

Are history educators (also) dangerous people?

Elize S van Eeden

North-West University

South Africa

elize.vanEeden@nwu.ac.za

SASHT 29th Annual Conference

Polokwane, University of Limpopo, 10-11 Oct 2015

Dumela, re ja le amogela mo SASHT conference!

Hello and welcome at the SASHT conference – a first time ever in the Limpopo Province. On this historical occasion its necessary to say that it was high time. After all the history educators of this province are responsible for the third most Grade 12's in History in the country. We as Society hope to be more visible in this Province through its members and activities in future.

Introduction

In many ways, you are witnessing a very special occasion on the eve of the Society's 30th conference birthday next year (2016). As far as I can recall – ever since the start of my membership of the Society in 1992 and when I was invited to attend the founding conference in 1986 – there has never been a presidential speech. After all, educators are busy people! For the past two years I have, with interest, taken note of the presidential speeches by the chairs of two other major historical societies in South Africa, namely the South African Historical Society (SAHS) and the South African Historical Association (SAHA). As they discussed a contentious issue or two that they felt necessary to “RELEASE” on such an occasion, I realised that the SASHT also experiences issues and deals with issues that should be “RELEASED”. We are, after all, the educational side of the discipline/subject, and we may sometimes perhaps sense the concomitant tension and contentious attachments much more than those in the purely historical field of research and writing.

So what will then be the proverbial pebble in the shoe that I have for this very first SASHT presidential address? In this regard I had to borrow at least my point of departure from Prof. Sandra Swart of the University of Stellenbosch. In a recent presidential address in early July 2015 at the South African Historical Society Conference, she titled her address as follows: “Are historians dangerous people?” She pondered on this particular question for quite a while in the course of her address. She remarked that the question actually evolved from an observation made by a well-known Russian statesman of yesteryear – not that we as historians and history educators expect to ever receive accolades from politicians for our research and teaching assessments...

This well-known statesman was none other than the post Second World War Russian leader Nikita Krushchev.¹ In a little bit of additional research that I conducted, I picked up that he had apparently actually said that: “Historians are dangerous people, they are capable of upsetting everything.”² Though one of my network colleagues in Russia is currently following this up to identify the exact speech in which Krushchev is said to have made this observation decades ago, the statement can be traced and attributed on Google to an

educator, Christina Barnes, in 2012, when she apparently exposed her students to it. Barnes wanted to know from students what it meant to study History. Eventually one of several students responded by stating that: "... if a historian interprets something incorrectly, that could be dangerous."³

I strongly feel that we could also associate this student's opinion with the history educator's profession where we are daily battling or struggling towards a representative and truthful historical account of a past – one that can be assessed in the light of whether it is based on "fact" and/or fiction, is accurate, reliable, authentic, representative and legitimate or as valid as time and source access permits. We may even nurture or endorse a particular thought, ideology or paradigm engraved on our minds, as if the historical profession in History education and in History proper lacks principles and methods in what actually should be best practice research and teaching. It's as if we then use a revised "GAME PLAN" like the Springboks did when they recently lost to Japan in the World Cup.☺ Surely Krushchev was then perfectly correct by asserting that there can be a dangerous element in History. May history hopefully always be dangerous because of a principle such as aspiring for truthfulness and not because of hasty, ill-considerate, unethical, unprofessional practices that can lead to wrong interpretations and loads of perceptions creating life-long misconceptions that in turn nurture dangerous battles among peoples of different races, classes, genders and communities.

