

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, &
Professional Papers

Graduate School

2021

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP UNDER APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA AS PORTRAYED IN THE APARTHEID ARCHIVE PROJECT AND INTERPRETED THROUGH FREIREAN EDUCATION

Kevin Bruce Deitle

University of Montana, Missoula

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Deitle, Kevin Bruce, "SCHOOL LEADERSHIP UNDER APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA AS PORTRAYED IN THE APARTHEID ARCHIVE PROJECT AND INTERPRETED THROUGH FREIREAN EDUCATION" (2021). *Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers*. 11696.

<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/11696>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP UNDER APARTHEID

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP UNDER APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA
AS PORTRAYED IN THE APARTHEID ARCHIVE PROJECT
AND INTERPRETED THROUGH FREIREAN EDUCATION

By

KEVIN BRUCE DEITLE

Dissertation

presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in International Educational Leadership

The University of Montana
Missoula, Montana

March 2021

Approved by:

Dr. Ashby Kinch, Dean of the Graduate School
Graduate School

Dr. Daniel M. Lee, Chair
Department of Educational Leadership

Dr. Patty Kero, Committee Member
Department of Educational Leadership

Dr. John Matt, Committee Member
Department of Educational Leadership

Dr. William P. McCaw, Committee Member
Department of Educational Leadership

Dr. Tobin Miller Shearer, Committee Member
Department of History

Abstract

Deitle, Kevin, Ph.D., 2021

International Educational Leadership

School Leadership Under Apartheid South Africa as Portrayed in The Apartheid Archive Project and Interpreted Through Freirean Education

Chairperson: Dr. Daniel M. Lee

This qualitative study employed a phenomenological approach to examine how teachers, school leaders, and students rationalize their roles in the educational process when their institution is bounded by an educational system that openly strives against them. For a context, this study examined apartheid-era South Africa, from 1948 to 1994, which established social and administrative policies that deliberately curtailed the education of Indigenous and other South Africans, as a means of oppressing non-European ethnic groups.

In lieu of face-to-face interviews, stories and interviews submitted to The Apartheid Archive Project, curated by the University of the Witwatersrand, in Johannesburg, South Africa, portrayed the experience of education under apartheid. Relevant testimonials were examined using the phenomenological approach described by Moustakas (1994), and interpreted through the perspective of critical pedagogy, with Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2000) as the key source. The central question asked, "How do personal experiences of an oppressive school system, as interpreted through the framework of Freirean education, inform school leaders?"

The conclusion required school leaders to recognize and embrace the role of schools and education in social change – a role that leads toward the recognition of oppression, and provides a means of liberation. Oppression infiltrates school systems, impinges upon the educational process, and robs students of learning opportunities. In recognizing this, educators engage their responsibility as school leaders, and embrace the pivotal role education plays in social reconstruction, liberation, and humanization.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	11
Purpose of the Study.....	12
Central Question.....	12
Definitions of Terms.....	13
Delimitations.....	25
Limitations.....	26
Significance of the Study.....	27
Summary.....	29
Chapter Two: Review of Literature.....	30
Key Sources.....	31
The 17th Century, and Earlier.....	36
The 1658 School.....	39
Traditional Education.....	42
Early Educational Policies.....	44
The 1663 School, and Segregation.....	47
The 1685 School.....	53
The 18th Century.....	56

Scholarchs.....	57
Missionary Education Begins.....	62
The Pioneers.....	65
The 19th Century.....	67
Batavia's Liberal Experiment.....	68
British Administrative Policy.....	73
White Emigration.....	82
The Indigenous Kingdoms.....	85
Missionary Education.....	90
British Educational Policy.....	114
The 20th Century.....	126
The Union Era.....	135
Native Education.....	141
Scientific Racism.....	149
Christian National Education.....	159
Apartheid.....	182
Bantu Education.....	202
Politicization of Pupils.....	215
Historical Discussion.....	223
Themes and Patterns.....	224

Freirean Educational Theory.....	227
Foundations.....	227
Praxis and Conscientization.....	229
Leadership.....	232
Application to South Africa.....	234
Criticism.....	248
Discussion.....	250
The Apartheid Archive Project.....	251
Aims and Principles.....	252
Summary.....	254
Chapter Three: Methodology.....	256
Central Question.....	257
Participants.....	260
Data Collection Procedures.....	263
Summary.....	275
Chapter Four: Data Analysis.....	276
Description of the Analysis.....	277
Collect Experiences.....	279
Generate Themes.....	280
Generate Descriptions.....	318

Report the Essence.....	323
Narrative Report.....	325
Summary.....	330
Chapter Five: Conclusions.....	332
Findings.....	333
Answers to the Sub-questions.....	334
Answer to the Central Question.....	340
Implications of the Findings.....	340
Implications for the Discipline.....	344
Implications for Practitioners.....	346
Recommendations.....	349
Recommendations for Educators.....	349
Recommendations for Future Research.....	350
Contribution to the Field.....	351
Conclusion.....	352
References.....	358
Appendix A.....	379
Appendix B.....	386

Chapter One: Introduction

Between 1929 and 1932, a team of economists, sociologists, and other researchers criss-crossed South Africa in two Model-T Fords, speaking with local residents and documenting their interviews in recordings and photographs (Wilson, 1999, p. 118). Under the auspices of the Carnegie Corporation in New York, their mandate was to study the “poor white problem” – a combination of landlessness, migration to urban areas, inadequate education, and the inability of White citizens to compete with their Black African counterparts for jobs (Wilson, 1999, p. 118).

The commission was established in part through the political power of White South Africans, but also through the influence of religious groups, including the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC) (Dubow, 2014, p. 18; Wilson, 1999, pp. 117-118). In the late 1920s, South Africa was still reeling in the wake of two years of war with Britain, even as the leading edge of the Great Depression loomed on the horizon (Wilson, 1999, p. 118). British concentration camps and scorched-earth tactics had scarred the Afrikaner population (Dubow, 2014, p. 17). In the lean years that followed, wealthy White landowners evicted tenant farmers, sending them into urban areas to compete with established low-wage Black and Asian workers, effectively putting an end to the traditional image of the Afrikaner male as an agricultural figure (Beck, 2014, p. 111; Dubow, 2014, p. 17; Morrell, 2001, p. 26; Willoughby-Herard, 2003, p. 148). Altogether, this meant that by 1930, roughly one in five Afrikaans-speaking South Africans could be classified as “poor white” (Moore, 2016, p. 8), representing a considerable portion of the DRC’s congregation (Wilson, 1999, p. 118).

The enduring irony of the *Carnegie Ondersoek na Armoede* project was perhaps in its name, which translates to “Carnegie Investigation into Poverty” (Wilson, 1999, p. 117), but made little to no comment on the situation of poor Black South Africans (Moore, 2016, p. 8). The com-

mission produced five volumes covering economics, psychology, education, health, and other areas of White poverty, but spoke little on other racial demographics, except where statistics reflected common knowledge, or starkly contrasted White population trends (Moore, 2016, p. 8). For example, the report mentions how rural White and Coloured populations were decreasing at the time, while Black populations were growing at a rate of 20% or more (Moore, 2016, p. 8).

The legacy of the commission, now titled the *Report of the Carnegie Commission of Investigation on the Poor White Question in South Africa*, is twofold. On the one hand, the report is a snapshot of a segment of South Africans of the era, their situation, and their collective psyche (Moore, 2016, p. 8). In that sense, it offers insight into the weight of White poverty on the consciousness of Afrikaners of the day, and how race urbanization was perceived as a threat to the sense of majority enjoyed by White South Africans (Moore, 2016, p. 8). In a similar way, historians praise it for its accuracy and comprehensive scope, applauding its “amazing” and “unbelievable” photographs, as well as offering an “extremely interesting survey of poverty” (Wilson, 1999, p. 118). And although it was admittedly lopsided, the report became a stepping stone toward later efforts to record poverty in South Africa, perhaps in a more balanced fashion (Wilson, 1999, pp. 119-120).

But the other legacy of the “Carnegie Investigation into Poverty” is more sinister. Now with an “official” grasp of the extent of White poverty, and with accompanying measures of other racial trends, the report was easily hijacked for political purposes (Wilson, 1999, p. 118). The Carnegie project became one of many precursors to the rise of the Nationalist Party, and formed the background for much of the invective spouted by a government described variously as “the most notorious” and “most oppressive” form of racial domination known to the post-World War II era (Dubow, 2014, p. 38; Thompson, 2001, p. 189), if not “one of the most danger-

ous social engineering experiments in the history of the world” (Alexander, 2013, p. 61). The researchers who coordinated the study were committed to early precepts of social work, but tied that responsibility to their own nationalistic beliefs (Willoughby-Herard, 2003, p. 5). In that way, these academics and social scientists “struggled over the theories, cultural markers, and social policies that would mar South Africa’s political order for four decades” (Willoughby-Herard, 2003, p. 5). Indeed, by the 1950s, fully entrenched and established as *apartheid*, government officials recalled the 1932 commission report in glowing terms, as a pivotal moment in the battle against White poverty – if an anti-poverty campaign can be conducted at the expense of others even poorer (Wilson, 1999, p. 119).

The apartheid government’s main thrust was to establish a lower tier of society, preened solely as a working class, and defined by racial characteristics (Christopher, 1994, p. 141). No contact would occur between the superior and inferior populations, except in an employer-employee context, which the government expressed in white-black terms (Christopher, 1994, p. 141). It was neither secretive nor shy about this; in 1954, South Africa’s minister of native affairs infamously insisted “there is no place for [the Black African] in the European community above the level of certain forms of labor” (*Debates of the Senate*, 1954, col. 2619). Four years later, that man, Hendrik Verwoerd, would become the seventh prime minister of South Africa in an election open only to White South African men.

The most egregious points of apartheid are common knowledge; history courses around the world teach about the struggle of all South Africans toward freedom and equality. However, it is less well known that a primary tool of the apartheid regime was education – in fact, no other portion of South African society displayed such an obvious degree of inequality as the education system (Christopher, 1994, p. 4). Within the majority of modern South African history, racial

characteristics not only determined social position and labor opportunities, they also determined school systems, available facilities, funding, and even geographic availability (Wolpe, 1971, as cited in Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 61). The education provided to Black South Africans through the late 20th century was engineered to – and in fact had evolved to – anchor them to a lower working class (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 63). That included “an ideological orientation geared towards appropriate work attitudes such as diligence and punctuality, the operation of the colour-caste system, and their subordinate position in the social relations of dominance and subordination in South Africa” (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 65). That educational schism both reinforced and instilled the cultural and social division that became the hallmark of apartheid-era South Africa.

Beginning in 1948, there was no need for the apartheid government to conceal its policy to compartmentalize – socially, economically, and geographically – Black African populations. In 1954, as the Parliament of South Africa squabbled over the fear that “it will probably be eventually impossible to maintain the supremacy of the white race, and that racial purity might possibly disappear” (*Debates of the Senate*, 1954, col. 1049), Verwoerd – still serving as South Africa’s minister of native affairs – accused the education system of the day of a deceit:

Up till now [the Black African] has been subjected to a school system which drew him away from his own community and practically misled him by showing him the green pastures of the European but still did not allow him to graze there. This attitude is not only uneconomic because money is spent on education which has no specific aim, but it is even dishonest to continue with it. (*Debates of the Senate*, 1954, col. 2619)

His criticism of the education system does not recant any tinge of bigotry on his own part; instead, his speech fulfilled the traditional vision of the racist, nationalist government, as it was

built on the shells of the governments that preceded it. That overarching goal was captured in the sympathetic writings of an English columnist in the late 1800s:

Say not that we are superior and they inferior ... but simply that we are different, and that the difference involves, as a matter of practical comfort and convenience for both colours, a certain amount of keeping to ourselves. Of course we shall go on thinking ourselves the superior race; but it is quite open to our coloured friends to do the same. (Garrett, 1895, as cited in Cook, 1909, pp. 102-103)

In that same backhanded way, Verwoerd and his peers believed a society stratified on the grounds of skin color was beneficial, not destructive. By their own admissions, the apartheid government stunted the education of the Black African demographic because

racial relations cannot improve if the wrong type of education is given to Natives. They cannot improve if the result of Native Education is the creation of frustrated people who, as a result of the education they received, have expectations in life which circumstances in South Africa do not allow to be fulfilled immediately, when it creates people who are trained for professions not open to them. (*Debates of the House of Assembly*, 1953, col. 3576)

A year earlier, Verwoerd explained that it fell well within his ministry's purview to dictate exactly which profession was open to a Black African – in fact, it was doing him a courtesy.

If my Department controls Native education it will know for which type of higher profession the Native can be trained, where he will be able to make a living with his knowledge, instead of choosing his own path in a direction where he cannot find a sphere of activity, thus turning him into a frustrated and dissatisfied being. (*Debates of the House of Assembly*, 1953, col. 3585)

For modern audiences, this sugar coating does not make the compartmentalization of education easier to swallow. It was no more attractive at the time. Contemporary critics recognized the system for what it was – an overt attempt to “arrest the development of the African people,” who comprised nearly three quarters of the national population, by some estimates (Tabata, 1959, p. 13).

