Edition, 1980
- J. Thompson: Studies in the Theory of Ideology, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1984
- O. Van Der Berg and P. Buckland: Beyond the History Syllabus: Constraints and Opportunities, Pietermaritzburg, Shuter and Shooter, 1983
- O. Van Der Berg: "To Travel with a Different View: The Politics of Teaching", Inaugural Address, November 1983; Publication of University of Western Cape, Series A, No 50 N
- R. Van Der Ross: The Rise and Decline of Apartheid - A Study of Political Movements Among the Coloured People of South Africa: 1880 - 1985, Bellville, Tafelberg, 1986
- M. Wilson and L. Thompson (eds): The Oxford History of South Africa, 2 Volumes, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1971

Bulletins of the Department of Education and Culture - House of Representatives that were consulted:

Diploma in Education Syllabus, History, Senior Primary - Specialization Subject, Department of Internal Affairs, Cape Town, 1982

Education Bulletin, Department of Internal Affairs, Vol 17, No SP.1/82, Cape Town, 1 January 1982

Other Documents

"Constitution of History Lecturers' Association"

DEPARTMENT OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS

---

CAPE TOWN

1982

---

DIPLOMA IN EDUCATION

SYLLABUS

HISTORY

SENIOR PRIMARY

SPECIALIZATION SUBJECT



## MODULE 2

## SOUTH AFRICAN HISTORY

1. Pre-Colonial Cape History † 1590 - 1652
  - 1.1 Knoi-Knoi: pastoral agriculturists
  - 1.2 San: Hunter-gatherers
2. Discovery and occupation of and settlement at the Cape
  - 2.1 Voyages of Discovery: de Almeida, Bartholomeus Diaz and Vasco da Gama
  - 2.2 Dutch occupation of and settlement at the Cape
    - 2.2.1 Wreck of the Haarlem
    - 2.2.2 Remonstrantie of Janssens and Proot
    - 2.2.3 Jan van Riebeeck at the Cape
    - 2.2.4 Simon van der Stel
    - 2.2.5 Willem van der Stel
3. Intergroup relations: 1652 - 1795
  - 3.1 Indigenous people
    - Slaves
    - Dutch officials
    - Burghers (include French Huguenots)
    - Malays
    - Town-Dwellers
    - Trekboers
  - 3.2 Result of inter-action

## MODULE 3

## SUBJECT DIDACTICS

1. General aims of the subject
2. The objectives that are striven for in a lesson
3. The various types of lessons in the subject
4. Elementary teaching techniques in the subject
5. Elementary teaching aids e.g. chalkboards, pictures, charts, textbooks sketches
6. Written preparation of the lesson

## MODULE 2

## SOUTH AFRICAN HISTORY: 1795 - 1854

1. Occupations of the Cape
  - 1.1 First British Occupation
  - 1.2 Reforms brought about by the Batavian Republic
  - 1.3 Second British Occupation (briefly)
2. Intergroup relations: 1806 - 1854
  - 2.1 British policy towards:
    - (i) the settled community (Malays, Khoi-Khoi)
    - (ii) the trekboers (frontier farmers)
    - (iii) Xhosa
    - (iv) the northern frontier - emergence of the Griqua states
3. General Policies in regard to Slavery
  - 3.1 Slave Laws (briefly) : governors Caledon, Cradock and Somerset
  - 3.2 Ordinance 50
  - 3.3 Circuit Courts
  - 3.4 Philanthropism in South Africa
4. The Difecane/Mfecane (oorsigtelik)
  - 4.1 The migration of the Bantu to Southern Africa
  - 4.2 The spread of the Bantu into ethnic groups
  - 4.3 The Mfecane and its results

- 5. The Great Trek
  - 5.1 Causes
    - 5.1.1 The threats against the spiritual values of the Frontier farmers
    - 5.1.2 The threats against their material well-being
  - 5.2 Routes: origin and destination (in broad outline)
  - 5.3 Selected figures: Dingaan - Retief; M.W. Pretorius - Mosjesj; Silkaats - Potgieter  
(NB: Any two combinations)
- 6. The Conventions
  - 6.1 Historical background
  - 6.2 Bloemfontein
  - 6.3 Sandrivier
  - 6.4 Significance