Undeniably, historians and educators of History involved in research, the writing of History and the teaching of History all probably know that the historical battle (to use the words of historian Arthur Marwick) towards an absolute and perfect way of researching, writing, assessing and teaching will probably never be won. However, there are ways to ensure that progress is actually made towards best practice. Consider achieving this by means of developing a sensitivity; by searching for and using a diversity of knowledge; by ensuring inclusivity regarding past voices on issues and equally by cultivating habitual critical source reading while also ensuring that learners and students on senior levels are exposed to critical reading (I regard this skill as an essential element of assessment in History). Critical reading implies that the student or learner does not rely merely on a meagre source excerpt (and sometimes not even in proper context!), but that learners do adequate research on a theme from wide variety of applicable articles. In this regard I am not ignorant of the time limitations in schools and at universities that may lead to a practice of a reliance on a single source, hoping that it will serve the purpose and be reliable at the same time. Yet this is not always the case and every so often teachers are engaged in their own historical battles in the classroom: battles with regard to own identities; their own origins and histories; often the lack of appropriate resources of which they are supposed to avail themselves, and to whom they ought to "apply". Teachers may have life histories sometimes punctuated with emotions and a particular sense of what is "right" or "wrong". The dear "truthfulness" that we as educators then want to "RELEASE" can sometimes turn out to be another battle. We can therefore quite rightly ask whether we should open the door to the possibility that history educators are (also) dangerous people. It surely can be the case if our aims are emotional, political and ideological – which in turn impacts on the impossibility of aspiring for any "truthfulness".

Currently, the status of “truthfulness” in history education is a debate that entails much more than this presidential address. At the International Congress for Historical Science in Jinan (the biggest conference of Historians worldwide) in August 2015, the International Society of History Didactics, representing educators of History, also participated. One of the themes they covered in a session was that of “The importance of the concept of veracity/truthfulness in history education”.⁴

Features of VERACITY from a South African’s point of view are defined as: wanting to know what actually happened (a sense of “truth”), being “truthful” in the way sources are utilised or knowledge is disseminated; a tendency towards being accurate in articulating research at all times; being open-minded, reliable, legitimate, exact, sincere and aspiring to truthfulness as part of a professional “honourability”. Vocabulary that comes into action as complementary to veracity will be to appreciate "prismatic" thinking, acknowledge multi-diversity, multi-disciplinary inclusiveness and to be sensitised towards all knowledge offered as relics from the past. One can also only exercise “historical veracity” in so far as access to sources, knowledge and availability permits. Consequently reinterpretations, no matter what paradigm or information may come to light, will always (and should always) remain part of the openness in historical research and debate.⁵

Judging by the number of articles found in some scientific journals in Africa on concept-related words to veracity or its alter ego truth and fiction, it is possible to assume that debate and a quest for truthfulness in History and history writing in South Africa has not gone unnoticed:

Journal	Articles on veracity-related discourses	Comments
Journal of Southern African Studies	249	Only one historian considered the possibility of veracity in research done. Truth or truthfulness visible in fiction contributions only (e.g. art, cinema and literary contributions).
South African Historical Journal	171	More references to notions of veracity, but with the emphasis rather on using words connected to assessing or endorsing veracity – words like “interpretation”; “reinterpretation”; “misinterpretation”. Earlier published articles linger on the use and sometimes irresponsible use of “truth” in discussing research done.
New Contree	176	The same notion as in the SAHJ is pursued, except that a very focused publication on fact and fiction was done by Kobus du Pisani in the early 21 st century. There was also some authors’ encouragement to follow a postmodern approach to research in History.
Journal of African Studies	114	A feature in some articles is that critical contesting of truth and “truer” versions are necessarily possible in counter-memories. A theoretical discussion on the possibility or impossibility of historical veracity appears to be a less contentious debate in the JAC. ⁶

Historia	77	Examples of discussions on “fact and fiction” are evident in articles identified on contesting “truth” in history. ⁷
African Historical Review	36	Journal articles identified expose limited discussion on “truth” as a theoretical debate, and in particular the historian’s “ability” or “inability” to be “truthful”. Subaltern voices in postcolonial times are part of some discussions, implicating the acceptance of diverse voices of history. An exposure of criticism on fantasies in history (like writings on the Zulus) is said to have a limited standing in the popular market whose perceptions remain statically embedded in past images of history. ⁸
South African Journal of Cultural History	25	It is mostly the use of films as media to create images of “truth” that seems to be targeted, as well as the value of imagining in cultural history, and also critical discussions on the postmodern paradigm and claim it imposes on “truthfulness” in History as discipline.
Yesterday&Today (since 2006) ⁹	9	Theoretical contemplations on “historical truthfulness” of histories displayed in textbooks for various grades in schools and those used in undergraduate studies fall short, ¹⁰ or are rather mechanically and artificially assessed for the limitations or efficiency in which the standard curriculum is represented. More voice should be added to how a “truthfulness” should be encouraged in master narratives of South African history.