But long before Verwoerd laid out the Nationalist Party’s rationale, it was customary to curtail education for “non-white” populations. The apartheid era rightfully bears the brunt of criticism, but the preceding union government was likewise guilty of educational segregation, as were colonial administrations as far back as the 19th century and earlier (Chisholm, 2012, p. 84; Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 62; Dubow, 2014, p. 11; Mahlangu, 1992, p. 132). For some scholars, apartheid was not so much the initiation of a new policy as an entrenchment of existing ones (Dubow, 2014, p. 12), coupled with the capitalism and White domination bequeathed by the colonial period – albeit with some alterations (Wolpe, 1990, p. 60). At its formation in 1910, the Union of South Africa established a color bar, extending the franchise to vote to White male settlers only (Lodge, 2008, para. 1), with very few exceptions. As part of the union’s superstructure, “Native Education” was established for Black Africans, with its core principles clarified in official publications:

The education of the white child prepares him for life in a dominant society, and the education of the Black child for a subordinate society. ... There are for the White child no limits, in or out of school. ... For the Black child there are limits which affect him chiefly out of school. ... The limits [of Native Education] form part of the social and economic structure of the country. (*Report of the Interdepartmental Committee on Native Education*, 1936, p. 86, as cited in Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 64)

Pre-apartheid government statistics reinforced this pattern of subjugation. Public school enrollment among Black Africans never surpassed 8% before 1945, and while it is true that the overall school census did increase in years leading up to that figure, most of those students were in early grades (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 63). Three years before the formalized start to apartheid, 76% of Black African students were in the first four years of school, with less than 4% in post-primary classes (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 63).

In that sense, the apartheid government only institutionalized what was already social convention – and had been, for generations (Nwandula, 1988, p. 51). The school policies dividing students by color first appeared in the 17th century, and throughout colonial history, South African governments partitioned learners on the basis of skin tone (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. 506). In the early decades of the 20th century, the union government introduced separate curricula for Black Africans, taking the first steps toward an education system that “envisaged the separation of whites and blacks in political and economic structures, and promoted this ideology through schooling” (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 67).

The Bantu Education Act of 1953 codified the de facto separation of education on the basis of color (Lavin, 1965, p. 432). In the years that followed, corresponding acts partitioned off education for students of Coloured and Asian heritages (Troup, 1976, p. 49). In so doing, the apartheid government ensured that students would only attend school with people of their own color, and the curriculum in all cases sought to enshrine the same principles seen in the 1936 report – a nation where White African students were ensured supremacy, and Black African students inferiority (*Report of the Interdepartmental Committee on Native Education*, 1936, p. 86, as cited in Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 64). As the government did not desire Black Africans to “aspire to certain positions in society,” their education for those positions “was not deemed nec-

essary” (Christopher, 1994, p. 150), and the national curriculum was rewritten to reflect those racist goals (Ross, 2008, p. 131).

Other areas of the educational apparatus followed suit. Schools were required to register with the national education department, and as a criterion for approval, were forced to adopt the government’s apartheid curriculum (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 66). If a school refused, it was declared illegal (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 69). Funding to Black African schools plummeted. Three years before the Union of South Africa was rebranded as a republic, government spending on education for White students outstripped funding for Black students by 10 to one (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 62). By 1970, with the apartheid government well entrenched, that figure had swelled to 30 to one (Troup, 1976, p. 31). In 1974, only one-half of one percent of the gross national product was spent on “native” education (Ndlovu, 2006, pp. 322-323). Student-teacher ratios in Black African schools were likewise frightening; by 1960, the government estimated a ratio of 57 students per teacher (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 72), but the reality of the situation may have been far worse. Figures were reported in aggregate across school levels, which critics claimed was a purposeful attempt to obscure the worst overcrowding problems (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 72).

As might be expected, teacher quality under the Bantu Education Act suffered as well. With few options for professionally trained teachers, schools hired underqualified educators, many without university degrees – a move that apartheid supporters hailed as an increase in the number of teachers available to Black primary schools (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 71). Inadequate teacher training, coupled with rampant underfunding and astronomical overcrowding, meant many pupils did not advance beyond the first four years of schooling (Beinart, 2001, p. 161). For every 100 Black African students who entered the first grade in 1969, only four fin-

ished their full course of education (Abdi, 1999, p. 155).

However, the real challenge to student success came in the medium of instruction. Fearing that an academic training with “too much emphasis on ... dangerous liberal ideas” would result in an African elite, the apartheid government imposed the local vernacular as the language of instruction until grade six (Beinart, 2001, pp. 160-161). Under the pretense of promoting ethnic identity, Afrikaans and English – the languages of dominion – were postponed until upper grades (Beinart, 2001, p. 153). Critics denounced the move as re-tribalization, with the goal of producing a cheap – but not necessarily illiterate – labor force (Beinart, 2001, p. 160).

The government’s efforts to splinter society into racial bands reached the university level as well. The Extension of Universities Act in 1959 criminalized the entrance of Black African students to White universities, without the express consent of the Minister of Internal Affairs (Troup, 1976, pp. 55-56). Those enrolled in White colleges were forced to leave (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 72), sometimes without any option to continue their studies, except a government promise to build a tertiary institution somewhere in their ethnic homeland (Christopher, 1994, p. 152).

In order to achieve its goal of a stratified society, the government shunted a wide swath of its population into an understaffed, underfunded, overcrowded, and geographically isolated education system (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 69). But even if, by some miracle, a Black African succeeded in the woeful public school system, he or she would continue to higher education institutions that promoted the apartheid ideology (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 72). Those who completed their education in remote tribal colleges were expected to redirect their efforts toward their homelands (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 69).

It was obvious to both supporters and critics that the rationale for these changes was, in a

large part, baggage carried over from colonialist and segregationist regimes. Pre-apartheid government analyses made it clear that heavy industry in South Africa depended “on the continuance of cheap Native labour” – in fact, “any attempt to alter the existing economic structure by drastic action would bring it to ruin” (*Report of the Native Affairs Commission for the Years 1939 and 1940*, 1941, p. 11). This belief persisted well into the apartheid era, and invited repeated attempts at opposition (Meth, 1981, p. 1).

From every angle, the apartheid education system represented a willful and conscious effort to compartmentalize society on the basis of racial and ethnic characteristics. Apartheid-era politicians and their supporters were willing to stunt the education of an entire demographic in pursuit of racist ideology, framed against an industrial and economic context. To say the apartheid government inherited these segregationist policies, or that the society of the day allowed their adoption, does not excuse the intentional miseducation of generations of South Africans by a racist regime. And even though that regime reached its conclusion in 1994, many of the lessons of a government that used education to further a racist agenda are still subject to inspection.

One of those lessons concerns how school leaders can maintain their professional integrity under a government that runs counter to the core values of education. By most accounts, education is a moral and noble pursuit: Educators are the “primary stewards of the democratic spirit” (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2013, p. 11). Education is at once a tool that can balance the conditions of men (Mann, 1868, vol. 3, p. 669), an insurance against the uncertainty of the future (Vergerius, 1404, para. 1), and a weapon capable of redrawing the world (Mandela, 2003). No social, political, or economic problem can be solved without a commensurate level of education (McNamara, 1982, as cited in Christie, 1985, p. 13). Teachers and school leaders have

embraced these ideals throughout human history.

But when governments or societies are at odds with those ideals, education runs the risk of being rerouted toward less dignified ends. When education is a tool of stultification – or worse, a proxy for outright oppression – the role of the school leader must change dramatically. School communities can choose to buckle under the weight of political malfeasance, or can confront the forces that would prevent students from living more fully and freely (Battiste, 2019, p. 175). There is no neutral education – it either integrates a new generation into the existing system, or it allows men and women to critically and creatively transform their world (Shaull, 2000, p. 34). This places school leaders in a position to either conform or transform, to become agents of duplication, or proponents of change (Battiste, 2019, p. 175). In that moment, education has the opportunity to liberate, or domesticate: It is either an instrument to integrate students into the status quo, or it is the means of enabling critical transformation (Battiste, 2019, p. 175; Jansen, 1990, p. 2).

Statement of the Problem

Few modern educators can claim to have suffered the adverse conditions seen under the apartheid-era government; for the dwindling population who experienced such an education system, their insight is invaluable for coming generations of school leaders. For those who lived through it, the full intent and malice of the apartheid education system was never in doubt. Verwoerd made it very clear in 1963, when he spoke to the Parliament of South Africa as prime minister: “Reduced to its simplest form the problem is nothing else than this: We want to keep South Africa White. ... ‘Keeping it White’ can only mean one thing, namely White domination – not ‘leadership,’ not ‘guidance,’ but ‘control’ – ‘supremacy’” (*Debates of the House of Assembly*, 1963, col. 212). Luckily, stunted educational systems such as this are uncommon in contempo-

rary societies. While every nation faces obstacles to the success of its students, few must contend with the deliberate sabotage of an entire segment of its own population.

In that sense, school leaders need the insight of past generations to contend with their own difficulties. School leaders and educators who practiced under the apartheid system have first-hand insight into the policies of a highly compartmentalized system, and the challenge of rationalizing their role in a system that ran counter to their own principles. In situations where educators face school systems, political movements, or entire government structures that do not intend for their learners to succeed, they must seek the advice of educators who can speak to those challenges.

What is more, as South Africans enter their third post-apartheid decade, those experienced voices become fewer and fewer. Wherever possible, the experience and wisdom of past school leaders needs to be identified, recognized, and recorded for the benefit of future educators. Without those reflections and insights, future school leaders may find themselves struggling through the same challenges as past generations of educators.

Purpose of the Study

This study sought to investigate the essence of education as it was practiced and experienced under extremely oppressive conditions, with a goal to inform teachers, students, or school leaders who face similarly challenging situations. For the purposes of this study, the central phenomenon was identified as education under apartheid.

Central Question

The central question of this study was, “How do personal experiences of an oppressive school system, as interpreted through the framework of Freirean education, inform school leaders?” The sub-questions that guided the central question were split to align with the textural and

structural descriptions expected by Moustakas (1994, p. 87) for phenomenological research. Two sub-questions conveyed the textural description: “What was the personal experience in an oppressive educational system?” and, “What was the educational experience in an oppressive educational system?” The structural description relied on the contributions of three sub-questions: “How was learning affected by an oppressive educational system?”, “How did participants react to an oppressive educational system?”, and, “How did leadership influence the experience of an oppressive educational system?” Together, the textural and structural descriptions allowed the study to portray the essence of education under apartheid, and permit the analysis that followed.

Definitions of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were used. For clarity and brevity, this document used racial terms that were official, established, or commonplace at the time; their use was not an endorsement or acceptance of their connotations.

African. The use of the word “African” in this study denoted any inhabitant of Africa as a continent. It is understood that citizens of varying ethnic groups have traditionally laid claim to the concept of “African,” through one language or another (Giliomee, 2003, p. 23; Tabata, 1959, p. 9). This conflict over ownership of the word “African” can be seen in the emergence of the terms “Afrikaner,” “native,” “bantú,” and others, and the distaste that each word seems to evoke in one party or another (Dubow, 2014, p. 17; Tabata, 1959, p. 9). As this study was not primarily directed at a South African audience, the word “African” was preceded by an appropriate identity when a racial distinction was necessary for the context. This also avoided confusion where speakers or historians – particularly in the apartheid era – conflated “black” to mean a variety of racial identities, or colonial histories employed “coloured” to include members of several racial or ethnic groups. In an attempt to conform with the seventh edition of the *Publication Manual of*

the American Psychological Association, this study referred to Coloured Africans with the same rules of capitalization and style as were used to discuss Black, White, Indigenous, Indian, or Asian Africans. Direct quotations or source materials that deviate from that style retain their original presentation in this document. This study avoided “nonwhite” in the simultaneous discussion of multiple demographics; some have dissuaded its use on personal grounds (Sonn, 2013, p. 434; Story B-2-21-32-SN32), but the term has appeared in individual retellings of apartheid-era oppression (Story B-2-11-20-SN18), as well as recent publications that discuss race, government, history, and policy in South Africa (Dubow, 2014, p. 58; Giliomee, 2004, p. 25; Guelke, 2004, p. 9; Steyn, 2012, p. 12).

Afrikaner. Occasionally interchanged with the Dutch loanword *boer*, the term “Afrikaner” was understood through the modern era to apply specifically to White South African citizens who speak Afrikaans as a first language (Wright, Kerr, & Wright, 2015, p. 9). The term implied European heritage, specifically from the Netherlands, Germany, or France prior to 1806, when Britain acquired modern-day Cape Town from the Dutch (Wright, Kerr, & Wright, 2015, p. 9). Other descriptions traced this heritage to as early as 1685, as either Dutch settlers or French religious refugees (Tabata, 1959, p. 28). The first documented self-identification as an “Afrikaander” dated back to 1707; until that time, the word’s precursors had been used to refer to Indigenous populations, or mixed-race offspring (Giliomee, 2003, pp. 22-23). The word evolved rapidly to include “Africaander,” “Africander,” “Africaan,” and “Africanen,” and its usage came to denote African birthplace by way of European ancestry (Giliomee, 2003, p. 23). The term conveniently allowed descendants of Dutch or French settlers to distinguish themselves from Dutch officials temporarily assigned to the colony (Kaplan, 1971, p. 823). Perhaps as a result, Afrikaner identity embraced the image of the farmer, or *boer*, as someone who instinctively understood

South Africa's land and people (Dubow, 2014, p. 17). It is important to note that Afrikaner does not necessarily imply Dutch descent; British, French, and German citizens were among the earliest colonists, and by the end of the 17th century, French Huguenots escaped religious persecution to South Africa (Dube, 1985, p. 87). These groups contributed to a hybrid language with a Dutch origin called Afrikaans (Dube, 1985, p. 87). In that way, an Afrikaner might not have Dutch parentage, but most likely speaks Afrikaans as a first language and identifies with the European immigrant culture (Dube, 1985, p. 87). Nationalist politics in the apartheid era monopolized the term, seeking to redefine White Africans as "torchbearers of Christian civilization drawn together by a unique culture and calling" (Dubow, 2014, p. 17). Apartheid-era texts explained an Afrikaner was "an Afrikaans-speaking white person, born in South Africa," with the caveat that a direct translation of the word to English is rendered as "African" (Tabata, 1959, p. 10). As the word *boer* was occasionally used as a term of derision by English-speaking South Africans (Beck, 2000, p. xiii), this study employed Afrikaner or White African, except where required by the context.

