

The Functions and Prospects of English-Medium Teacher Training in South Africa:

A Point of View

by R. E. LIGHTON

TEACHER TRAINING operates in a field of forces which, largely, training colleges cannot control. Their main function is to provide the teachers the schools need, and to run in-service courses to help teachers to meet the changing, growing needs of the schools. The schools also operate in a field of forces, many of which are largely beyond their control or influence, and must correspondingly be accepted as they are. Whatever, therefore, the needs of the schools are, these needs determine what the training colleges must do.

School needs are interpreted by people who run and administer the schools: the teachers, parent-teacher associations and school committees (perhaps), teachers' associations, school boards, inspectors of schools, head office officials, and statutory democratic bodies, such as South African Provincial Councils, and Parliament. These people and bodies form what might be called a field of forces — an unstable, complex field in which diverse and often divisive interests interplay and interact in a tug-of-war: sectional, sectarian, political, professional, ideological, and so on.

The training college staffs may, from the nature of their work and their contacts, share in the interpreting process, and help substantially in guiding and formulating, where possible. Essentially, however, their main task is to keep step. To do this they must adjust, readjust, adapt, and compromise. They are not masters of their fates. Their programmes are influenced, their policies slanted by strong, often rival interests: provincial, national and international; cultural; ideological; majority and minority; privileged and deprived; language; and, not least the bureaucratic.

In a sense, then, training colleges are adapting bodies, or organisms functioning in a medium abounding in stresses of fluctuating, varying intensity and persistence. Where trends—reactionary or progressive—persist and harden, the educational organism, and teacher training in particular, undergoes stress and must seek adjustment.

Stress occurs even in a simpler medium such as a fairly homogeneous community, with its social, economic and cultural groupings, the urban and rural, the agricultural, commercial and industrial, the extra-territorial connections and commitments. Policies and politics must grapple: and more so, by far, in a land like South Africa with permutations bred by multiple distinctions of colour, race, tradition, creed, civilization and language.

South African schooling finds itself within a perplexing field of forces. Consider, for example, the schooling of White children and the related issues of teacher training. The "two-stream policy" (namely, the teaching of Afrikaans and English-speaking children, in Afrikaans-medium and English-medium schools respectively) results in two-thirds of the White pupils being educated in the Afrikaans medium in their own schools, and one-third in the English medium, also in their own schools. Concomitant, in the Transvaal, is the separation of Afrikaans and English-medium teacher training, with the work being done by one English-medium and three Afrikaans-medium colleges (to be increased to four in 1961).

The observer may enquire whether this is desirable and justifiable. The issue is, in fact, contentious, but in most of South Africa the two-stream policy has been increasingly implemented and entrenched. The representatives of the majority section of the White population unequivocally want the two-stream policy, and doubtless many supporters of the minority section, too. Educationists differ among themselves on this issue, as do many other experts and community leaders. But that, today, is how most schools are organized, and that in turn determines their distinctive needs, and by all existing tokens what the foreseeable future is of English- and Afrikaans-medium education in South Africa. Such facts, needs, demands and policy issues indicate correspondingly what the function of English- (or Afrikaans-) medium teacher training in South Africa has to be.

Are there reasonable prospects of English-

medium teacher training fulfilling its required function? If not, what is the answer, what adjustments or compromise must there be, what trends will harden, and where will they lead? What, then, is the present trend?

There have been noticeable improvements in English-medium teacher training. The Johannesburg College, for example, has trebled its enrolment within seven years. Nevertheless, the English-medium schools get little more than half the number of English-speaking teachers they need, and in the high schools less than half. In fields such as science and mathematics the shortage is desperate, in the disciplines basic to technological progress, a *sine qua non* in a modern society.

If English-medium teacher training falls short, quantitatively, and Afrikaans-medium teacher training prospers, as is the case, the shortfall in the English-medium schools could be offset by continuing to draft Afrikaans-medium trainees into them. The question must therefore be considered whether, provided such teachers speak English adequately, the unequal staffing distribution would be acceptable. Would it be acceptable to have the Afrikaans-medium schools staffed practically exclusively by Afrikaans-speaking teachers, while the English-medium government schools had more or less a fifty-fifty distribution of English- and Afrikaans-speaking teachers? What would the reaction be if the reverse were the position?