By the way, it should be noted that several articles hosted in issues of the SAHJ are contributions from international scholars on research and debates related to South(ern) Africa. Though this reality is not at all discouraged, it certainly is not conducive for spurring on local and continental minds to be abundantly creative and thoughtful enough about their own soil as platform for research, contestation and theoretical contemplation (and yes, also to be articulated in a language with which the researcher and educator may be more familiar).¹¹ Yet, complexities in “doing history” will remain a transnational issue, and how to deal with sources and to assess or interpret sources in order to arrive at an ultimate interpretation of their being “historically truthful” remains a challenge.¹²

In what sense it will be possible to follow this very historically minded route in a perceived ahistorical environment such as South Africa – one encumbered with political attachments, legacies and, sadly, a limited number of educated learners in History – will present a challenge that will require more discussion than just a paper debate.

I want to share with you three “battles” coming from a past and currently still ongoing in history education. Its impact on History as discipline can be beneficial or negative, depending on the way a “truthfulness” are inclusive of the progressing towards the most feasible outcome.

✓ Curriculum onslaughts in South Africa's past as a battle¹³

By the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the visibility and handling of History at school level differed from province to province, and the training of teachers in History was still in its formative period. Prof FA van Jaarsveld fills us in on some factual relics that certainly need some thorough research and critical thought. About teaching History in South Africa some 100 years ago, Van Jaarsveld observed that:¹⁴

... There has never been satisfaction with history teaching at school. During the nineteenth century, the nationalist-minded Afrikaners complained about the biasedness of the British and Cape History that England as mother country commanded, and demanded a fatherland [South African-centred] history. [EvE translation from Afrikaans]

Cases do exist where History teaching at school level was actually abolished in an attempt at pacification. For example, after the Boer defeat in 1902, Lord Milner provisionally prohibited fatherland history in white schools and apparently only allowed British imperialist history.¹⁵ During the outbreak of this war in 1899, an English academic, HES Fremantle (later known as the first professor of History in South Africa at UCT) made some observations that relates to "truthfulness". Apart from having said that communities should be confronted with unbiased historical content,¹⁶ he also stated that:¹⁷

The absence of accurate and unbiased historical knowledge ... had allowed political myths to flourish among all the inhabitants of South Africa, and these had to be removed if a new country was to be built on a sound basis. Its bureaucrats too would need such knowledge, while a "scientific" study of the past would be vital for any serious study of "native questions" ... as "a work of incomparable importance" for the future ...

Now, as we all are aware of, this advice was certainly noted but not practically noticed in post-war history syllabi. Consequently, the "political attitude"¹⁸ remained that of the colonial conqueror as supervisor and overseer, and it paved the way for only Europeans to dictate and authorise in all fields that mattered. Education in South Africa in the meantime further expanded and several histories are available on how black, coloured and Indian teachers gradually added their voices of discontent to those of English-speaking teachers who criticised the dominant Afrikaner nationalist-centred approach to the content of the History curriculum in particular.¹⁹

In the politically unequal and unstable times of the 1960s, historians at tertiary institutions pondered on the necessity and possibility of transforming History in Schools as a compulsory subject. In the 1971 HSRC report, it was explicitly recommended that History ought to be a compulsory subject up to Grade 12. We all are living evidence that this recommendation fizzled out in subsequent years. Instead, we witnessed in our country the growth of more divisions and more "truths". The establishment of People's History²⁰ during the 1980s in reaction to the Christian National Education²¹ as well as out of frustration against the segregation policy, will also be remembered.²² After several transformational shifts in education, ones in which the teaching of History was merely left as a punching bag as if representing only the "not so memorable" past,²³ tides gladly changed in the first decade of the 21st century. In this regard Peter Kallaway responded by saying:²⁴

The rejection of the apartheid education curriculum was confused with the abandonment of a curriculum that was based on historically constructed knowledge...