Apartheid. Pronounced "apart-hate," apartheid was a racial policy enacted through the nationalist government of South Africa from 1948 to 1994, founded on segregation on the basis of physical characteristics (Beck, 2014, p. 135; Wright, Kerr, & Wright, 2015, p. 30). Originally a slogan of nationalist parties competing in the 1948 election, the word translates from Afrikaans to "separateness" or "apartness" (Beck, 2014, p. 135; Dubow, 2014, p. 10; Ross, 2008, p. 123). In its earliest days, the intent of the slogan was not perfectly clear (Beinart, 1994, pp. 139-140; Ross, 2008, pp. 123-124), but it carried the "keeping to themselves" (Cook, 1909, p. 102) motif evident in preceding segregationist governments, as well as a spiritual or moral imperative (Dubow, 2014, p. 10). In its heyday, apartheid was an institutionalized form of domination,

grounded in racist ideology (Dubow, 2014, p. 33). Some scholars differentiated between “petty” apartheid, which described laws governing racial divisions in everyday life, and “grand” apartheid, which governed land and political rights, including the union-era establishment of semi-autonomous homelands (Beck, 2014, p. 135). Apartheid policies began to erode in the late 1980s and early 1990s, and the regime finally expired with the Republic of South Africa’s first democratic multiracial elections in 1994 (Wright, Kerr, & Wright, 2015, p. 30). The apartheid era, for the purposes of this study, is bounded by the 1948 election on one end, and the 1994 election on the other (Beck, 2000, p. 126; Beck, 2014, p. 136).

Bantu. In an anthropological context, “Bantu” refers to both an African people and a series of related languages, originating in modern-day Cameroon (Beck, 2014, pp. 24-25). Approximately 2,000 years ago, populations began to migrate south and east, eventually expanding into regions of modern-day South Africa (Beck, 2014, p. 25). As a term, the word “Bantu” recognizes the language group and its origins, in the same way the terms “Romance” or “Germanic” describe both language and cultural relationships (Beck, 2014, p. 25). Within 20th-century South African government policy and publications, “Bantu” most commonly referred to speakers of Bantu linguistic groups (Moore, 2016, pp. 4-5). The 1951 Eiselen Commission relied on union-era publications to interpret “Bantu” as “any person who is a member of any aboriginal race or tribe of Africa” (Moore, 2016, p. 5), which introduces an inaccuracy. The commission specifically included the Nguni, Sotho, Venda, Tsonga, and Transvaal Ndebele in its description of “Bantu” (Moore, 2016, pp. 4-5); modern linguists likewise acknowledged the Nguni, Sotho, Venda, and Tsonga as Bantu speakers (Beck, 2014, p. 25). The Bantu Education Act of 1953 explicitly equated “Bantu” with “native” (Bantu Education Act, 1953, p. 258). Within apartheid contexts, the implicit understanding was that “Bantu” did not include Coloured populations or

citizens of Asian heritage (Moore, 2016, pp. 4-5). In some publications – particularly in union-era publications – the word was interchangeable with “native.” Both terms were considered derogatory, owing in part to their use within the bureaucracy (Beck, 2014, p. 25; Tabata, 1959, p. 10).

Coloured. The word “coloured” appeared in official documents to denote individuals of mixed racial heritage (Kaplan, 1971, p. 824). Both apartheid- and union-era publications used the term to indicate a separate racial identity, apart from Black African and White African populations, but again distinct from citizens of Asian heritage. A 1937 report into the Coloured population defined the term as descending from non-Europeans brought to the area during the colonial era, or a descendant of ethnic groups indigenous to the eastern portion of the country, or with a mixture of White or Black African heritage (*Report of Commission of Inquiry Regarding Cape Coloured Population of the Union*, 1937, pp. 8, 10). The 1950 Population Registration Act could offer little more specific criteria than to define a “coloured” African as an individual “who is not a white person or a native” (Dubow, 2014, p. 38). Through much of South Africa’s history, Coloured populations were considered distinct from any racial group, and in some cases elevated an individual within society. Belonging to the Coloured demographic did not bar a colonial South African homeowner from holding a political position; the fledgling nation’s first baronet and its first member of the British House of Lords were both identified as “coloured” (Ross, 2008, p. 52). As a result, colonial proceedings from the 19th century included the classification in voting processes, but the usage blurred where Coloured individuals were elected to positions, and therefore no longer considered Coloured Africans (Ross, 2008, p. 52). However, the use of the label “coloured” through the apartheid era was restricted to a narrow group of mixed racial backgrounds (Tabata, 1959, p. 10).

Conscientização or ***Conscientization***. As both the product and process of praxis (q.v.), the terms *conscientização* and conscientization describe a state of reflection upon the conditions of existence, and deliberate action to intervene in reality (Freire, 2000, p. 109). Through reflection, people “discover each other to be ‘in a situation,’” and when coupled with an informed and deliberate action, the two produced *conscientização*: a “deepening of the attitude of awareness” (Freire, 2000, p. 109). The two terms were not equivalent: “Conscientization involves assuming an awareness, but then it deepens it” (Freire, 2015, p. 38). This meant *conscientização* was not just the perception of oppression, but the pairing of that realization to an informed and deliberate action (Freire, 2000, p. 119). Freire recommended a deliberate pursuit of conscientization as part of liberation (2000, p. 160); in fact, Freirean education required peers and community members to discuss history and memory, making those two social features necessary for both praxis and conscientization, which in turn were requisites for liberation (Freire, 2000, p. 44; Sonn, 2013, p. 438). It is possible to confuse manipulation for conscientization, but doing so invalidated liberation (Freire, 2000, p. 177). As a rare addition to English from Portuguese, the word arrived in South Africa at “just the right moment” (Alexander, 2013, p. 59), and found its way into the vernacular of student liberation movements in South Africa the 1970s and 1980s (Dubow, 2014, pp. 160, 321). Steve Biko described conscientization as a “desire to engage people in an emancipatory process in an attempt to free them from a situation of bondage” (as cited in Nekhwevha, 2002, p. 138). The word has since become a shibboleth of veterans of anti-apartheid efforts (Story B-1-11-20-N17; Story B-1-11-20-N18).

Khoi and ***San***. Depending on the author and the time frame, the terms Khoi or San were occasionally combined to appear as *Khoikhoi*, *Khoekhoe*, or *Khoisan* (Beck, 2014, pp. 10-12). Historians have long acknowledged both the Khoi and San peoples as the earliest residents of

southern Africa, with evidence of their presence that can be dated tens of thousands of years into the continent's past (Beck, 2014, p. 11; Kaplan, 1971, pp. 41-42; Stow, 1905, p. 10). Some texts aligned the Khoi as a subgroup of the San (Beck, 2014, p. 12), but both populations were noted as pastoral and nomadic cultures, possibly originating in present-day Zambia or northern Botswana, and ranging far southward (Beck, 2014, pp. 10-12). The Khoi specifically had migrated to the southern extremity of Africa by the Christian era, and their populations were referred to frequently in records of early Dutch colonists at the Cape of Good Hope (Beck, 2014, p. 12). Early Europeans referred to the San as *Bushmen*, and the Khoi as *Hottentots* (Wright, Kerr, & Wright, 2015, p. 6); the terms occasionally appeared in more modern texts (Walker, 1957, p. 33), but neither label is considered acceptable in contemporary discussions. Owing to the colonial usage, "Hottentot" has since evolved into a pejorative suggesting an "inferior intellect or culture" or "one degraded in the scale of civilization" (MacCrone, 1957, p. 48). Meanwhile, "bushman" and its Afrikaans equivalent *bosjesman*, implied no more than the idea of "someone who quite literally lived in or by the 'bush'" (Marks, 1972, p. 57). Language structure separates the Khoi and San cultures, but for early colonists, the only distinguishing characteristic was the presence of cattle: The San lived "by the bush," while the Khoi were herders (Marks, 1972, p. 57). In that sense, the early Dutch made no distinction between the two groups, instead applying the labels in respect to lifestyles, which possibly gives rise to the combined term *Khoisan* (Marks, 1972, p. 57).

Leader and Leadership. This study subscribed to the definition of leadership proposed by Rost (1991, p. 102), and the ethical and moral components it requires: Leadership is an influence relationship between leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes (Rost, 1991, p. 102). Both leaders and followers must interact to influence one another re-

garding the changes they intend (Rost, 1991, p. 154). Those interactions are critical to the health, mutuality, growth, development, and success of the relationship (Rost, 1991, p. 154), which implies an ethical and moral component: If both leaders and followers use influence to bring about change, the relationship and the people in it can be affected (Rost, 1991, p. 154). In that way, the use of the word “leader” in this study with regard to education deliberately tied the function of a school leader (q.v.) to the moral considerations of that role, and ultimately to student success.

“Model C” School. Within the context of South African education in the early 1990s, a “Model C” school is understood to be a formerly White-only school (South African Institute of Race Relations, 2011, p. 1). In the closing years of apartheid, the government made some educational concessions, allowing the parents of children in White-only schools to determine how schools would be run (South African Institute of Race Relations, 2011, p. 1). A “Model A” school would become fully private, while a “Model B” school would remain a state school with a maximum attendance of 50% from Black African populations (South African Institute of Race Relations, 2011, p. 1). “Model C” created a semi-private school, with a state subsidy and up to 50% of the student body as Black African students, but with the remainder of its budget left to fees and donations (South African Institute of Race Relations, 2011, p. 1). In 1992, the government added the “Model D” school, which would remain under the direction of the White department of education, but had no limit to the number of Black African students who could enroll (South African Institute of Race Relations, 2011, p. 1). By April of that same year, 96% of all the schools that were under the control of the federal government had elected to become “Model C” schools (South African Institute of Race Relations, 2011, p. 1). Submissions to the Apartheid Archive Project that used the term “Model C” reflected the common reference to a formerly White-only school, even though the term is no longer in official use (South African Institute of Race

Relations, 2011, p. 1).

Nationalist Party. The term “Nationalist Party” referred to the Afrikaner-dominated political party established in 1914 in South Africa, which gained prominence in the run-up to its 1948 election success, ushered in the 1961 apartheid republic, and disbanded in 1997 (Beck, 2000, pp. xix-xxvi). A literal translation for *Die Nasionale Party* would correctly be “The National Party,” but this study followed the recommendations of Horrell (1965, p. 1) and in specific reference to the ruling party of the apartheid era, used “Nationalist Party” where possible. The rationale, as Horrell (1965, p. 1) explained, was to avoid confusion over the proper name of the political party as directly translated into English, and the use of “national” as an adjective suggesting a party operating as a representative of the government, or operating in protection of “national” interests. “Nationalist” likewise avoided misrepresenting the party as a coalition of political organizations cooperating as a unit (Horrell, 1965, p. 1).

Native. Primarily a precursor to the apartheid term “Bantu” in official publications, it most commonly appeared in use by White South Africans to denote Black African citizens or inhabitants (Kaplan, 1971, p. 826). The Bantu Education Act of 1953 equated “Bantu” with “native,” defining the latter as “any person who is or is generally accepted as a member of any aboriginal race or tribe of Africa” (Bantu Education Act, 1953, p. 1). As with “Bantu,” the use of “native” by segregationist governments meant the term has assumed a derogatory connotation (Kaplan, 1971, p. 826; Tabata, 1959, p. 10). Apartheid-era politicians wielded the term as a provocation; a nationalist politician once proclaimed in parliamentary proceedings that apartheid “meant he would not sit in a bus alongside a ‘native’” (Dubow, 2014, p. 33).

Praxis. Within Freirean educational philosophy, praxis referred to a social transformation that has its roots in both reflection and action (Freire, 2000, pp. 79, 87, 126). For Freire, praxis

was not possible without both elements: Reflection without action was hollow, and therefore demoted to verbalism; action without adequate reflection was activism and a false form of social transformation (Freire, 2000, pp. 87-88). Freire believed education could raise the consciousness of the general population and allow people to recognize oppression in their daily lives, and when praxis occurred, they would move to change it (Thomas, 2009, p. 255). As people grew in their capacity for recognizing and understanding oppression, Freire felt education would also reveal strategies for confronting and correcting the conditions of society (Thomas, 2009, p. 255). When praxis occurred, learners had not only developed the ability to critique their own society, but acknowledged and assumed their role in changing it, eventually liberating themselves and building a new society (Thomas, 2009, p. 255). Freire (2000, p. 159) referred to that moment as *conscientização*, or “conscientization” (qq.v.), and with each occurrence of praxis, conscientization accelerated (Thomas, 2009, p. 255).

School Leader. While this study used “school leader” as a catch-all for both formal and informal positions of influence or responsibility in a school, there were specific implications to the term as well. As South African education evolved through pre-colonial, colonial, union, and republic governments, many school leaders more accurately held other titles – for example, early pre-colonial school leaders held the formal post of *sieckentroosters*, and education was only one of their responsibilities as lay readers (Collins, 1983, p. 364; Walker, 1957, pp. 32-33). Over centuries, school leaders held titled positions as missionaries, principals, teachers, or other roles, with the administration, management, and delivery of education as a common responsibility. In that sense, “school leader” in this study could include teachers with an elevated role in a school. The use of the term “school leader” therefore offered a convenient and flexible label for any person in a position of responsibility or influence within an educational institution, regardless of era

or system. However, the term implied more than just administrative functions, as it was tied to the moral and ethical considerations that are inextricable from leadership (q.v.). The term did not include leaders from the student segment of an institution; “student leader” was more appropriate there.