MODULE 3  
DIPLOMA IN EDUCATION  
SECOND YEAR  
SUBJECT DIDACTICS

1. The emphasis is on the teaching of History in Standards 2, 3 and 4
2. The preparation and use of audio-visual aids
  - 2.1 Maps
  - 2.2 Time charts
  - 2.3 Projection media
    - 2.3.1 Overhead projector
    - 2.3.2 Films
    - 2.3.3 Tape recorder
    - 2.3.4 Video tape
3. The chalk board
  - 3.1 General guide lines
  - 3.2 Time line, diagrams/illustrations/sketch maps
4. Specific Methods
  - 4.1 Narrative
  - 4.2 Question and answer
  - 4.3 Text book
  - 4.4 Biographical
5. Lesson Structure

The following aspects may be regarded as the basic elements on which a lesson should be structured

  - 5.1 Lesson details
    - School
    - Standard
    - Composition of class
    - Subject
    - Subdivision of subject
    - Lesson Topic
    - Date

- Time
- Duration
- 5.2 Notes of lesson
  - General aim(s)
  - Specific aim(s)
  - Introduction and relation to previous knowledge
  - Presentation of new subject matter
  - Control
  - Application
- 5.3 In the above, wherever applicable, attention should be given to
  - Didactic form and principles
  - Method of development
  - Method of teaching
  - Teaching and learning aids
  - Test development
  - Remedial teaching
  - Application
  - Exercise Material

The above is the general form for a lesson when carefully planned and fully-written lesson notes are required of students
- 6. The physical conditions for the teaching of the subject
  - 6.1 The History room
  - 6.2 The History library
- 7. Qualities of a successful History teacher.
  - 7.1 Attitude of life and academic and professional qualifications
  - 7.2 Character and sense of responsibility
  - 7.3 Diligence, devotion to work and personal example
  - 7.4 Remains a student with lively interest in subject
  - 7.5 Fairness and objectivity
  - 7.6 Interest in and understanding of pupils
  - 7.7 Effective methods of presenting lessons

- 7.8 Effective use of textbooks and teaching aids
- 7.9 Creates a suitable classroom atmosphere
- 7.10 Inspires self-activity on the part of the pupils

## MODULE 2

## SOUTH AFRICAN HISTORY: 1854 - 1961

1. British Imperialism in South Africa
  - 1.1 Federation Schemes: Grey and Carnarvon
  - 1.2 Diamond Fields dispute
    - 1.2.1 Claimants
    - 1.2.2 Keate-award
    - 1.2.3 Significance
  - 1.3 Discovery of gold: significance (social and economic)
  - 1.4 Rhodes and Kruger
    - 1.4.1 British Imperialism versus Afrikaner Nationalism
    - 1.4.2 Uitlanders: Jameson-raid
    - 1.4.3 Encirclement (briefly)
2. The Anglo-Boer War: cause, course and significance
3. The National Convention
  - 3.1 Milnerism
    - 3.1.1 Reconstruction
    - 3.1.2 Failure
  - 3.2 The Unification of South Africa
4. The rise of Black political awareness: 1890 - 1910  
The Bombata movement



## MODULE 3

## DIPLOMA IN EDUCATION

## THIRD YEAR

## SUBJECT DIDACTICS

1. Emphasis is laid on the teaching of History to Standard 5
2. Nature of the subject (briefly)
  - 2.1 The meaning of the word history
  - 2.2 The content of history
  - 2.3 The scope of history
3. Aims of the subject
  - 3.1 The general aims
  - 3.2 The specific aims
  - 3.3 Lesson objectives
4. Aims and content of the syllabuses for the senior primary standards  
N.B. Students are not expected to memorise the various syllabuses
5. The scheme of work
  - 5.1 Division of work
  - 5.2 Order and arrangement
  - 5.3 Detailing (term, week and lesson units, teaching aids, examples; exercises, tests and planning of tests, revision; group teaching)
  - 5.4 Various methods of approach in organising and planning the teaching of the subject
  - 5.5 Report of completed work

6. The pupil and the subject  
Factors which influence the pupil studying the subject:  
stage of development, retention, attitude, facilities at home and at school, co-ordination with other subjects
7. Evaluation and Testing
  - 7.1 Types of testing-advantages and disadvantages
  - 7.2 Evaluation of assignments, projects, homework
  - 7.3 Examination
    - 7.3.1 drafting question papers and memoranda of marking
    - 7.3.2 time aspect
    - 7.3.3 division of marks and mark allocation
    - 7.3.4 marking techniques
  - 7.4 Remedial work
8. The Text Book
  - 8.1 The place and effective use of the text book in the teaching of History
  - 8.2 The characteristics of a good textbooks
9. The physical conditions required for the teaching of History
  - 9.1 The availability of historical material
10. Non-formal aspects of History teaching
  - 10.1 Excursions and exhibitions
  - 10.2 Newspaper History
  - 10.3 Newspapers and periodicals