Several revised curricula later, we find ourselves in 2015 and again it is heard from levels higher than FET and HET education that some considerations should be given to transforming History into a compulsory subject. In some way, the same motivation as in the past surfaced, namely to teach learners a past they should not forget. In addition to this, the teaching of History, amongst others, is heavily relied on to assist – with the required knowledge – to curb recent outbreaks of violence and intolerance as an apparent lack of understanding and a skew effort of “truthing” because of not being “well-informed”.²⁵ That brings me again to the topic of encouraging a sense of “truthfulness”. How did SASHT-members recently respond to the possibility of History becoming a compulsory subject?

✓ **Compulsory History in schools? Some views of SASHT members and some other dangerous signs**

In April 2015, some South African newspapers buzzed at the idea of the possibility of History becoming a compulsory subject in future as proposed by the Department of Basic Education.²⁶ After some solo responses by SASHT-members to newspapers, the SASHT executive also invited its members to comment and express their opinions. About 20 (23%) of the SASHT members responded – a percentage unfortunately too low to be regarded as representative of all the Society. Perhaps the timing for asking an input was a factor. Be as it may the responses received provided opinions, ideas and considerations which I only refer to today by accentuating their thoughts on the possibility of building a national history on “truthfulness”. If working towards openness, honesty and reliability, it means that it must be a history that has as building stones features of diversity of memories and an inclusivity of identifiable cultures. I doubt whether all respondents at the time thought of it in these ways when they provided their opinions. Without analysing the outcome too academically, I can say that the feedback from our members was very much 50% for and 50% against the possibility of compulsory History (A repeat of this activity will be done again soon to ensure a more representative view of SASHT-opinion).

Among those responses for History as a compulsory subject, I picked up notions among the members of expressing positiveness towards the idea because of:

- A new South Africa and a changed curriculum and all should be informed to “complement democracy”;
- More history learners, students and more educators (which implies that quantity is an exciting option for some);
- Informing learners with the intention of their being informed, “tolerant citizens”.

With reference to the first two responses, one can argue that thoughts about the subject were not necessarily academically inspired, but perhaps more emotionally, politically and economically motivated. Not that these contexts are avoidable, yet they should, to my mind as historian, not be the core priorities when reasoning about History as discipline. The last opinion in this group, namely “informing learners with the intention of being informed, “tolerant citizens” brings us somewhat closer to the idea of “truthfulness” by exposing learners to a diversity of views in the curriculum selected themes and timeframes.

Those SASHT members opposed to the idea of compulsory history (especially FET educators but also some university academics) accentuated a logistical concern and expressed misgivings regarding the possibility of tampering with intentions in pursuing “truthfulness”.

- Logistical concern: Current limitations in the training of history educators, so much so that an “anybody” may sometimes be recruited to teach History in school – which will nurture poor teaching. If History becomes compulsory, the aspect of bursaries and the training of more History teachers should be seriously considered.
- Concerns about possible tampering with “truthfulness”: that the DBE//DoE may interfere with what should be taught once History is transformed into a compulsory subject.

To continue this discussion and also to touch on other burning issues pertaining to History, the SASHT executive, in conjunction with the South African Book Fair held in Johannesburg, has organised a critical debate on, amongst others, whether History should be compulsory or not. Prof Noor Nieftagodien, Luli Callinicos, Barry Firth, Patrick McMahon, Michelle Friedman and I participated with Sarah Godsell (jr) as facilitator. My impressions were that some academics and teachers felt that the compulsory opportunity must be embraced while again, at the very least, half of the group preferred to follow the conservative route. In both opinions an “informedness” among learners and some logistics became the focus rather than whether compulsory history will allow for “truthful” approach to history.

Another additionally debated, but very seriously perceived, concern was the rumours about the possibility that the DoE may allow only one textbook per grade (see the Draft National Policy for the Provision and Management of Learning and Teaching Support Material (LTSM) of 4 September 2014).²⁷ Such a step, if ever so, will impact heavily on any notions of veracity or “truthfulness” in History teaching. SASHT-executive member Barry Firth articulated this well at the time.²⁸

The sources provided are the “glue” that ultimately determines whether or not learners are ably inducted into a historical mode of thinking. The sources allow the learners the opportunity to practise their “gaze”: activities developed around good sources provide ample opportunity for learners to identify all aspects of historical thinking (Canadian Benchmarks). And it is here that the textbooks show their greatest weaknesses: too many sources are poor examples of evidence and serve only as illustrations of the text. The text cannot be interrogated using the sources. The learner is then required to use his/her everyday knowledge to interrogate the sources. In the absence of a strong second register, learners are not able to do so and when that happens, it is not HISTORY.