Standards and Forms. Within discussions of 20th-century South African education systems, a “standard” is understood to be one full academic year of schooling (Murphy, 1973, p. 20), and loosely corresponds to a “grade” in American school systems. Public schooling under apartheid established two sub-standards for pre-primary students (Murphy, 1973, p. 20), followed by Standards 1 through 6 of primary school (Nokwe, 1954, p. 16). Between documents that speak to different time frames in South African history, it may be difficult to be sure the exact age of a student attending a given standard. At certain points in pre-apartheid schooling, Black African students began their pre-primary classes at 6 years old (Dube, 1985, p. 94), implying that the age of elementary school students could range from 8-14 years old. Standard 2 was the upper limit of “fundamental” education under the apartheid government, with Standard 3 and up available only to students who were selected to continue a “higher-primary education” (Nokwe, 1954, p. 16). Secondary school under Bantu Education consisted of five “forms” (Murphy, 1973, p. 20), suggesting the age of junior high or high school students might range from 14-19 years old. To complicate matters, some documents continued to use “standard” and avoided “form,” with the year in sequence from the start of schooling – that is, Standards 7, 8, 9, 10, and so forth (Interview C-1-6-10-SI10; Story B-1-41-50-N41; Story B-1-51-60-N54; Story B-2-11-20-SN19). However, differences between public and private schools, early and late time frames, and racially divided education departments made these ranges difficult to define authoritatively.

Story. In citations of the contents of the Apartheid Archive Project, “story” and “stories”

referred to the submitted testimonials and interview transcriptions, either in part or in full. The word could refer to episodes within a submission, or to entire submissions that offer only one anecdote. In most cases, the word “story” took the place of the word “narrative,” in hopes of preventing confusion where “narrative” has other uses, such as the narrative approach to qualitative research (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 109). Additionally, direct citations of archive submissions used “Story,” followed by a full numerical label, as described in Chapter Three.

Student Success. Many discussions of “student success” tied the concept to “academic success,” implying academic achievement and the attainment of educational objectives (York, Gibson, & Rankin, 2015, pp. 1, 9). While student success should take into account academic success, the overall idea of student success varied with perspective (York, Gibson, & Rankin, 2015, p. 1). Furthermore, strictly aligning “student success” with indicators of student performance would omit a number of personal aspects which were important to this study. For that reason, this study borrowed the definition provided by Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, and Hayek (2006, p. 7): Student success is “academic achievement, engagement in educationally purposeful activities, satisfaction, acquisition of desired knowledge, skills and competencies, persistence, attainment of educational objectives, and postcollege performance.” Student achievement was implied in that definition, as were traditional indicators such as enrollment, persistence, and post-graduation achievement (Kuh et al., 2006, p. 5). At the same time, this definition permitted interpretations that included “ineffable qualities” that were beneficial to society and the individual, such as student satisfaction, critical thinking, self-awareness, self-confidence, social competence, a sense of purpose, an appreciation for human differences, commitment to democratic values, or a well-developed sense of identity (Kuh et al., 2006, pp. 5-6). Many of these interpretations were of greater importance in a discussion of apartheid-era schooling, and for that reason, this study used

the term with emphasis on these “more difficult to measure aspects” of student success (Kuh et al., 2006, p. 5) as they were portrayed in submissions to the Apartheid Archive Project.

Delimitations

Conceptualized and initiated in 2008, the Apartheid Archives Project contains testimonials from various members of the South African citizenry, all of whom speak to their experiences under, and in the wake of, the apartheid government (The Apartheid Archives Project, 2011, para. 1). In that context, this study was delimited by membership to that historical experience, and the effects it had had on society, culture, and community. The results of this study might not have the same influence in situations or conditions which do not measure up to the apartheid structure as it evolved through history.

The archive was established in hopes of maintaining the common, everyday details of apartheid and racism, many of which had not been acknowledged or assessed through larger, more dramatic testaments, such as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 12). The project was in that sense intended as “a space which could absorb and re-process accounts of past intolerable experiences, so as to ultimately afford individuals the internal capacity to accommodate or own these experiences and the knowledge and feelings which accompany these” (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 15). The archive coordinators explained that “the project is fundamentally premised on the understanding that traumatic experiences from the past will constantly attempt to re-inscribe themselves in the present, often in masked form, if they are not acknowledged, interrogated and addressed” (The Apartheid Archives Project, 2011, para. 1). Again, where this experience differs from other cultures, societies, or governments, the results of this study may not prove particularly transferable.

Limitations

This study has limited applicability, possibly only to the demographics described in the “Delimitations.” It likewise inherited some limitations from the data collection procedures of the Apartheid Archive Project, in that the project coordinators relied on their own personal and professional networks to collect responses, with an Internet portal as an added venue for the submission of testimonials (Stevens, Duncan, & Hook, 2013, p. 10). That technological requirement may or may not have had an effect on the overall content and general character of the archive.

As a qualitative analysis, this study lacked generalizability, and should not be expected to apply to a larger population, a population that does not fit the features described in the “Delimitations,” or features which do not describe the participants to the archive. It was also limited in its structure as a phenomenological study, which attempted to allow the testimonials to guide the underlying essence, without offering a theory for the central phenomenon.

For readers concerned over the “truth” of the archive, this study did not intend to establish or prove the “truth” of content, but neither did the project leaders expect the archive submissions to represent a neutral or objective reflection of truth (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 13). Research based on stories does not attempt to produce “conclusions of certainty” (Webster & Mertova, 2007, p. 90), and this study embraced that principle. This study operated on the presumption that participants were forthcoming in their responses, provided stories that were faithful to their memories, and in that sense supplied an honest retelling of their feelings and thoughts. However, it would not be reasonable to expect the personal memories of participants to reflect “truth” as it appeared in official records or in commonly accepted histories. While there was no reason to doubt the faithfulness of contributions to the archive, it was always possible that the participant tailored their response in a way that masked or obscured their perception of

events.

Reasons for that could include submissions crafted for social desirability, or stories that were altered for personal motivations. While unlikely, it was altogether possible that submissions were self-edited in hopes of avoiding confrontation, escaping prosecution, preventing discomfort, or even in the case of interviews, to curry favor between the participant and the project representatives. While those are weaknesses for most any interview- or story-based research, the charged political atmosphere of the day may have resulted in stories that deviate from strict fact.

Regardless, it was beyond the scope of this study to offer any validation of archive content, and for that reason, this study had no intention of doing so. Where recollections or commentary differed from official records or accepted historical accounts, it falls to the reader to incorporate that observation into their judgment of accuracy, relevance, and transferability.

Significance of the Study

This study may hold particular significance to school leaders and educators. The insight offered through the testimonials of apartheid-era educators and students will shed light on school leadership and educator roles in extremely adverse conditions. This, in turn, should allow educators to make decisions and decide on school policies that ensure student success despite the orientation of the overarching school system enforced at other levels.

In the same vein, some significance could be realized by students. As will be seen in the next chapter, students played a central role in the evolution and eventual demise of the apartheid government, and in some cases their active opposition to an oppressive school system cost them their lives. The insight offered through this analysis may inspire students to work toward their own educational success, even when the government or its policies actively oppose that.

Where students, educators, and school leaders may gain wisdom from the results of this

study, it follows that the school community may also benefit. School managers, school boards, school governing organizations, and school stakeholders may see value in the testimonials of apartheid-era school members, and possibly use those lessons as they interact with their own school systems.

Beyond that, the results of this study may offer insight into school and government policy, as is allowed in a school hierarchy or beyond. While it is possible that the testimonials discussed here run counter to the bureaucratic goals of policymakers and administrators, it could prove significant in their understanding of how government and society affect the inner workings of an educational system.

As a mirror of contemporary and historical events, this study may also find parallels in the delivery of education in countries other than South Africa. Discussions of education for colonized populations brings to mind schooling for Indigenous Australians, where as late as the 1970s assimilationist policies removed Aboriginal children from their families and placed them in government custody (Schaffer, 2002, p. 5). The 19th-century policies in the United States that allowed Native American children to be taken by force from their families to work in Christian vocational boarding schools likewise embodied social agendas bent on cultural extinction (Bird, 2017, p. 20). Critiques of modern American schooling policies have accused recent federal education authorities of rampant mismanagement, due in a large part to ideological opposition to public schooling at the topmost levels (Olen, 2020, para. 6). In February 2021, Chinese authorities overhauled the Hong Kong educational system, placing the blame for social unrest on teachers and the curriculum (Gopalan, 2021, para. 25). Observers were clear that the goal for the mainland government was to “tighten the leash on the younger generation” – in some cases, for children as young as 6 years old (Gopalan, 2021, para. 26).

In any one of these examples, the traditional role of an educator stands in opposition to the stated agenda of a government or society. Where a reader can draw a parallel between education systems elsewhere and the experiences of apartheid-era educators and students, this study may prove significant for their understanding. It falls to the reader to determine what governments and policies obstructed education with the same outright, deliberate, and systematic malice as the apartheid government; where a comparison is seen, this study may provide some illumination.

Summary

Chapter One provided an overview of the apartheid era of South African history, with special consideration toward the education system and its purpose in propagating the apartheid government's racial and social agendas. Chapter Two will begin with an in-depth investigation of the school systems of South Africa, as they evolved through the colonial and union eras, and into the apartheid regime. Once complete, a discussion of Freirean and other relevant educational philosophy will begin, to be followed by an introduction to the Apartheid Archive Project.

Chapter Two: Review of Literature

In his 1925 book *Education in South Africa: 1652-1922*, E. G. Malherbe – himself one of the commissioners of the original “Carnegie Investigation into Poverty” (Dubow, 2001, p. 102; Wilson, 1999, p. 126) – warned both teachers and administrators to be conscious of the long-term effects of their actions.

Teachers often forget that their pupils constitute members of a Society, of a Nation, and that their teaching has a social and national as well as an individual aim. On the other hand, administrative officials are apt to forget that the rules and regulations they make for the whole country come to bear, in the last resort, upon the souls of individual children, and affect their lives in a very vital way. (Malherbe, 1925, p. viii)

Malherbe could not have known, in 1925, the direction education would take in the decades after his book was published. For us, a hundred years later, his advice becomes a rather chilling premonition.

Discussions of South African education have tended to focus on the plight of Black African students; that was – and still is – appropriate not only in terms of sheer population statistics, but more importantly because that segment of South Africans was, for such a very long time, in a state of educational crisis (Hartshorne, 1985, p. 150). Keeping that in mind, the study of Black African educational administration in South Africa must be undertaken with a view toward wider political and economic issues, as they impinged upon Black Africans within the social order (Davis, 1984b, p. 135). This requires not only an understanding of school policy and development in that specific time frame, but also a framework for the historical events that molded education through preceding phases of South African history. Education and educational policy after European settlement at the southern tip of the continent cannot be discussed without

a context for imperialism, colonialism, and the expansion of European power in South Africa, beginning nearly 350 years ago (Keto, 1990, p. 21).

For those reasons, this chapter first attempted to encapsulate South African education from its earliest formal implementations, through to the close of the apartheid regime in 1994. Of course, history does not consist, and has never consisted, solely of a recitation of facts about the past (Guelke, 2004, p. 208). Out of respect for that principle, this study summarized its historical overview with a comparison of theoretical interpretations. This was followed in turn by a discussion of critical pedagogy, centered on Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, and its manifestations within apartheid-era South African education. Afterward, the rationale and creation of the Apartheid Archive Project was discussed, as well as its structure and arrangement.

Key Sources

This historical review benefited greatly from the meticulous records of Dutch and British colonists and governments, and the enthusiasm of historians over the past 350 years to preserve authentic accounts. Leibbrandt's 1896 multivolume *Precis of the Archives of the Cape of Good Hope* was helpful, particularly for English translations of original, handwritten Dutch records. To a lesser degree, Theal's 1896 *Belangrijke Historische Dokumenten Verzameld in de Kaap Kolonie en Elders* provided assistance. Where possible, this review likewise drew from the Toward A New Age of Partnership (TANAP) online database of 25 million pages of Dutch East India Company documents (*An Ambitious World Heritage*, 2002, para. 6), specifically the *Resolutions of the Council of Policy of Cape of Good Hope*. For documents of the early English colonial experiences, Theal's 35-volume *Records of the Cape Colony* of 1898 was a frequent reference. Where first-hand accounts or biographies were available – such as Livingstone's *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa* from 1858, or Philip's 1828 account *Researches in South Africa: Il-*

Illustrating the Civil, Moral, and Religious Condition of the Native Tribes – they are cited as an observer’s viewpoint. South Africa’s bureaucratic obsession with commissions and investigations also worked in favor of this study, particularly the 1863 publication of the *Report of a Commission Appointed ... to Inquire into and Report upon the Government Educational System of the Colony*, and the testimonials of the 1908 *Report of the Select Committee on Native Education*. Both reports offered the full-length viewpoints of education experts and practitioners, as well as distilled snapshots of the challenges schools faced at that moment in time.

For narration of national events, often beyond the scope of education, this review relied on five published histories, four of which were recommended as the “best” of interpretive histories in Dubow’s (2014, p. vii) *Apartheid, 1948-1994*: the third edition of Thompson’s *A History of South Africa* from 2001; the 1994 edition of Worden’s *The Making of Modern South Africa*, which later appeared in a new version with a new subtitle to reflect post-apartheid content; the 2008 publication of Ross’ *A Concise History of South Africa*; and Beinart’s 1994 and 2001 editions of *Twentieth-century South Africa*. Where sections paralleled or overlapped in their descriptions, more than one source was cited.

The fifth interpretive history, Beck’s 2000 and 2014 editions of *The History of South Africa* became a common addition for two reasons: First, it occasionally supplied a retelling free of the allegiances that sometimes appear in domestic histories; and second, Beck was able to connect points of American and South African history that would be helpful to this study’s primary audience. For that same reason, Kaplan’s *Area Handbook for the Republic of South Africa* from 1971, a U.S. government publication, offered useful overviews into political and social events that might connect with international readers.