These questions are pertinent, for that is largely the present problem. Furthermore, it is possible that the English-medium schools will be staffed increasingly by Afrikaans-speaking teachers, as the English-speaking married women teachers, nominally temporary teachers, are obliged to give up their posts for them. Of course, Afrikaans-speaking teachers entering the English-medium schools are as a rule proficient; and some in due course become principals of English-medium schools. Most are certified as competent to teach through the medium of English. Actually they reveal wide differences in proficiency in English. Many never master its use even tolerably well. Pronunciation not infrequently jars; the continuous and indefinite, the past indefinite and the present and past perfect tense forms are confused; concords and sequences suffer, and prepositions go quite awry. But these divagations should not confuse the issue. If all spoke English acceptably, would the over-all position be acceptable? Or, reversing the position, would the Afrikaans schools be satis-

fied with large numbers of bilingual English-speaking teachers?

To answer such questions one must know more about the teachers than what their language proficiency is, what their general proficiency as classroom teachers is, their ability to maintain discipline etc. One must know their backgrounds, their aspirations and ideals, their codes of values and bases of judgment — in short, how they were brought up and educated, and how they were trained to teach.

One assumes that training colleges pursue broadly similar aims: to turn out teachers who are, or are becoming, mature, balanced and responsible; who are intelligent and competent; who should become not only dedicated but enlightened mentors and leaders; and who will be sympathetic, co-operative personalities, and possibly, broad-minded, tolerant, sensible idealists.

How does training in the English-medium suit the possible achieving of such aims? Are all languages perhaps equally suitable? To be dogmatic is to presume, nevertheless there are grounds for regarding the English language as a most suitable medium for promoting inherently sound education, including teacher education. Coupled with its use as a medium, admittedly, is the development (always desirable from an English-speaking point of view — perhaps dogmatically so) of the broad or at least broadening Anglo-American outlook on culture, education, tolerance in race, religion, class distinction, and so forth. (By Anglo-American is meant the English-speaking peoples of the world.)

Both the English language and the associated cultures have markedly influenced world education and opinion. The English language is not only a rapidly growing world language: with it and through it the outlook, notions and concepts of the British, North American and Commonwealth peoples have taken root increasingly throughout the world; across oceans and continents, in national and international assemblies and organisations. English is pre-eminently the language of science, industry and government, and of literature. It is a language of fact, fiction, and reference, of religion and philosophy, of the mundane and the immortal. Through it, directly or by translation, the articulate, and literate geniuses of all peoples and ages speak, stir men's minds and feelings, and move them. It has become a world pollinator, a universal in-seminator.

It is the language of the people of the British Isles, the Americans, Canadians, Australians and

New Zealanders, the Whites of the Central African Federation, and of many South Africans. It is spoken by large numbers of Western Europeans, by Jews, West Indians, Filipinos, Indians, Japanese, Chinese, Malays, Africans, Egyptians, Central and South Americans. In other words, English knows no confines of colour, race or nationality, no frontiers. It is a hungry, assimilating language, broad, catholic. It is correspondingly, amazingly rich in vocabulary, idiom and allusion; in the vehicles of communication. 'In the beginning,' said St. John, 'was the word.'

English is not only the language of the minority White section in South Africa; it is the language learnt by the rest of the literate South Africans, and spoken by many more. To quote from H. G. Wells: "The inducements to an Englishman, Frenchman or German to become bilingual are great enough nowadays, but the inducements to a speaker of the smaller languages are rapidly approaching compulsion. He must do it in self-defence. To be an educated man in his own vernacular has become an impossibility. He must either become a mental subject of one of the greater languages or sink to the intellectual status of the peasant." (*Anticipations of the Reaction of Mechanical and Scientific Progress upon Human Life and Thought*).

It is true that Afrikaans is establishing itself as an expressive and adequately effective modern language. This has deservedly been called a wonder. None the less, its use, like that of many other effective modern languages, must remain territorially limited. It is the home language of some four million people and the second, or other language of many of the people associating regularly with the Afrikaners.

The minority White group in South Africa is therefore privileged to employ as its medium of communication and instruction the powerful tool of a world language, coupled with an encyclopaedic literature and a universal compendium of knowledge.