So far nothing in particular has resulted from the outspoken responses against such a possibility by the SASHT and academic institutions in general.²⁹ As representative for the SASHT on textbooks and as communicator to the DoE, prof. Rob Siebörger, also present today, communicated in the media with regard to the “one-textbook” rumour that, in this regard:³⁰

The greatest loss is (a) that a generation of learners will be led to believe that there is one superior version of history to be studied at school and, (b) that learners will be led to think of school history as being contained and limited (“this is all you need to know to do well in history”), in complete contradiction to the discipline of history and to the multiplicity of sources of information available elsewhere.

May I add that inadequate content and research in textbooks with regard to the histories of most races in South Africa have left a void in History education in the past³¹ but also in the present, which represent dangerous “voids” if aspiring truthfulness is part of the broader vision.³²

✓ **Quality training and qualified educators (teaching)?**

Though one could discuss the issue of “truthfulness” in more depth, I think the last aspect I want to briefly touch on in this regard today is the utmost importance of the availability of quality training for both current and prospective history teachers. (By the way, the training of educators as theme will also be covered at the International Society for History Didactics at their late August 2016 conference in Trabzon, Turkey).

○ Past research on history education in South Africa – HSRC reports³³

No fewer than four reports on the status of the teaching of History in schools were published from the 1960s to the 1990s, two of which were done by the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) of South Africa. In respectively 1971 and 1992, many facets of the status of History as school subject were brought to the table. Some of the findings in the 1971-report relating to truthfulness are:

- That no less than 82,3% of the respondents were of the opinion that students’ reading ability as well as retention was very limited;
- That unacceptable objectives and ill-prepared teachers created problems;³⁴
- That “...the employment of inefficient, irresponsible and pedagogically unsound methods in order to attain good examination results” also created a problem;
- The ill-considered use of the prescribed textbook in class, namely overemphasising it at the expense of other relevant history publications are a concern. It was said of History teachers that they were the victims of spiritual isolation, and should the situation prevail, they would smother the subject History.

In the 1971 HSRC Report, it was recommended:

- That more precedence or priority should be given to insight and interpretation.

We must take note of Prof. Albert Grundlingh’s observation made in 1973 regarding understanding the decline of the History intake at tertiary level. It was based on what happened in schools that he noted as a negative trend also observable in the United States of America of the day. Amongst others, he listed the textbook system and inadequately qualified and incompetent teachers as part of the “problem”.

In some way this concern can be interpreted as a lack of knowledge that breeds distorted “truths”. Informed educators (considering extended studies) may overcome this constraint in particularly South Africa.

In the 1992 HSRC report³⁵ one would appreciate some of the most prominent observations³⁶ made and which certainly could severely impact on the level of history-related skills and ethics in the discipline, namely that:

- Teachers are not adequately trained. Some teach history classes without ever having received any training whatsoever in the subject. The concern was that precisely this shortcoming gives rise to the situation where teachers are unable to adequately deal with complex matters in the History syllabus, and are even less able to deal with new approaches in the teaching of History (for example explaining the logic behind a diversity of perspectives regarding certain events);
- Opportunities available to teachers with regard to in-service training on a regular basis are absolutely necessary. It has apparently been found that 31,25% of black teachers teaching History received no training whatsoever in that subject; nonetheless they

- indicated on the questionnaire that they deemed themselves to be sufficiently competent to teach History;
- All the teachers that were subjected to the questionnaire indicated that learners should be made aware of the diverse perspectives regarding historical themes. (Whether educators “truthfully” championed this need in the class is another debate).

The principle of pursuing diverse perspectives and prolific historical contexts as also endorsed in the 2012-CAPS will enable multiperspectivity as a means towards truthfulness:³⁷

Multiperspectivity means that there are many ways of looking at the same thing in the past. They may involve the different points of view of people in the past according to their position in society, the different ways in which historians have written about them, and the different ways in which people today see the actions and behaviour of people in the past.