For material from the 17th and 18th century, E. A. Walker’s 1957 edition of *A History of*

Southern Africa offered some commentary, but occasionally became too complex, and in other places a bias can be sensed. Similarly, early historians such as Theal and Cory tended toward the sensationalist – Theal in particular wrote with a bias that does not require any special insight to detect – and for that reason were used primarily where their explanations provided a more immediate perspective than modern authors could offer.

Other omissions may be less obvious. Many histories of South Africa referred to the apartheid-era work of Martin Legassick; this review contains very little of Legassick’s material, primarily for the reasons that Moore (2016, pp. 53-54) mentioned: Legassick’s interpretations “do not concentrate on education specifically, but rather as an extra-economic coercion.” Similarly, parts of Seroto’s (2018) work were avoided because they seemed to ascribe general statements about the state of education to the curriculum of one particular missionary school (compare Molteno, 1983, p. 66, and Maree, 1984, p. 151, to Seroto, 2018, p. 10). Occasionally, the value in Leonie’s 1965 dissertation *The Development of Bantu Education in South Africa, 1652-1954* was in translations of out-of-print Afrikaans analyses of education; unfortunately, the work as a whole parroted support for Bantu Education, which usually detracted from its usefulness.

For better or for worse, much of the early flow of this review was based on the elements and events discussed in Malherbe’s (1925) *Education in South Africa: 1625-1922*. Malherbe (1925) contributed to a large part of the educational history in this study; indeed, that text played a large part in a long string of articles discussing education in South Africa. Malherbe is a pivotal figure in South African education discussions. In one sense, he was at a middle point in the evolution of South African education, and the events he discussed in 1925 formed the basis for the school systems that followed. Economist Francis Wilson (1999, p. 127) praised him and his role in the “Carnegie Investigation into Poverty,” and Malherbe also earned respect as “South Africa’s

historian of the emergence of state-controlled schooling” and as the “doyen of liberalism in South African education” with a commitment to “facts” and a portrayal of social scientists as policymakers (Chisholm, 2019, p. 19; Cross, 1986, p. 190; Fleisch, 1995a, p. 2).

However, liberalism on the whole suffered scathing criticism through the 1970s and 1980s, with the advent of Marxist investigations that accused liberal education theory of either moralistic self-righteousness or complicity in the ravages of apartheid (Dubow, 2001, p. 99). More specifically, scholars resented Malherbe’s (1925) unenthusiastic treatment of education for Africans of color (Cross, 1986, p. 190), and his training under turn-of-the-century professors and institutions whose methods and beliefs that have fallen out of favor since the early 1900s. Fleisch (1995a, p. 10) noted that Malherbe was an enthusiast of IQ testing and had studied with Edward Thorndike while at Columbia University. Although Thorndike was admittedly America’s foremost educational psychologist, his steadfast support of eugenics through to the 1940s (Thorndike, 1940, p. 957) is an uncomfortable association for readers of Malherbe (1925) in any post-World War II era. Knowing that Thorndike’s work was a “powerful intellectual influence” on Malherbe, as well as expectations that Malherbe was a “paternalist and an instinctive supporter of white supremacy” (Dubow, 2001, pp. 104, 121), underscored not only the omissions of Black African education from his 1925 book, but also its preoccupation with “South Africanism” to the inclusion of White Africans, but the exclusion of their Black African peers (Cross, 1986, p. 190).

There were several standouts among the scholarly works that dissect and describe South Africa’s educational history. Frank Molteno’s 1983 master’s thesis *The Schooling of Black South Africans and the 1980 Cape Town Students’ Boycott: A Sociological Interpretation*, and its abridged reprint as “The Historical Foundations of the Schooling of Black South Africans” in

Kallaway's (1984) *Apartheid and Education*, was a consistent reference in almost every post-1984 discussion of education in South Africa. Molteno's 400-page thesis included a forceful yet efficient examination of history and education in the southern African region, and how it led to the events of 1980. Similarly, Christie and Collins' (1982) article "Bantu Education: Apartheid Ideology and Labour Reproduction" reframing South African education along Marxist principles was not only a concise interpretation of education statistics, but set the tone for much of Kallaway's (1984) book. As the scope of this review moved into the apartheid era, Kallaway (1984) became a frequent reference, which accounts for the addition of Davis (1984a and 1984b) and Enslin (1984), as well as contemporaneous authors – perhaps most notably Collins (1983), Dube (1985), and Cross (1986). *Apartheid and Education* was not without its detractors (Cross, 1986, p. 196), but later scholars have credited it for refocusing capitalism at the center of the discussion of South African educational history (Fleisch, 1995, p. 8), and having a somewhat balanced representation of Marxist and liberal perspectives (Moore, 2016, p. 65).

Marxism reappeared in the theoretical portion of this review, which focused mainly on Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, first published in 1970 and reissued as a 30th-anniversary edition in 2000. Freire (2000) was particularly helpful in analyzing the actions of the apartheid government and its predecessors within a dichotomy of oppressor-versus-oppressed, and his focus on the educational aspect of that interaction made it ideal for this study.

As Freire's (2000) popularity coincided with the slow decay of the apartheid monolith, there was a large body of work that applied or employed *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and its sister publications to the South African context. As one late example, Naidoo (1990) invoked Freire in a discussion of student resistance movements through the 1980s, offering a critical pedagogist's perspective on the last few years of the apartheid era. Neville Alexander's speeches and

presentations were originally released in 1990, but were available in digital form as Alexander (2013); many of those passages dated to the late 1980s and extolled Freire from the vantage of apartheid's declining years. Where possible, this study attempted to include post-apartheid Freirean reflections rather than works published contemporaneous to the nationalist regime; Thomas (2009) and Nekhwevha (2002) both used Freire as a retrospective lens for their discussions, and for their outlook to the future. Thomas (2009) in particular made a case for the continued use of Freirean tactics as a counter to a sense of political hegemony that appeared in the decades after apartheid closed.

Discussions of the Apartheid Archives Project itself relied primarily on *Race, Memory, and the Apartheid Archive* published in 2013, which incorporated a number of articles and discussions of the archive contents. As an introduction and justification for the archive itself, Stevens, Duncan, and Sonn (2010), which appeared as the second chapter in the aforementioned book, established the logistical and rational background for the archive, as well as presenting possibilities for its past and future analyses.

The 17th Century, and Earlier

For many historians, education in South Africa began in 1658, six years after the establishment of a restocking station for Dutch East India Company (DEIC) ships at the Cape of Good Hope, under the command of Johan van Riebeeck (Leibbrandt, 1896, vol. 5, p. 18). Among the seven holdings of the DEIC worldwide, the Cape was the youngest, but also the least desirable (Walker, 1957, p. 29). The region had a poor reputation with the Portuguese, who preceded the Dutch in forays along the coast of southern Africa: There was no gold, the Indigenous residents had fearsome reputations, and traversing the waters where the south Atlantic met the Indian Ocean was troublesome (Walker, 1957, p. 29). In spite of that, the Cape was a midway point be-

tween the Netherlands and the company's far eastern holdings, as well as one of the few hospitable locations for a landfall (Walker, 1957, p. 29).

Ironically, it was a shipwreck that led to the first informal settlement in Table Bay, the site of present-day Cape Town. In 1647, the remaining crew of the *Haarlem* survived there by growing their own food, until a return fleet rescued them a year later (Walker, 1957, p. 30). van Riebeeck was a ship's surgeon in the returning vessels, and spent a considerable time ashore at the Cape (Walker, 1957, p. 30). That fact, along with his extensive experience with the company in the West Indies, China, and elsewhere (Leibbrandt, 1896, p. iii), won him the commission to build a provisioning depot at the site (Walker, 1957, p. 30). His instructions were to build a fort for 80 men, establish a garden to supply passing ships, maintain a reliable water supply, and begin relations with local populations in hopes of cattle trade (Walker, 1957, pp. 30-31).

As the commander of the settlement, van Riebeeck's instructions came from several directions. The government of the Netherlands at the time was a loose union of sovereign states, and the DEIC, now at the end of its golden era, had a similarly federated structure that had evolved as the trade empire grew (Walker, 1957, pp. 27-28). Company policy was established in Holland by the Council of Seventeen and its commissioners, but instructions could also be handed down by chambers within the DEIC hierarchy, where Amsterdam held the majority over smaller Dutch provinces (Walker, 1957, p. 31). van Riebeeck regularly submitted reports and journals to the company bureaucracy in the Netherlands, but also fell within the reach of the company's governor in India, and took instructions from another in Batavia, now modern-day Jakarta (Walker, 1957, pp. 31-32). It would be many years before the Cape settlement would warrant its own governor, and that, along with the delays in issuing and receiving instructions, meant the Cape's commander had considerable control (Walker, 1957, p. 32).

Company protocol allowed for a Council of Policy as a guiding assembly, which had legislative, executive, and to a small degree judicial powers, unless the commander overrode its advice (Walker, 1957, p. 32). In parallel, the DEIC arranged for the Classis of Amsterdam to provide ministers in company endeavors, as well as *sieckentroosters*, or “sick comforters,” as lay readers (Walker, 1957, pp. 32-33). While a *sieckentrooster* could minister to the sick, prepare youth for confirmation, or deliver prepared prayers and prepackaged sermons, he was not permitted to administer the sacrament or perform marriages or burials (Malherbe, 1925, pp. 46, 146; Walker, 1957, p. 33). A *sieckentrooster* could call a bann for a forthcoming marriage; after the third call, the marriage was formalized by the Council of Policy (Walker, 1957, p. 33). Under that provisional structure, the colony continued without a resident minister for the first 13 years, relying instead on a succession of *sieckentroosters*, and the services of passing ship chaplains (Walker, 1957, p. 33).

The DEIC was generally opposed to colonization: They considered themselves a profit-seeking, mercantile endeavor, and had by that point in history established an influential and far-reaching monopoly (Walker, 1957, p. 37). Colonists, or “free burghers,” were expensive and caused political and other complications, not the least of which was an expectation of an enslaved population to satisfy labor demands (Walker, 1957, p. 37). Cheap – or better yet free – workers elevated White burghers to an aristocracy (Collins, 1983, p. 362). van Riebeeck’s difficulties with the local Khoi groups slowed his work toward cattle trading, and his first impulse – to seize the herds of local Khoi and enslave their owners before shipping them to the Indies – ran contrary to his instructions (Walker, 1957, p. 36). Introducing private colonists would certainly only complicate the situation; all the same, a land grant in 1675 meant it was possible to live apart from service to the company (Malherbe, 1925, p. 40), and shortly thereafter, free burghers

and their enslaved workers were common (Walker, 1957, p. 37). Private citizens not only began their own negotiations for Khoi cattle, but began farming with an aim to sell their crops to the company (Walker, 1957, p. 37). However, without forced labor to reduce the costs of production, the free burghers complained that the prices set by the DEIC were impossible (Walker, 1957, p. 37).

To meet the demand, van Riebeeck imported enslaved Javan and Malagasy laborers, with the first arriving in 1657 (Walker, 1957, p. 39). That proved successful, and two more ships – the *Maria* and the *Hasselt* – were dispatched to other company holdings for more (Walker, 1957, p. 39). In the mean time, a third ship, the *Amersfoort*, arrived with Angolans recovered from a failing Portuguese slavers' ship in mid-ocean (Walker, 1957, pp. 39-40), even as the *Hasselt* returned with nearly an equal number (Walker, 1957, p. 40). Now flush with forced labor, the excess was sent onward to Batavia and the remainder was accepted into the colony (Walker, 1957, p. 40).

The 1658 School

These events set the stage for the opening attempt at European-style schooling in South Africa. Company policy required enslaved workers to be brought to Christianity, so on those orders van Riebeeck established a small school in April 1658, modeled after the education system of the Netherlands (Keto, 1990, p. 27) and intended for those adults to learn the Dutch language and elements of church services (Malherbe, 1925, p. 28). His journal entry explains the rationale for the school, and the selection of the teacher.

April 17th. – Fine weather. Arrangements made for establishing a school for the Company's slaves from Angola brought hither by the *Amersfoort*. The sick comforter, Pieter van der Staal, to be the teacher, especially as he reads Dutch correctly. (Leibbrandt, 1896,

vol. 6, p. 115)

van der Staal was perhaps uniquely qualified to be schoolmaster – not just because he “reads Dutch correctly,” as van Riebeeck wrote, but because his role as the *sieckentrooster* matched the purpose of the school: teaching the slaves, by rote, the prayers and hymns required for church services (Collins, 1983, p. 364).

That was not an easy task. van der Staal and the Angolans had no common ground for language, and it was unlikely they could understand one another at all (Malherbe, 1925, p. 28). The image of enslaved Africans struggling in a makeshift school to learn prayers by rote to a foreign god, as recited to them by a lay reader, was not improved by the remainder of van Riebeeck’s entry:

That [van der Staal] may encourage the slaves to attend and hear or learn the Christian prayers, it is ordered that everyone shall receive after school a glass of brandy and two inches of tobacco each. . . . Everything to be done in the presence of the Commander, who shall attend for a few days to put everything in proper order, and bring these people under proper discipline, signs of which are already apparent. (Leibbrandt, 1896, vol. 6, p. 115)

Knowing that the students were “encouraged” with alcohol and tobacco, and knowing that van Riebeeck’s intent was to establish discipline, diminishes the van der Staal school as the first in South Africa. The epilogue is no more flattering: The school closed before long, because the “pupils” repeatedly ran away, sometimes for days on end (Malherbe, 1925, pp. 30, 28; Walker, 1957, p. 40). van der Staal himself was likewise unlucky; he died within a year or two of the school’s inception (McIntyre, 1949, p. 8).