To revert to a previous contention: if we aim to produce mature, healthily balanced teachers endowed with enlightened, sympathetic, co-operative and tolerant personalities, a fortiori an undertaking so vital, so formidable indeed, is facilitated by using a world language—and more so when that language is coupled with an outlook, and has a communication-currency that strengthens transcontinental understanding, co-operation and expanding popular, democratic developments!

All the riches of the classics and of drama, all that is significant in philosophy, speculation and metaphysics, have been exquisitely translated into English, and countless other priceless, imperishable contributions to man's thought, indigenous and otherwise. To the proficient student of English, above all to English-speaking students, these are heritages readily to be enjoyed, capitalized and shared. English opens wide the doors to ennobling, liberal, humanizing influences.

If education is to be a humanizing force strengthening harmonious, positive co-existence, the intermediate objectives must form the framework of educational policy. South African English-medium education, for the reasons mentioned, provides a convenient means for developing a broad, outgoing, enlightened humanism. Indeed, certain distinctive features of English-medium education (including teacher training) in South Africa rather peculiarly promote custodianship along these lines, for the English-medium schools serve communities that are heterogeneous, or mixed.

This fact is corroborated by a glance at the school registers and examination lists. In the Afrikaans-medium schools almost all the surnames and most of the first names are obviously Afrikaans. On the other hand, the English-medium schools have a wide variety of names, for besides the many English names there are many Afrikaans, Jewish, German, Greek, Italian and Portuguese names, and so on. This contrast is paralleled in the training colleges.

Such distinctions extend beyond language. Creed and denomination, social and community codes, tradition and convention, loyalties and politics play their part. For example, the Afrikaans-medium schools and colleges, a university such as that of Potchefstroom, and the Afrikaans teachers' association (*Die Transvaalse Onderwysersvereniging*) actively support "Christian National Education".

Before attempting to assess the significance of heterogeneity among English-speaking South Africans in religious affiliations and outlook, and the impact thereof on education, it may be convenient by way of contrast to outline what is generally understood or implied by the relatively straightforward, more uniform distinctive concept of "Christian-National" education. Both "Christian" and "National" permit a wide or a narrow interpretation, so their significance must be sought within the framework of reference, or context.

"Christian" in this context, relating to the

Afrikaans-medium schools, connotes in effect the form of Christianity predominantly upheld by the Afrikaners of South Africa, namely, Calvinism, as represented by the three South African Dutch Reformed Churches. "Christian" in this context would be most unlikely, for instance, to connote Roman Catholicism or Anglican denominationalism, but presumably it would to some degree include Presbyterianism. It is difficult to distinguish the extent to which the different Dutch Reformed Churches fully subscribe to the tenets of Calvinism, but to a greater or lesser degree they are all Calvinistic.

What then, the uninformed may enquire, is Calvinism, and what are the Calvinists' articles of faith? A basic tenet of Calvinism is that the chief end of man is to know and do the will of God. In practice, until a man is united to Christ the benefits of Christ's work cannot be attained by him. Through the virtuous life and through faith the believer receives justification, his sins are forgiven, he is accepted by God and is held by Him as righteous, the righteousness of Christ being imputed to him. This requires as well real personal righteousness. However, the assurance which the believer has of salvation he receives from the operation of the Holy Spirit; but this again rests on the divine choice of man to salvation; and this falls back on God's eternal, sovereign purpose, whereby He has *predestined* some to eternal life and some to eternal death. The former are kept by him in progressive faith and holiness unto the end. (Encycl. Brit.). This, briefly, appears to be the general basis of Calvinism. Developments in European Calvinism are said to have been more progressive than in the South African Dutch Reformed Churches, but throughout the emphasis on predestination seems to be basic and significant. This significance has been described by Tawney (*Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*) as follows, when referring to Calvin: ". . . the doctrine of Predestination satisfied the . . . hunger for an assurance that the forces of the Universe are on the side of the Elect. . . . He taught them to feel that they are a Chosen People, made them conscious of their great destiny in the Providential plan and resolute to realize it."

Toynbee (*Study of History*) comments on the creed of the predestinarian as follows: "seem . . . to have made the bold assumption that their own will was coincident with the will of God . . . and was therefore bound, a priori, to prevail. The Calvinist's Jehovah is a God who vindicates His Elect . . . Such an assumption gives a confi-

dence in victory which . . . is apt to justify itself by achieving the result which it has taken for granted in advance . . . but the assumption . . . invites its eventual confutation by the inexorable logic of events."