This vision for History in CAPS, together with a sufficient training of educators in this regard, can be accentuated habitually and in a clearer way in classrooms.³⁸ Dealing with purging perceptions in their various guises (stereotypes; gender discrimination; exaggeration and propaganda) helps to eradicate error. A preparedness, passionate presentations, infinitely professional attitudes and an exclusive ethic protocol are all building blocks towards accomplishing “truthfulness”. Also practically show parents the power of History. It does not help to just vocalise it without concomitant action.³⁹

Recapping and assessing

That a search for the complete “truth” will always imply partiality seems to be a *fait accompli*, one that is never contestable. In History no historical discussion is definite or final for Marwick. The debate can always be qualified or corrected and political bias will vigorously be pointed out. Marwick also points out that historians (and for that matter history educators) are not propagandists. Their “job” is to understand the past (or parts of it), to inform and not “to change the future”. As is known among historians Marwick’s view is in turn contested by post modernists like Alun Munslow who prefers to deconstruct History...and so this particular “battle” continues.

If in the possible absence or lack of a more inclusive utilisation of past recounts in their variety (multi-disciplines) and diversity (several voices) – the question will be if it will not bring about more remoteness and distance?

The hope is that historians will aspire to produce all-inclusive reflections on a past with which each engages and which may differ in certain time frames as more or additional information on the past is exposed, discovered or reinterpreted with the support of additional sources that provide even more detail and additional insight. This process must be done with integrity.

An escape involving fiction or a lack of truthfulness in everyday life with its spontaneously growing paradigms and ideologies is hardly imaginable. It can, however, be manageable in the education process by dealing with the past in a more inclusive and reflective way. A critical reading and assessment of scientific articles in some themes of history curricula to my mind contributes towards the educator’s, learner’s and student’s ability to understand

the challenges and values of “truthfulness” in dealing with History. This perhaps is not done enough and constructively in both the FET and HET-phases of History teaching.

Though it may require another decade or so in South Africa to critically review the performances of textbook publications in the post-1994 years, the reality of time and the way it steers historical decisions, selections and representations of the day seems an inescapable obstruction to a deliberated history. Other obstructions are the historian’s and the history educator’s fallible nature; the influence and impact of the space of origin and way of living on the persona, as well as an enforced directive in education. It also seems as if some history educators find it difficult to deliberate History as a science from the dream of nation building and specifically the history educator’s so-called “task” in this regard. The wish to see nation building is not contested here, but it’s the impression among some that it’s the task of the history educator to fulfil it. In order to do so the focus to be “truthful” with the past maybe compromised because nation building as a politically inspired wish can lead to a process of selectively utilising the past, and that also is not HISTORY. This dream by all means can be and should be dreamed, but will always remain worlds apart from what History as a discipline represents. Let’s build with care and sensitivity on what we have.

Thank you to each and every history educator for their passion and dedication in the classroom and lecture hall! The fact that you attended this conference (and I know some of you have paid your own expenses because you wanted to be here) and for sharing your needs and knowledge with the next two days. May the rest of the conference proceedings on assessment be stimulating to one and all.

Ke a leboga! //Thank you!

¹ With acknowledgement to a Christina Barnes, 2012.

² See Anon., “What does it mean to study history?”, in <http://www.dpcdsb.org/NR/rdonlyres/EA81D42F-53AD-4B4E-B061-D086615EF2FD/32808/WhatdoesitmeantostudyHistory.pdf> as accessed in July 2015.

³ Anon., “What does it mean to study history?”, in <http://www.dpcdsb.org/NR/rdonlyres/EA81D42F-53AD-4B4E-B061-D086615EF2FD/32808/WhatdoesitmeantostudyHistory.pdf> as accessed in July 2015.

⁴ International Congress for Historical Science, ISCH/CISH, XXIInd Congress, Session: ISHD-Prof Terry Haydn on The importance of the concept of veracity/truthfulness in history education, 28 August 2015.

⁵ Elize S van Eeden, Paper on “Assessing the historiography of fact and fiction in understanding and teaching History in South Africa”, CISH XXIIInd Congress, ISHD-Session, Jinan, China, 23-29 August 2015. Also compare with Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary (London, 1975).