The short-lived first school earned other criticism in the centuries that followed. First, van Riebeeck’s instructions leave no doubt that while the stated purpose for the school was reli-

gious, the real goal was disciplining the Angolans to fill their role as forced labor – a goal that failed so spectacularly that the colony avoided enslaved West Africans for decades into the future (Walker, 1957, p. 40). Education, religious or otherwise, was a side effect: “It is safe to assume that the colonists’ real concern was that the slaves serve the purpose for which they had been brought, namely to labour for their masters” (Molteno, 1983, p. 22). To that end, a religious education also served to subvert any previous sense of cultural identity, thereby driving the laborers “physically and psychologically into their masters’ worlds” (Molteno, 1983, p. 23). By sending them to school, van Riebeeck and the colonists expected indoctrinated Africans would be more obedient servants, more efficient workers, and more pliant laborers (Molteno, 1983, p. 23).

It is also possible to draw a straight line from the evangelical imperative of the era to the profits of the DEIC (Walker, 1957, p. 30). The original documents written by the survivors of the *Haarlem* appealed to the Chamber of Amsterdam to establish the Cape restocking station on the grounds that “we shall be able in time to employ some of [the Khoi and San] children as boys and servants, and to educate them in the Christian religion” (Jansen & Proots, 1650, as cited in Babb, 1984, p. 35). The Indigenous peoples, Babb (1984, p. 35) explained, “would be taught to work for the Company. . . . They would be converted, and God in His gratitude would heap profits on the Company.” This convenient merger of religion and capitalism reflected an underlying belief that European culture and civilization were superior, perhaps best epitomized in the fact that no Europeans would deign to learn the Khoi or San languages (Babb, 1984, pp. 35, 38).

It is also debatable that the school offered much academic content. Christie (1985, p. 33) doubted many enslaved Africans, or for that matter, Khoi or San residents, attended the school during its short run, and those who did would not have received much in the way of education. “They learned mainly about religion, and some basic reading, writing, and arithmetic” (Christie,

1985, p. 33). In that sense, the education that was offered was designed only to satisfy the needs of the society of the time (Christie, 1985, p. 33) – drawing us back to the idea of disciplining forced laborers in order to produce more obedient servants. The first formal attempt at education in South Africa did not hope to adapt to the preexisting Indigenous forms, but instead sought to eclipse them (Molteno, 1983, p. 26).

Traditional Education

To be clear, the ill-fated school of 1658 was not the first education on the subcontinent. Many authors acknowledged that date for the first formalized Western school, but discussed the presence of education in southern Africa long before 1652, as components of the culture and customs of precolonial ethnic groups (Christie, 1985, p. 30; Keto, 1990, pp. 19-20; Mahlangu, 1992, pp. 23-24). But implicit in that acknowledgment was a crucial distinction between school and education: “There were no formal schools,” Christie (1985, p. 30) explained, “but that doesn’t mean there was no education taking place.”

Elders taught children the expectations of society and the traditions of their culture, as well as songs, poems, and stories (Christie, 1985, p. 30). Jansen (1990, p. 1) used these same ideas to define a historical period of “traditional African education” – directed by community elders, communicated through an oral tradition, based on cultural transmission, and closely integrated with life experiences. As an example of that, du Toit cited the 1777 text *Nieuwe Algemene Beschryving van de Kaap de Goede Hoop* for the role of Khoi mothers in educating their children:

Once the child was capable of any meditation, he received education “in all the customs, duties, and traditions adopted by the nation. It is the Women, on whom this care is based, that everything that belongs to the education belongs to her, until the sons are grown up

and the daughters are of marriageable age.” (du Toit, 1936, p. 185)

Du Toit interpreted this to mean that education, as it derived from the tribe itself, to be the responsibility of the mother, during the child’s first years (1936, p. 185).

Similarly, Schapera (1938, pp. 176-185) discussed how gender roles determined education for girls and boys among the Tswana, a Bantu culture traditionally hailing from the areas of modern-day Botswana and northwestern South Africa. As boys matured, they moved from the lessons of household tasks taught by their mothers, to building, hunting, and agriculture, taught by their fathers (Schapera, 1938, pp. 176-185). Girls, on the other hand, learned food preparation, domestic chores, and some animal husbandry (Schapera, 1938, p. 176). Regardless of gender, parents were responsible for teaching children how to behave in family and social relationships (Schapera, 1938, p. 176). This description might not have fit the formal definition of a “school” for some researchers, but it did establish the presence of education long before the arrival of the European settlers. For that reason, it would be inaccurate to suggest that education did not exist prior to van der Staal’s brief lessons of 1658, even if the introduction of a formalized school could be proven an innovation.

This split between “school” and “education” exposes another cultural contradiction: On the one hand, Indigenous cultures generally incorporated education as part of their social and family structures, relying on parents to prepare their children for adulthood, but likely omitting the concept of a formalized school. At the same time, the colonists who sent slaves to school to memorize prayers in Dutch, perhaps catching some basic academics as well, trusted in the formal institution of a school, even if it offered little real education. It is probably no surprise that these contrary understandings of “school” and “education” would find little compromise in the centuries to come.

Early Educational Policies

The act of sending a forced laborer to school to memorize prayers does not suggest colonists were eager to educate local populations – in fact, it was quite the opposite (Collins, 1983, p. 364). van Riebeeck's original record made clear the goal to establish discipline (Leibbrandt, 1896, vol. 5, p. 115), but for the colonists, an educated worker posed another problem: Future generations might make demands beyond their place in society (Collins, 1983, p. 364).

There were other interpretations of the progress of education in the early days of the Cape. For those authors, these attempts were the groundwork for universal education, which was a feature of the Reformation, and was integrated into the charter documents of the DEIC (Coetzee, 1958, pp. 381-382, as cited in Leonie, 1965, pp. 44-45). For the 140 colonists at the cape in 1658, the imperative to educate their own children, as well as the children of the local communities, had its roots in the Synod of Dort, established only a few decades later, in 1618:

Schools must be instituted in country places, towns and cities. Religious instruction must be given. The Christian Magistracy should see to it that well-qualified persons taught with suitable compensation. The children of the poor should be instructed free. In all schools only orthodox Christians might teach. To secure these ends suitable means of church inspection of schools was devised. (Malherbe, 1925, p. 22)

What is more, the synod's authority resurfaces in other DEIC regulations for the colony, including a requirement to teach in the mother tongue (Coetzee, 1958, pp. 381-382, as cited in Leonie, 1965, pp. 44-45). For Leonie, where the early settlers educated their hosts, the primary motivation was DEIC policy (1965, p. 45). Insofar as the company and the church imperatives required it, the colonists supported schooling – even across racial boundaries (Leonie, 1965, p. 45).

As a possible example of that, the commander of the newly founded station and his first

sieckentrooster made attempts to teach some local residents to read and write (Leonie, 1965, p. 46). Unfortunately the newcomers eventually decided their students were unteachable, owing to their “undisciplined lives” (Leonie, 1965, p. 46). However, this episode stretched the imagination, mostly because van Riebeeck repeatedly belittled the Khoi and San in his letters and journals, infamously describing them as “dull, stupid, lazy, and stinking” (Leibbrandt, 1896, vol. 5, p. 176; MacCrone, 1957, p. 48). Derogations found their way into company reports as well, where the local Africans were “black stinking dogs” (*Resolutions of the Council of Policy of Cape of Good Hope*, 9 May 1662, para. 11). Despite the incongruity, Leonie (1965, p. 46) pointed to those unfruitful lessons as one of many attempts at education in the early settlement.

Malherbe (1925, pp. 40-44) disagreed. The authorities of the day recorded very little on the topic of education, he said (Malherbe, 1925, p. 40), and considering they kept meticulous notes of every aspect of their daily lives, it was hard to believe that a serious and genuine effort at universal education would go unmentioned for long. But the stronger reason for a lack of news on education went back to the original motives of the DEIC: The company never intended for the South African stopover to evolve into a colony (Malherbe, 1925, p. 40). The only purpose was to “establish and maintain at a minimum cost a distant water and cattle station whose existence had no other purpose than to facilitate ocean traffic” (Cory, 1913, vol. 1, p. 8). With the DEIC focused on trade, little progress had been made for the education of the Cape Colony’s residents (Seroto, 1999, p. 20).

Furthermore, by the 1600s, the DEIC itself was nearing bankruptcy and eroding under political decay (Malherbe, 1925, p. 38). In that slow decline, company heads in Holland likely thought only of the settlement as a business endeavor, and their concern for the living situation of the colonists – a living situation that would have included education – was superficial at best

(Malherbe, 1925, p. 44). Married to that was the overarching conviction that education fell within the realm of religion, and therefore was the domain of the Classis of Amsterdam (Theal, 1909, vol. 2, p. 150). More than likely, if the operations of the company – and therefore the operations of the colony – did not depend on it, education policy was unlikely to ever be a priority for the DEIC (Molteno, 1983, p. 25). “The Government saw fit to superintend,” explained Malherbe (1925, p. 44), “but not to support.”

There were rebuttals to these points. du Toit recognized that the state of education in the colony, even as late as 1676, was “neglected” (1936, p. 28), and Leonie admitted that in spite of the edict to educate and Christianize, when dedicated schools were available, few students enrolled (1965, p. 47). But du Toit felt this was not to the satisfaction of company managers in Amsterdam (1936, p. 28). As proof, a letter from company Commissioner Nicholaes Verburgh to the cape governor dated March 15 that same year complained that “here to date no permanent Schools have been held, to teach the children to learn, write, and arouse in them Christian virtues” (du Toit, 1936, p. 28). With a head count of 65 children in the settlement in 1672, it was clear that “there was no shortage of children in this ‘emerging Colonie’ and that good schools were therefore all the more necessary” (du Toit, 1936, p. 28). To that end, a new schoolmaster was appointed – Jan Wittebol, a man of “sound compartment” (du Toit, 1936, p. 28) and previously a surveyor in the colony (Leibbrandt, 1896, vol. 15, pp. 35, 37) – and the cape government began a search for a “stone house” to serve as a permanent school, while allowing Wittebol to charge wealthier parents for his services (du Toit, 1936, p. 28). du Toit might have been correct: By 1679, reports described “the state of the youth as ‘well much advanced,’” with 32 Dutch, 11 mixed-race, and five enslaved children enrolled (du Toit, 1936, pp. 28-29).

Retrospective debates over the importance of education at the onset of the colony may be

empty arguments, but it was possible for both camps to be right. It was likely true that the DEIC did not value education in their business success, preferred to leave the issue to the classis, and as a result, schooling did not rank high on the list of priorities for Amsterdam, or for that matter, the Cape Colony. In the same moment though, the colonists were known to be under a constant stream of strict rules and reminders, issued from the Council of Policy locally, from the DEIC beadledoms in India and Batavia, from chambers in Holland, and from the corresponding church authorities – possibly preventing them from making much progress on any single enterprise at a time. Company observers commented on the swirling bureaucracy that drove the lives of settlers.

Commissioner Verburg, reporting upon the state of the settlement in 1672, said: “The Dutch colonists at the Cape of Good Hope bear the name of free men, but they are so trammelled and confined in all things, that the absence of any freedom is but too manifest. The orders and proclamations, from time to time issued, are so rigid that it would be impossible to carry out the penalties therein, except with the utter ruin of the burghers.”

(Cory, 1913, vol. 1, p. 8)

Possibly, from our vantage point, the “trammelled and confined” daily life of the free burghers appears to us, centuries later, as a lack of interest in education.

The 1663 School, and Segregation

In 1663, a second school opened at the colony – this time for children, and because “colour prejudice seems to have been non-existent in those days” (Malherbe, 1925, p. 28), the doors were open to any race (Leonie, 1965, p. 45). School records report 12 White children, one local child, and four enslaved children in attendance (Fouche, 1910, as cited in Malherbe, 1925, p. 28). As with the earlier school, teaching was the responsibility of the colony’s *sieckentrooster*, then Ernestus Back, who succeeded the late van der Staal (Malherbe, 1925, p. 30).

Back and Engelgraaf. Back's performance was at first admirable – records of the day credit him for “great diligence in teaching both Dutch and black children to read and learn their catechism” (Leibbrandt, 1896, vol. 14, p. 83) – and presumably for that reason, he was permitted to charge parents a fee for his services. However, his tenure was short-lived; he was, by most descriptions, an irredeemable alcoholic with the unfortunate habit of arriving drunk at services (Malherbe, 1925, p. 30; McIntyre, 1949, pp. 7-8). When repeated warnings failed, the colony took the appearance of a comet in December 1664 – the same comet that presaged the Great Plague of London (McIntyre, 1949, p. 9) – as a sign of heavenly displeasure, and deported Back and his family to Europe (Malherbe, 1925, p. 30; McIntyre, 1949, pp. 7-8). Other authors described a less favorable fate for the backsliding *sieckentrooster*: By some accounts, Back died soon after his expulsion (Nachtigal, 1893, p. 52).

His replacement was a young Dutchman who had arrived the same year as a “soldier” – a civil service rank that does not correspond to any specific profession, military or otherwise (Leibbrandt, 1896, vol. 16, pp. iii-iv; Malherbe, 1925, p. 37) – but only taught for a year, maybe less:

Death in hospital of Daniel Engelgraaf, of Amsterdam, who had arrived in 1663 as soldier in the *Marsseveen*. During life he had been a quiet and useful young man, and for that reason we had afterwards employed him as schoolmaster for the Cape white and black children. (Leibbrandt, 1896, vol. 14, p. 189)

Engelgraaf's performance in his short tenure was no more clear than his qualifications: Aside from a eulogy depicting him as a “quiet and fit young man” (du Toit, 1936, p. 27), the only evidence of his success was an increase in the school census (du Toit, 1936, p. 27; Nachtigal, 1893, pp. 52-53). It is suggested that he was lenient in disciplining the children, which was possibly a

good thing, given that people at the time “ruled everywhere too much with the stick” (Nachtigal, 1893, pp. 52-53). In any case, he did not hold the position of *sieckentrooster*, and for du Toit, that earned him the title of the first “real” schoolteacher in the subcontinent (1936, p. 27).