The significance of the Calvinist interpretation of "Christian" in the compound "Christian-National" becomes clearer when the connotation of "National" in this context is considered. "National" connotes, at least popularly and generally, the framework or policy ensuring, where possible, the entrenched hegemony of the Afrikaner, and above all the perpetuation of his existence as a distinctive "volk" (i.e. nation) cherishing and maintaining what are regarded as traditional and divinely ordained obligations in South Africa.

"Christian" and "National", when related to Afrikaans-medium education, are therefore not loose, detached concepts but appear to form in combination a definite, compound conception providing if not a goal, then a direction, a working basis, a criterion, or in short, a theocratically oriented educational and political philosophy. Its critical non-adherents might label this an 'ideology'.

It is not the writer's intention to presume to assess the validity of the conception of a theocratic national policy, nor to evaluate the possible implications of a comprehensive application of the Christian-National policy in South African education. These are not the points at issue here. The particular point to be made is that English-speaking educationists, and others, are not inclined to support or favour the Christian-National policy as outlined above, although almost half of the men and women teaching their children do uphold the Christian-National policy. (The facts are detailed farther on).

Where others than the Afrikaans-speaking Calvinists favour a Christian and/or National outlook, the connotations of Christian and National differ from those outlined above, quite radically so in some respects.

To attempt to assess the attitude of English-speaking South Africans to religion and nationalism is difficult. As in language, so in religious affiliations the English-speaking community (and a comparatively small portion of the Afrikaans-speaking community) reveals marked heterogeneity. There are Anglicans, Baptists, Christian Scientists, Congregationalists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Quakers, Roman Catholics, the Salvation Army, Seventh Day Adventists, Spiritualists, Jews, and of course many with only nominal or no religious affiliations.

The difference is in fact more far-reaching because of the prevalence in most English-speaking communities of a noticeable degree of religious indifference, agnosticism, scepticism, rationalism and non-adherence to any church or indeed religion. Consequently, any generalizations about the English attitude to religion must be broad. Generally, it may be said that English-speaking communities do not have a theocratically oriented national outlook. Most would not assume that a majority vote, or any vote represents or expresses God's revealed will. Nor would they readily accept that the chief end of man in the workaday arena of politics, economics, industry, and commerce — nor probably in education — is to know and do the will of God: the basic tenet of Calvinism.

On the contrary, the general or customary English attitude is more pragmatic, matter of fact and secular; it inclines to a liberal, middle-of-the-road tolerance and is therefore somewhat flexible and disposed to compromise for the sake of getting things done, such as improving the general standard of living and bringing the economy into line with changing, emergent conditions. If one may speak of a predisposition or bias, it is a changing, adjusting, evolving one, not an avowed one of determinism, of predestination and divine guidance.

This broad antithesis does not seem artificial or conjectural. The two predispositions, or biases, not only diverge; they appear irreconcilable. Apparent incompatibles, they form part of the field of forces within which South African education, and teacher training, exist. Because neither is within the direct control or immediate influence of the schools, a problem cloaking a dilemma is faced by the designers and custodians of the school system.

This is not apparent if viewed, superficially in fact, from a language, or organizational angle, namely, from the everyday angle. Mother-tongue education is normally desirable in "civilized" languages, at least in the early classes. Many people in South Africa, however, favour the possibility of movement towards a later change of language medium, provided the other language — or second language — has been initially and concurrently taught. Some, again, favour the possibility of movement towards the more or less equivalent use of language mediums: the dual-medium system. Where both language groups, each receiving mother-tongue instruction, form part of one school, we speak of parallel-medium schooling; this can conveniently lead up to dual-

medium schooling in the upper classes, where these combine. If schooling is to develop along such lines, the organization should be sufficiently flexible to permit and facilitate such realignments and adjustments. The parallel-medium school offers the most convenient, flexible organization for this purpose. This fact should be generally obvious and popularly acceptable, if the major factor in the situation were language — this could be so if both language communities were in the remaining respects largely homogeneous. The dilemma, the basic incompatibility, would be avoidable, and the irritating side effects.