⁶ In particular is pointed out Michael Wessels’ article on “The /Xam narratives: Whose myths?”, *African Studies*, 67(3), pp. 339-364.

⁷ See for example Maria Hugo and KW de Pauw, “Feite of fiksie – Freudiaanse fantasie en ‘n feministiese beeld van Susanna Smit”, *Historia*, pp. 8-13; Robert A Laing, “Our South African (Afrikaner) heraldic heritage – A mythical creation?”, *Historia*, 49 (1), May 2004, pp. 110-134.

⁸ Compare with Stephen Leech’s “New histories for a new millennium”, *Kleio [African Studies]*, 2001, 33(1), pp. 144-155.

⁹ Though in existence since 1981 a thorough Google Scholar research is only possible as from 2006.

¹⁰ One recent critical view on past narratives is that of Noor Nieftagodien, “Youth in history, youth making history: Challenging dominant historical narratives for alternative futures”, *Yesterday&Today*, 6, December 2011, pp. 1-11. Elize van Eeden also produced some articles that could be considered.

¹¹ Compare Marijke du Toit, “Telling tales: The politics of language in oral historiography”, *South African Historical Journal*, 42(1), 2000, pp. 89-120.

¹² Luise White, “The most telling: Lies, secrets, and history”, *South African Historical Journal*, 42(1), 2000, pp. 11-25 (esp. p. 13).

¹³ See also Elize S van Eeden, “Studying History in South Africa; Reflections of yesterday to face, map and bridging diversity today and tomorrow W Hasberg & E Erdman (Eds), *History Teacher Education. Global Interrelations* (Germany, Wochenschau-Geschichte, 2015). Chapter contribution by ES van Eeden, “Studying History in South Africa: Reflections of yesterday to face, map and bridging diversity today and tomorrow”, pp. 225-258.

¹⁴ FA van Jaarsveld, Skoolgeskiedenis in die nuwe Suid-Afrika, *Gister en Vandag/Yesterday and Today*, 20 September 1990, pp. 1-2.

¹⁵ FA van Jaarsveld, Weereens ‘n skoongeveegde lei? – Afrekening met, en nuwe singewing aan die Suid-Afrikaanse Geskiedenis?, *Historia*, 39(1), May 1994, pp. 95-96, 98.

¹⁶ See R.B. Mulholland, “The Evolution of History Teaching in South Africa” (MEd thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1981), p. 127 as cited by H Phillips, “The South African College and the Emergence of History as a University Discipline in South Africa”, *Historia*, 49(1), May 2004, pp. 1-11.