First Efforts at Segregation. Despite Engelgraaf’s death, a new integrated school was underway. But in those early years a curious shift and reversal appeared in records of the colony’s education system. In 1666, local church authorities asked the colony administration to require all enslaved children to attend school – a positive development to be sure – but five years later, only a dozen students were attending (Leonie, 1965, p. 47). Then in late 1676, the religious representation appeared to reverse itself, asking the colony to separate the schoolchildren according to color. The request was still more mystifying because even at this late date, the colony still appeared to be color-blind where education was concerned: “It is worthy of remark that at this time the feeling of alienation between Europeans and the coloured races, which in the next century was very strong indeed, seems scarcely to have existed” (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. vi).

The colony administrators recorded their agreement, with the caveat that Black African children be permitted to continue at the present school, until a new facility and instructor could be found (Leonie, 1965, p. 47).

And whereas their reverences have been pleased to observe that it is very necessary that a school should be established, as has been already done in India, for the black as well as the Dutch children, to lead them up in time to a well-mannered discipline and human knowledge, – we are likewise quite of one mind with them and have thanked them for their good zeal, and have resolved at the earliest to seek after a fit person and opportunity, but in the meantime to allow some of the perfectly black children to go to the Dutch

school, besides employing a competent person to instruct the aforesaid slaves in the prayers for morning and evening. (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. 505)

This entry, and the situation around it, generated conflicting interpretations. The most logical reason to ask for a segregated school was a burgeoning number of students (du Toit, 1936, p. 45), but again, the census in prior years does not support that. Leonie framed the church's suggestion as a matter of efficiency: "It would be more expedient if a separate and special school were established for the slave children in the slave quarter" (1965, p. 47).

du Toit interpreted the request differently, and explained that "a movement arose" that led the church to reverse itself (1936, p. 45). du Toit also suggested there were questions of behavior and influence where enslaved company laborers and the children of settlers were taught (du Toit, 1936, p. 46), and other authors neatly summarized the attitudes around the issue.

The slaves of the Company lived under social conditions which gave rise to much immorality, and it was therefore repugnant to the burghers to send their household slaves to schools where they would rub shoulders with the Company slaves. Accordingly, they were admitted to the schools for European children. (Cook, 1949, p. 349)

If indeed this was the case, then it followed that the original context was to separate the settlers' children from enslaved workers, but also implied that the request underscored a social division between master and slave (Molteno, 1983, p. 23).

The best context for the church's reversal, and the move to separate the students, comes through a description of the politics of the day. In those years, DEIC holdings worldwide were embroiled over the baptism of the children of non-believing enslaved workers (Theal, 1909, vol. 2, p. 151). Until the 1660s, it had been customary for ship chaplains to baptize enslaved children when asked, regardless of their race or background (Theal, 1909, vol. 2, p. 150). The service was

accompanied by a reminder to the parent or owner to educate the child in Christian principles (Theal, 1909, vol. 2, p. 150). But the custom was borne more out of conviction than of dogma, as was evident in the voices of critics, who complained that the practice had no basis in scripture (Theal, 1909, vol. 2, pp. 150-151).

Complications arose because both company policy and church law emancipated any enslaved worker of mixed ancestry who converted to Christianity, and granted eligibility for freedom for any enslaved Black African who converted (Babb, 1984, p. 45). As might be expected, in a fledgling colony where the income of the settlers relied upon enslaved laborers, the issue was sufficiently divisive for the administrators to appeal for advice from company authorities overseas (Theal, 1909, vol. 2, pp. 151-152).

In 1664 the reply arrived, with instructions that the children of non-believing enslaved workers at the Cape would be baptized, “provided that those with whom they lived bound themselves to have such children educated in the Christian religion” (Theal, 1909, vol. 2, p. 151). The rationale, the company explained, was in the precedent established by Abraham, whose faith required that all males in his household should be circumcised (Theal, 1909, vol. 2, p. 151). Other company holdings had established schools to educate the children of enslaved workers, and the Cape authorities were instructed to do the same (Theal, 1909, vol. 2, p. 151). In other words, under company law and with a grounding in the Old Testament, the owner of an enslaved worker who had been baptized was required to provide an education – which had both financial and social ramifications.

What followed was an uneasy stance, with Cape officials publicly supporting policy for baptizing and schooling the children of enslaved workers, but appearing reluctant to release the workers who qualified (Babb, 1984, p. 46). On the other hand, the masters were not keen to pay

the price of education, nor to lose labor to time spent in school (Moore, 2016, p. 20), and so owners “kept their slaves away from the school and from instruction” (Babb, 1984, p. 46). Owners even went so far as to argue that enslaved children should not be baptized at birth, even if the church and the company required it (Babb, 1984, p. 46). And of course, avoiding baptism absolved the owner of the cost of sending the child to school, and the obligation to release them one day (Babb, 1984, p. 46).

This provides the proper backdrop to the 1666 request to send all children to school, the disproportionately small school census of 1671, and the request for a school just for enslaved residents in 1676 – as well as the Cape administration’s halfhearted adoption of the idea. Declaring such an establishment would not only satisfy Amsterdam, but by promising to first “seek after a fit person and opportunity” (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. 505), the uncomfortable issue was effectively kept at arm’s length.

This was not the only instance where the colony government feigned authority over education; in 1682, the Council of Policy required everyone under the age of 12 to attend school, and for older children to receive instruction twice a week (Molteno, 1983, p. 25). This too appears to have been ignored, especially in the case of enslaved girls, and Molteno (1983, p. 25) reported no attempts to enforce the rule. The most likely reason, as in previous years, was that owners were hesitant to surrender the child’s labor, but Molteno (1983, p. 25) repeated that education encouraged forced laborers to think beyond their station. The frontiers of the restocking station were not without violent skirmishes, and those incidents, along with the aforementioned debate over emancipation, were blamed on attempts to westernize the enslaved population (Low, 1958, p. 22). As a result, the “civilizing efforts of the Company soon dwindled” and within the next few decades, the “conscious effort to Christianise [slaves] died away” (Walker, 1957, pp.

70, 84).

The 1685 School

Both Babb (1984, p. 46) and Leonie (1965, p. 47) noted that only a dozen enslaved children were in school in 1671, a year before a census put the number of people in the colony at 221 (Malherbe, 1925, p. 41). And yet, in spite of the 1676 decision, it would take another decade and the physical intercession of a DEIC commissioner at the Cape before an actual school for enslaved children would open.

In more ways than one, the 1685 school marked a new direction for education in southernmost Africa. With a dedicated facility, only free students attended the original 1663 school – a delineation that smacks of segregation, and is not infrequently called thus. The label is not accidental, nor convenient, nor malicious: The published instructions for the school demarcate students by skin color – in particular, “no white children shall be received in the [slave] schools” (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. 506).

While this division set a precedent for South African education in the future, it was not a hard and fast rule: Even late into the 18th century, integrated schools were not unheard of. In his memoir, Borchers (1861, p. 18) described his experiences as a child in a Dutch school in Stellenbosch, circa 1790: “In front, stood the large writing-table and benches, generally occupied by about forty or fifty of the rising generation, of all colours, some paying, others admitted gratis, – the latter chiefly from the poor maintained by the church funds.” From this we can assume that, where allowed, schools were open to children of many racial backgrounds, even a century after the first separation of students.

Administrative Policies. The 1685 school registered 60 students under the age of 12, divided into separate classes for boys and for girls (Leonie, 1965, p. 48; Molteno, 1983, pp. 23-24).

Perhaps to avoid the flaws seen in previous schoolmasters, and perhaps to protect the school from withering from neglect, company officials recorded specific rules for the schoolmaster to follow.

He shall undertake to be in the school precisely at eight o'clock in the morning and at four o'clock in the afternoon. ... He shall hear their lessons twice ... teach them good Christian morals and manners; allow no evil or filthy speaking ... cause them to answer the questions of the Heidelberg Catechism ... teach the most of them to sing psalms, to write, cause them to say the usual prayers daily. (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. 505)

Likewise, the instructions for children appear to connect with the experiences of earlier cohorts.

Their parents shall by no means keep them from school. ... [students] shall show [illegible in original] and all lower officers due reverence in the streets or elsewhere. That they shall not neglect their lessons without sufficient reason, but be punished. ... That on Sundays they shall appear twice at church. (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. 506)

The instructions also establish a basic form of monitoring and evaluation, calling for a clergyman to “twice a week visit the schools and enquire what progress they are making” (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. 506). With specific instructions for teachers and students (and obliquely, parents), and with a primitive form of accountability, the 1685 school is a clear forerunner to an institution of public education (Leonie, 1965, p. 49; Malherbe, 1925, p. 35).

Curriculum. The record also gives a snapshot of the curriculum of the day, and paints a picture of how education would evolve in coming decades. Religion, as it aligned with the precepts of the Dutch Reformed Church, was at the core of the experience (Collins, 1983, p. 365), with an uncomfortable nod toward van Riebeeck’s original goal: “In the coloured school the es-

sential truths of Christianity according to the tenets of the Dutch Reformed Church were taught, and submission to authority and respect to superiors strongly inculcated” (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. vi). Regardless, academics were an afterthought; “book learning was necessary only in so far as it enabled them to read their Bibles” (Cook, 1949, p. 349). All the same, some of the stronger students likely made progress on the “three R’s” (Collins, 1983, p. 365).

While it might appear suspect, the omission of academic content for enslaved children was neither racist nor elitist – it merely emulated what was available to their White peers (Collins, 1983, p. 365). Schools had a religious purpose, and students of any color were expected to attend for a year, mostly as a prerequisite for admission to the church (Collins, 1983, p. 365). This meant education for White colonists was likewise rudimentary, with no implication of superiority (Collins, 1983, p. 365).

At the same time though, schools redrew the cultural and social viewpoints of their students, regardless of color. Within the context of religion and Christianity, schools necessarily introduced components of European culture (Molteno, 1983, p. 26). This is not to suggest students were brainwashed into accepting a European social order, only that knowledge came prepackaged in “Western values and assumptions” (Collins, 1983, p. 366). Religious schooling – in Africa and beyond – necessarily “taught elements of the same culture to which the trader, the magistrate, and the farmer belonged” (Cook, 1949, p. 348). For the settlers, this did not interfere with the evangelical underpinnings for education, namely the belief that Christian, or Western, schooling would “free Africans from ‘barbarism,’” and integrate them with the civilized world (Murphy, 1973, pp. 59-60). Religious and faith-based instruction believed the Indigenous cultures of Africa to be deficient and sought to correct them, and in the process became the founda-

tions for racism that Dube (1985, pp. 88-89) categorized.

The 18th Century

Malherbe (1925, p. 30) encapsulated much of the earliest history of South Africa by saying education made very little headway in the 17th century, and “what was achieved was due to the zeal of the church.” That zeal, Malherbe (1925, p. 45) asserted, was much of the reason that early South Africans did not grow up altogether devoid of education. This was very likely true. However, in the years between 1679 and 1687, the population of the colony doubled, then doubled again in short order, reaching more than 1,200 people by the opening of the 18th century (Malherbe, 1925, p. 41). In spite of that growth, advances in education made through the last half of the 17th century sputtered at the opening of the 18th: Even Malherbe (1925, p. 35) noted that education “seems to be very little in evidence in the dispatches of the Council of Policy” during the first part of the new century.

The greatest impediment to progress in education was – as the DEIC feared (Walker, 1957, p. 37) – politics, which by the 1700s had thoroughly ensnarled the colony administration (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. vi). The DEIC itself was in its declining years, nearly bankrupt (Malherbe, 1925, p. 38), and suffering from a moral tone that was “thoroughly rotten” (Walker, 1957, p. 61). Politics in Europe complicated life in the faraway holding (Malherbe, 1925, p. 38), while droughts and plagues of locusts at the end of the 17th century tormented the colony locally (Walker, 1957, p. 61). To make matters worse, the Cape administration, already mired in “selfishness and self-interest” among the “official clique and their favorites” (du Toit, 1936, p. 31), found itself under the hand of Governor Willem Adriaan van der Stel, an autocrat who repeatedly attempted to make his fortune by monopolizing colony property and industries, and selling at profit to the DEIC (Walker, 1957, pp. 61-65). A paper currency was

introduced, which depressed the market at Cape Town (Malherbe, 1925, p. 38). Smallpox appeared in the subcontinent in 1717, then again in 1755 and 1765 (Malherbe, 1925, p. 35). Smuggling, tax evasions, and the lack of a strong central authority all added to the general swirl at the opening of the 18th century, and predictably, education – particularly efforts to educate Indigenous students (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. vii) – suffered as well (Malherbe, 1925, p. 38).

Scholarchs

Despite this grim picture, education administration began to appear in earnest in the early 1700s. Where previous efforts came at the direct interventions of company officials, the common consciousness of the state of education in the colony – or the lack thereof – precipitated calls for proper leadership. Much of the effort to establish proper oversight for education in the 18th century began with the interventions of the Rev. Engelbertus Franciscus le Boucq (du Toit, 1936, pp. 31, 84). Le Boucq was a Frenchman educated as a Roman Catholic and had been a monk in Belgium, but afterward converted to Protestantism (Theal, 1909, vol. 2, p. 395). Historical records describe him as exceptionally intelligent, but also an inveterate mixer: “He could converse in many languages, and was unquestionably a man of high ability and learning, but he was of irascible disposition and wherever he went was engaged in strife” (Theal, 1909, vol. 2, p. 395).

Le Boucq arrived in South Africa in March 1707, and almost immediately set to work (Theal, 1909, vol. 2, pp. 395, 415-417). Within months, he had not only relayed his concerns over the state of education in the Cape to the Classis of Amsterdam, but in June of the same year, confronted the local Council of Policy with a petition, asking that the “deplorable state of education” at the Cape and on its outskirts “may be redressed and suppressed” (Leibbrandt, 1896, vol. 1, p. 124).