But the dilemma persists because some of the remaining differences are far-reaching, radical, irreconcilable. At the April 1960 congress of the three Afrikaans-medium Training Colleges in the Transvaal (known as the T.O. Belangegroep), an item listed for formal discussion was "The Teaching of Arithmetic According to the Christian-National Principle." The subject chosen could as well have been geography, history, nature-study, etc. Such discussion along "Christian-National" lines would be strange in an English-medium training college, where subject treatment is determined by considerations such as the school syllabus, general (including S. African) requirements, the functional and correlation values of the subject—regarded objectively and by modern research findings and developments.

These remarks apply equally to the more fundamental aspects of the curriculum, such as the principles and history of education, and educational and genetic psychology. It was not without point that at the September 1959 Congress of the newly established South African Association for the Advancement of Education the President, Prof. B. F. Nel of the University of Pretoria, presented an urgent, almost impassioned plea for incorporating Christian principles as basic criteria and determinants in psychological constructs, and most especially in the constructs of educational psychology. Any attempted regimentation, any such dicta, however sincere and well meant, would not be compatible with the spirit of an English-medium college unless they were in line with current scientific practice in the fields of psychology and psychiatry. There must be a joint advance. For example, in March and May 1960 the Johannesburg College of Education collaborated with the Witwatersrand Mental Health Society and the Tara Neurological Hospital in the running of education and mental health conferences for teachers. This was done as part of the World Mental Health programme

for 1960. Similarly, for the past five years the College has organized, together with the Tara Hospital, the running of regular — and well supported — sessions in group dynamics, for senior teachers. It is also noteworthy that in some countries ministers of religion are being trained in the application of psychological and psychiatric therapeutic approaches. Conversely, the clinical psychologists and psychiatrists not infrequently find in religion a therapeutic aid.

Science, which basically is a-moral, and religion, which is usually though not always necessarily moral in intent, should admittedly in our workaday world co-operate in social welfare and education. Neither, however, should — putting it naively — attempt to dictate or determine the other's lines of development. This is what some adherents of "Christian Nationalism" seem to think should nevertheless be done, at least in the field of education. One recalls what Wordsworth said about the child being father to the man.

Similar issues are evident in the field of science teaching, particularly in the teaching of biology. Many Afrikaner Calvinists are fundamentalists inflexibly opposed to modernism. They maintain traditional orthodox beliefs such as the inerrancy of Scripture, and reject anything to do with evolution as an unacceptable or unproven hypothesis. This is especially so with the sponsors of 'Christian-National' education, with many, probably most of the leaders in Afrikaans-medium education, and this is the official standpoint in at least one Afrikaans university, namely, Potchefstroom. These views are also shared by many biology teachers.

On the other hand, the English universities (and to some extent some of the Afrikaans universities), the English-medium training colleges and the English-medium schools, with the exception probably of some of the Church schools, adopt a modern approach and employ evolutionary concepts as everyday currency in their thinking and culture. Many of them favour an increase of biology teaching in schools in order to develop a readier percipience and perspective in modern world affairs, for example, in the fields of anthropology and race relations, genetics, etc.

A cognate issue is religious education in schools and training colleges. Again a contrast is evident. The Afrikaans students and teachers have a more detailed and indeed enviable knowledge of the Bible, they display keenness and a readier acceptance of Biblical authority, and altogether they have a more uniform, generally un-

critical outlook. The task of their lecturers is correspondingly straightforward, whereas the lecturers' task in religious education in the English-medium colleges is exacting and challenging. This is particularly so in post-graduate training, and here it is the more necessary, therefore, to have lecturers well grounded in philosophy, theology and apologetics. Of course, students and teachers may be exempted from religious education if they choose; for undeniably no one should teach Bible History who does not believe what he teaches. Students, in fact, rarely request exemption; but there is no doubt that many English-speaking teachers are dilatory in their treatment of religious education.