-
- ¹⁷ See R.B. Mulholland, "The Evolution of History Teaching in South Africa" (MEd thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1981), p. 127 as cited by H Phillips, "The South African College and the Emergence of History as a University Discipline in South Africa", *Historia*, 49(1), May 2004, pp. 1-11.
- ¹⁸ See R.B. Mulholland, "The Evolution of History Teaching in South Africa" (MEd thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1981), p. 127 as cited by H Phillips, "The South African College and the Emergence of History as a University Discipline in South Africa", *Historia*, 49(1), May 2004, pp. 1-11.
- ¹⁹ Compare RE Chernis, "The study of South African school history syllabuses and textbooks, 1839-1990", *Yesterday and Today*, 21 April 1991, pp. 12-23; EG Pells, *300 Years of education in South Africa* (New Haven:Greenwood Press, 1970).
- ²⁰ WP Visser, "People's History en geskiedenisonderrig op skool: 'n Alternatiewe geskiedenis vir die nuwe Suid-Afrika", *Yesterday and Today/Gister en Vandag*, 25 Mei 1993, pp. 32-39; ES van Eeden & T Vermeulen, "Christian National Education and People's Education: Historical perspectives on some common grounds", *New Contree*, 50, November 2005, pp. 177-206.
- ²¹ Compare ES van Eeden & T Vermeulen, "Christian National Education and People's Education: Historical perspectives on some common grounds", *New Contree*, 50, 2005, pp. 177-208.
- ²² Compare K Hartshorne, *Crisis and challenge. Black education, 1910-1990* (Oxford University Press, Cape Town, 1992), pp. 218-254; M Cross, *Imagery of identity in South African education, 1880-1990*, pp. 73-81; 213-216.
- ²³ Compare Peter Kallaway, "History in senior and secondary school CAPS 2012 and beyond: A comment", *Yesterday&Today*, 7, July 2012, pp. 1-40.
- ²⁴ Compare Peter Kallaway, "History in senior and secondary school CAPS 2012 and beyond: A comment", *Yesterday&Today*, 7, July 2012, pp. 1-40.
- ²⁵ Republic of South Africa, "Minister announces major changes in education sector", *SANews*, 6 May 2015. The words used by the Minister of Education, Minister Angie Motshhega.
- ²⁶ Republic of South Africa, "Minister announces major changes in education sector", *SANews*, 6 May 2015; Poppy Louw, "History is in our future", *The Times*, 23 April 2015, p. 4.
- ²⁷ See Republic of South Africa, Government Gazette, 591(37976), 4 September 2014; RSA, Draft LTSM for public comments, ca Sept 2014, pp. 3-4.
- ²⁸ Barry Firth, Report on the SA-Bookfair debate/ES van Eeden, 12 August 2015.
- ²⁹ See letters by the SASHT and UCT in the archival records of the SASHT, of which some parts are also available in www.sashtw.org.za.
- ³⁰ See Siebörger's comments in <http://www.litnet.co.za/the-south-african-society-for-history-teachings-representative-on-the-proposed-one-textboo/>, 18 November 2014 when talking to Carine Janse van Rensburg.
- ³¹ Coetzee, C.G., "The Bantu and the study of History", *Historia*, 11(2) 1966, 96-105.
- ³² See for example Grundlingh, Albert, M., "Herhistorisering en herposisionering: perspektiewe op aspekte van geskiedbeoefening in hedendaagse Suid-Afrika", *Historia*, 46(2), November 2001, 312-314.
- ³³ See for this discussion the English version of Elize S van Eeden, "Die jeug en Geskiedenis – vandag en gister, met verwysing na die Hertzog-era" (The youth and History – today and yesterday, with reference to the Hertzog era), *Suid-Afrikaanse Akademie vir Wetenskap en Kuns/ South African Academy for Science and Art*, 21 September 2011, pp. 1-43.
- ³⁴ Human Sciences Research Council, "Die onderrig van geskiedenis aan Suid-Afrikaanse sekondêre skole; 'n Verkorte weergawe van 'n opname in die jaar 1966", Compiled by Liebenberg, C.R., Report 0-11, HSRC, Pretoria, 1971, 1-36.
- ³⁵ Trümpelmann, "Martin, H., "The HRSC-investigation on history teaching – a response", *Yesterday and Today/Gister en Vandag*, 23, May 1992, 46-49; Anon., "What our pupils think", *Yesterday and Today/Gister en Vandag*, 24, October 1992, 45-60.
- ³⁶ Another report on the status of History in historical white Afrikaans and English Schools, commissioned by the Committee of University Principals was also released in 1992, with nothing extraordinary that previous reports did not report on. See Breytenbach, H.J. & S Leo Barnard, "Die huidige stand van die vak Geskiedenis op skoolvlak in blanke hoërskole in die RSA", *Yesterday and Today/Gister en Vandag*, 23, May 1992, 28-32.
- ³⁷ Peter Kallaway, "History in senior and secondary school CAPS 2012 and beyond: A comment", *Yesterday&Today*, 7, July 2012, pp. 1-40.
- ³⁸ Compare Peter Kallaway, "History in Senior Secondary School CAPS 2012 and beyond: A comment", *Yesterday&Today*, 7, July 2012, 23-62.
- ³⁹ Ecker, Alois, "Process-oriented methods in the teaching of history. New avenues in the initial training of history teachers at the University of Vienna", http://univie.academia.edu/AloisEcker/Papers/1428329/Process-oriented_methods_in_the_teaching_of_history, ca 2000, 1-23. Also compare Van Eeden, Elize, S, *Didactical guidelines ...*, Chapters 2- 3.