Another knotty, indeed thorny, issue in South African education and teacher training is history teaching. What, the teacher trainer enquires, is history, and what the function of the history teacher? Is history the collation and study of records through time, and the establishing, objectively and impersonally, of justifiable inferences, the establishing of trends, group movements, mass responses, interactions, reactions, integrations, and so on? Or is history perhaps a variant discipline highlighting the antecedents of one's group or nation, the unfolding and revealing, or inferring, in retrospect, of one's distinctive destiny, obligations and mandate? How far may one go in making such inferences? Is it the function of the history teacher to instil, to propagate patriotism, and to preach defined, restricted, confined allegiances? If this is his task, by what rationale must he reconcile it with the gospel that God is the Father, and all men and women are equally brothers and sisters in Christ? It may be argued that such a question is specious, that the underlying antithesis is unfair, because it has been distorted. If so, is there a possible distributed middle, a judicious combination enabling the history teacher to remain objective, to safeguard the truth and do justice to all sides while helping to kindle a patriotism enlightened and laudable? How, in South Africa, with its multi-racial issues stemming from a turbulent past and present, is this aim best accomplished, what are the obstacles and how are they to be obviated or surmounted? In how far have we succeeded, or are we likely to succeed?

There are it seems countless problems and questions. Those given serve perhaps to highlight some aspects of the field of forces in which South African education and teacher training operate. There are many challenges, and perplexities. Few, if any, of the forces, it is evi-

dent, can be controlled or directly influenced by the colleges, schools or education departments.

Various responses are possible, however, and have been made by the different Provinces. An example of this is the say the parent has in choosing the child's medium of instruction, with Natal giving considerable latitude, and the Transvaal circumscribing the parent's say. A more crucial response, however, is the separation of the pupils into Afrikaans- and English-medium schools: the two-stream policy already referred to. Natal has not gone as far as the other Provinces have in this matter, whereas the Transvaal, the largest and most prosperous Province, has been increasingly implementing the policy.

There is no doubt that for most Whites the two-stream policy has become, or is becoming, a cherished, almost hallowed tradition. This aura also envelops many of the schools, already almaters with established reputation. There seems to have been an inevitability about all of it. Conditions have favoured the process of separatism. These conditions, it is clear, extend well beyond the language field. They involve ingrained attitudes, largely unconscious prejudices, fixed notions, inbred loyalties and so on. One recalls the saying of Josh Billings:

"It ain't people's ignorance that does the harm: it's their knowing so many things that ain't so!" The wise teacher with the courage of his convictions can powerfully influence his community and lead his pupils to reconstruct their world more sanely. Above all, the training colleges can help to steer the prospective teachers that they and their pupils in due course may wisely and courageously lead on to a better world made up increasingly of enlightened, tolerant, cooperative, and progressive citizens.

One would wish to end on this note, piously. "Do away," many cry, "with this alienating separatism among schools and colleges, cultural and professional organizations, and so on: let the younger ones get together, and the microcosm will pattern the macrocosm!" That, they say, is the road for the wise statesman and educator, the nation-builder. "Never!" declaim and protest others, equally sincerely, "for you would follow false prophets and forsake a hard-won heritage; you would make common cause with many who do not sufficiently or acceptably honour their God and their duty to their fellow citizens!"

Let us therefore attempt a matter-of-fact, practical assessment. Most Afrikaners readily endorse the two-stream policy, but in practice many do all they can to have their children enrolled in

English-medium schools. They claim that their children can learn sufficient Afrikaans at home, and that the really important, most urgent need is for their children to master English, to be thoroughly bilingual and to make every possible success of their lives. In point of fact, many of the abler Afrikaans-speaking children attending English-medium schools fully live up to such expectations; it is the dull-average and less receptive children who find adjustment to another medium burdensome — and they are the majority. Such adjustment problems would however be reduced in parallel-medium schools.

By contrast, most English-speaking people probably favour in principle the existence of parallel-medium schools leading up to dual-medium classes; but in practice most would probably prefer their children to attend English-medium schools, because they prefer their children's English to be pure, and — privately — they prefer their children not to mix overmuch, or go outside their group. This is partly why there are many English-medium private schools. In point of fact, extremely few English-speaking parents, except those living in remote areas where no other schools are available, ever seek to place their children in Afrikaans-medium schools.

Very largely, therefore, the two-stream policy is approved in practice by both groups. It enjoys popular support, notwithstanding the outstanding, enviable exceptions of some notably successful parallel-medium schools of which each Province can boast. But the present trend of influential opinion seems to be towards entrenching the two-stream policy. This is clearly so wherever the "Christian-National" outlook is to be found.

If the supply of English-speaking teachers were as commensurate with the demand as the supply of Afrikaans-speaking teachers is, the English-speaking community might — though with hesitation — press for parallel-medium schools. They would have some reason for hesitancy, because by and large their children would form the minority sections in the parallel-medium schools, and therefore most of the principals would, not unfairly, be Afrikaans-speaking, together with most of the staff members, as well as most of the members of the school committees and parent-teacher associations. A similar minority-majority ratio would obtain in the training colleges, the principals of which, for the same reason, would probably be all Afrikaans-speaking. Majority representation would tend everywhere to ensure corresponding directive dominance.

This minority handicap would become more adverse if the minority group provided commensurately fewer teachers than the majority group. This has for long been the position, especially in the Transvaal. Consider, however, the overall South African position. With the English-medium school population comprising about thirty-three percent of the total White school population, the percentage of English-speaking teachers to be commensurate, or adequate, should be about the same, namely thirty-three percent. A recent survey revealed the actual percentage of English-speaking teachers in South Africa as eighteen, in other words, not much more than half what it should be! This means that the Afrikaans-speaking teachers fill virtually all the posts in the Afrikaans-medium schools, and almost half the posts in the English-medium schools, including many of their principalships.

Originally, the Afrikaans committees demanded recognition of their Christian-National schools, the right of the parents to choose their teachers, mother-tongue instruction, and separate schools, in order to safeguard and promote their interests. They have long since realized these aims. Paradoxically, they could permit a swing back towards parallel-medium schools, and instead of endangering their securely won position they could conveniently expand it.

If this is the logic of the past fifty odd years of popular White education in South Africa, what then? How must the English-speaking community best safeguard and promote its interests and concurrently those of the whole multi-racial, multi-lingual country?

The answer seems to be that the English-speaking section would find its interests better safeguarded if the two-stream policy persisted for the foreseeable future. On the other hand, the Afrikaner's outlook and national policy could more readily be augmented, developed and propagated if the two-stream policy were relaxed. This would mean a turning of the tables, with the English-speaking section retorting that however willing they might have been to concede and compromise, they now fear the gods and the gifts they bring. They would, with reason, look dubiously upon the gift horses they had so often praised, for the price to be paid could be very high, and grow unduly so with the years.

In the past, minority groups lost their identity as they became absorbed by the big group — the Huguenots in South Africa, for example: French was no longer heard; only the proper names survived, and little else, though their religion re-

mained, for they too were Calvinists. But the position in South Africa today is not analogous. The minority White group retains and cherishes intimate affiliations, in language, literature, secular outlook and countless concepts, with a far-flung, highly dynamic, progressive world community. Though a minority group locally, it serves to represent an established, supremely influential and powerful world group.

Today all the world is indeed a stage. The struggle for the pattern of world development is between the Anglo-American world group, with the associated free nations, and on the other side the bloc of totalitarian, Communist countries. South Africa's fate is linked with the fortunes of the Anglo-American world group: her daily welfare and security are dependent upon reciprocal associations with the free world. And one of her vital links, indeed highly important, is her minority White group.

The White minority group represents in a sense the majority world group; and the South African majority group a world minority group. All the countries and peoples of the world are growing more interdependent. In Smuts' holistic sense, the field of forces is boundless. Complex though our field is, it is a part of a wider, more complex field — and to be a healthy community we must co-operate sensibly with others, both inside and outside. To begin to be a healthy community we Whites in South Africa should first sincerely co-operate with each other. Only then can we hope perhaps to find workable answers to urgent common problems. These things we all say, over and over, but we suffer frustration because of seemingly irreconcilable, radical differences. While we suffer thus, while we remain impotent, we are unhealthy. As teachers we should be helping to build healthy people, healthy communities, a saner world. Here we seem to be faced with a dilemma. What can be done about it? The theocratic, predestinarian, fundamentalist basis is incompatible with the secular, pragmatic-evolutionary, liberal basis. Must this always be so? Can this continue? Are our eyes open; and our hearts and minds? Can we teachers ever be only detached observers?

As teachers, and the trainers of teachers, both English and Afrikaans, we should share some of the responsibility, face the facts, follow the argument where it leads, and humbly, unselfishly, courageously try to find, or help to cut, a common pathway through this frustrating man-made labyrinth—while there is some sand in our hour-glass.