Le Boucq did not seem to trust the local council to handle the issue alone, and given the political atmosphere of the day, he could probably be forgiven. After listing the deficiencies he saw, he asked that “the proper Church Orders, both of India and of the fatherland ... tried by the Council of Seventeen, may be introduced here, and strictly adhered to” (du Toit, 1936, p. 84). Invoking the authority of Amsterdam, and Cape oversight in India, was not an uncommon occurrence (du Toit, 1936, p. 84), and likely lent some weight to his demands.

Le Boucq wanted a governing body that would ensure a uniform education policy, and also to establish an individual “school overseer,” who would share supervision of education facilities with a minister (du Toit, 1936, p. 84). He asked that the council “appoint a *Schoolarg* in addition to the pastor – not to bear the name, but to bear after the schools ... so much as it is feasible, to be ruled and directed evenly” (du Toit, 1936, p. 84).

The council sparred with le Boucq repeatedly in the years to come (Theal, 1909, vol. 2, pp. 415-417), but on this one point, they apparently took his advice. Seven years later, a newly minted governor ratified an order that carried his name – the School Order of Chavonnes of 1714 – establishing scholarchs as an element of school administration (Malherbe, 1925, p. 38). Within the new office was the second-in-command to the governor, a religious representative, and the “military captain for the supervision of education” (Malherbe, 1925, pp. 37-38). It had the authority of the governor and the Council of Policy, but was considered an ecclesiastical committee, as two out of its three members were part of the Cape Town religious court (Malherbe, 1925, p. 37). As the colony evolved so did the scholarchs; by 1795 it was referred to as the College of Directors of Public Schools, and included a commissioner of police, three clergymen, and two elders of the Dutch Reformed Church (Malherbe, 1925, p. 38). At that late date, it held responsibility over public schools, and could conduct inspections with an aim toward correcting “the defects

now subsisting in the means of Education” (Theal, 1898, vol. 1, p. 248).

School Order of Chavonnes. For Malherbe, the scholarchs were the first “ad-hoc school boards” (1925, p. 37), and while new to the African subcontinent, they were not innovative. Similar structures existed in Holland as early as 1654, also called “scholarchs,” which performed school oversight and included members of “the magistracy and of the consistory” (Malherbe, 1925, p. 38). Company holdings in Ceylon, Batavia, and Formosa also had “scholarchs,” with localized customs regarding their inspections (Malherbe, 1925, p. 38).

The introduction of scholarchs was not the only result of the School Order of Chavonnes; the proclamation also established the first public school in Cape Town, and created the School Ordinance, which became the Colonial Education Law for most of the century (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. vii). Malherbe (1925, pp. 35-36) downplayed the importance of the ordinance, describing it as “merely a codification of the current educational practices,” to include religious teaching, children’s behavior in and out of school, separation of the sexes in school and church, the number of holidays, and school fees.

The real goal of the 1714 order, and related orders in 1743 and 1769, was to tighten the position of schoolmaster to “such men as were competent, Godfearing, and willing to be subject to certain regulations in the conduct of school work” (Malherbe, 1925, pp. 37-38). Through the 18th century, shortages of teachers were addressed through the discharge of “soldiers” and “sailors” from the DEIC – which again, were civil service and not military titles – with the company’s permission to work as “teachers on loan” (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. vii). Those “soldiers” and “sailors” likely pursued another trade while in the company employ; Malherbe (1925, p. 37) provided a long list of possible occupations for “schoolmasters,” not the least of which were tax collector, glazier, or coffinmaker. Their skills beyond teaching led some

farmers or landowners to abuse the system, and recruit skilled craftsmen from the DEIC ranks – in effect hiring “tailors, shoemakers, and other tradesmen under the name of schoolmasters” (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. vii). By 1743 it became the responsibility of church officials to interview a “sailor” or “soldier” seeking discharge from the DEIC to become a schoolmaster, ostensibly to determine “his character, religious opinions, and competency – ‘lest a door be opened to drag in erroneous doctrines’” (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. vii).

Malherbe (1925, p. 35) related stories of teachers who did “drag in erroneous doctrines,” including a schoolmaster in 1769 who reportedly did not believe in the flood of the Old Testament, or the miracles of Moses. The misbehaving schoolteacher even declared David a thief, Moses a murderer, and other “Godless utterances” (Malherbe, 1925, p. 35). Interventions by a clergyman did not satisfy, so church authorities suspended the teacher, and the governor subsequently deported the “God-dishonouring creature” from the colony (Malherbe, 1925, p. 35). This process of suspension followed by banishment fell directly within the duties of the colony’s ecclesiastical court, and was exercised more than once (Malherbe, 1925, p. 35).

Century-long Stagnation. In a company fraught with corruption (Walker, 1957, p. 37) and a colony struggling with malfeasance (du Toit, 1936, p. 31), adding another layer of bureaucracy may not have been the wisest idea. History validated that opinion: While scholarchs were regularly in office, the state of education at the end of the century was no better than at the start (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. ix). Schools existed, but as mentioned earlier, teachers were underqualified, and in some cases, even “deplorable” (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. ix). By 1791, the issue of school quality had come full circle, and the incumbent scholarchs pleaded,

No one can doubt the necessity of improvement in our schools who has observed the deep ignorance and deficient civilization of a great part of our population. ... Our schools are in so bad a state that our youth can scarcely be grounded in spelling, reading, writing, and the elements of arithmetic. (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. ix)

Teacher quality was to blame, the scholars concluded: Too many schoolmasters had been hired despite their lack of preparation for the task, and of those, some were “scarcely able to write, unable to spell correctly, with but little knowledge of elementary arithmetic” (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. ix). As the century drew to a close, the scholars concocted a plan to remedy the situation (Malherbe, 1925, p. 38).

Malherbe (1925, pp. 38-39) was critical of the scholars as well: They had been inefficient throughout the century, he said, and their 1791 plan for improving schools was chiefly completed after probing from the Chamber of Seventeen into the dire state of education in the colony. At the same time, the jurisdiction of the scholars ended at the limits of Cape Town, with no governance into the vast continent beyond. If schools in the town were in a “deplorable” state in 1791, it was to be expected that country schools fared even worse (Malherbe, 1925, p. 39). Unfortunately, efforts to correct the situation, at least within Cape Town, never reached fruition, owing once again to politics and events in far-off Europe (Malherbe, 1925, p. 39).

The School Order of Chavonnes of 1714 and the establishment of the scholars was a noteworthy advance in the administration of education in the 18th century, but it is important to remember that this 100-year span did not offer more in the way of academics. Through to the end of the 1700s, schools were still the province of religion, and still primarily a mechanism for admission to the church. The intercessions of Le Boucq, the structure of the scholars, the rigor in screening candidates for schoolmasters, and the role of the ecclesiastical court are proof enough

that while the institution of education was evolving, it was still regarded as the spiritual sphere. At the same time, the scholars' criticisms at the close of the century suggest they were aware that there was more to schooling than memorizing prayers and hymns.

Missionary Education Begins

With education firmly housed within the spiritual domain, it is probably no surprise that the 18th century also sees the first attempts at missionary education, which some scholars felt represented a step forward in the education of Indigenous South Africans. Leonie (1965, p. 51) credited missionaries for the first efforts to meet the educational needs of Bantu populations, so those cultures "could have any appreciation for the Bible and Christianity." This was their stated intent, but missionary education had a much more considerable influence over South African education, in the decades and centuries to come.

The first Protestant mission in South Africa was an outreach of the Moravian Society, established by Georg Schmidt in 1737 in modern-day Genadendal, roughly 100 kilometers east of Cape Town (Leonie, 1965, pp. 51-52; *Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. vi). Schmidt's mandate was to evangelize, and bring people into church membership (Collins, 1983, p. 366). The mission taught Khoi students religion and agriculture, but also the Dutch language, because "their language was too difficult for me [Schmidt] to acquire" (du Toit, 1936, p. 185; Leonie, 1965, p. 53). Boys and girls were taught in separate classes, but both learned handicrafts, with boys receiving additional training in a trade (Molteno, 1983, p. 26).

Over time, the school numbered 50 people (Hamilton, 1901, p. 16), but when Schmidt began baptizing converts, he ran afoul of local residents and, more importantly, the clergy in Cape Town (Hamilton, 1901, p. 16). Although he had the permission of the Council of Seventeen (Hamilton, 1901, p. 15), local Dutch Reformed Church pastors found fault with the conditions of

his ordination, which were through a written certificate rather than an imposition of hands (Hutton, 1909, p. 244). There was also a question of whether he was allowed to teach, considering that the Classis of Amsterdam specified “that no one to the ministry of schools, but one who is a member of the Reformed church, will be used” (du Toit, 1936, p. 186). In 1743 Schmidt was recalled to Holland while his commission was reviewed, and a year later, Moravian officials failed to secure permission for him to return to Genadendal (Hamilton, 1909, p. 16). In his place, the Cape Town clergy requested that “two, or at least one” *sieckentrooster* or schoolmaster, “comfortable and pure in our teaching, may be appointed” (du Toit, 1936, p. 186).

As an epilogue, the Council of Seventeen and the Classis of Amsterdam jointly decided Schmidt had overstepped his bounds when he baptized Khoi converts, but advised the colony to find its own replacements (du Toit, 1936, pp. 186-187). For the next 50 years, there were no other missionary efforts within the reach of Cape Town’s clergy (Hutton, 1909, p. 245; *Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. vii). When the Moravians restarted their mission in 1792, religious and classroom education for the Khoi were within their mandate (Leonie, 1965, p. 53), but once again they ran into opposition from local residents and authorities. This time critics simmered into mild approval though, when they discovered that the Khoi who had trained at the mission were better employees than others (Collins, 1983, p. 366).

More will be said about missionary education in later sections, when the influx of evangelical groups reaches its peak. At this point in history, it is important to note that, whether in the 18th century or later, missionaries were part of colonizing forces (Collins, 1983, p. 366). The evangelical emissaries were at the vanguard of White populations expanding into new territories, annexing the grazing lands of the original Khoi and San peoples (Collins, 1983, p. 366), and later, the Bantu-speaking kingdoms. With no access to range land, the traditional residents re-

sorted to agricultural work on White farms, forming small villages and farm units where they provided unskilled labor (Collins, 1983, p. 366). This becomes the single greatest criticism of missionary education, and explains its modern reputation as a tool for making Indigenous Africans better servants, rather than education “for education’s sake” (Dube, 1985, p. 90).

The Moravians – and others who came after them – persuaded the Khoi and other nomadic groups to abandon their culture and time-honored means of survival (Collins, 1983, p. 366). In doing so, the goal of religious conversion undermined the traditional Khoi identity and lifestyle, teaching them instead to build permanent homes, adopt regular labor as a habit of discipline, and farm crops (Collins, 1983, p. 366) – dangerously close to the same objectives for educating forced laborers in the earliest days of the colony (Molteno, 1983, p. 22). Missionaries encouraged the transition from independent, self-sufficient nomad to “docile and effective” unskilled worker (Collins, 1983, p. 366). And once local populations were accustomed to labor and permanent residences, they likewise acquired a sense of loyalty to the colony, and adopted artificial wants – thereby moving one step closer to a permanent source of cheap labor (Babb, 1984, p. 51).

For the Cape residents and their presiding authorities, missionaries provided the artificial concepts of obedience, discipline, and servitude sought in a labor force (Collins, 1983, p. 366). Even better, missionaries were an inexpensive solution to African subjugation, and would teach as much of Christianity as would limit attacks on colony members (Babb, 1984, p. 51). Missionaries were aware of this, and accepted the role so long as it meshed with their own evangelical goals, and the goals of their supervising agency (Babb, 1984, p. 51).

It is not far-fetched to suggest westernization, colonization, and subjugation were at the forefront of the missionary agenda; in later decades, many missions were quite forthcoming in

expressing their eagerness to erase traditional African ways of life. Suffice to say that the efforts of missionaries satisfied colonists, in that they produced “docile and effective workers” (Collins, 1983, p. 366), and for that reason, White settlers were reportedly grateful. And so long as the colonial residents reported satisfaction, the early South African state was willing to support missionaries and their schools (Collins, 1983, p. 366) – or, as Georg Schmidt learned, to withdraw that support.

The Pioneers

Before the close of the 1700s, one more distinct population had begun to separate from its Dutch beginnings in the Cape. Every colonial government until the 19th century had the official aim of keeping the races apart, and in particular, insulating White settlers from Indigenous populations (Houghton, 1976, p. 19). DEIC governors prohibited their colonists from settling far afield, and in 1774 one governor even threatened capital punishment for trading with Indigenous Africans (Houghton, 1976, p. 19).

The Roving White Population. In spite of that, land leases were easy to acquire in the 18th century, and the interior regions – particularly after recurring droughts – were suitable only for large-range cattle grazing (Macmillan, 1963, p. 22). Those conditions and the desire for trade (Houghton, 1976, p. 19) encouraged cattle farmers – commonly known as the Dutch loanword *boer* – to work grazing lands east, then north, away from the whitewashed houses of Cape Town and its faulty bureaucracy (Macmillan, 1963, p. 22). There was almost no reason to establish a permanent family farm: Leases were charged at a flat rate, and at the death of the lease owner, the agreement closed and any improvements were auctioned to the benefit of heirs (Macmillan, 1963, pp. 21-22). Fencing and building materials were scarce, and therefore would have required pricey imported materials, and their transport (Macmillan, 1963, p. 22). Farther ranges were still

open to expansion, meaning there was little need to manage feed or hay (Macmillan, 1963, p. 22). Subdividing a grazing farm removed its inherent value, and because the DEIC manipulated market prices, cultivation was pointless (Macmillan, 1963, p. 22). “It was almost normal to move even further on,” and take on a new farm at the same terms (Macmillan, 1963, p. 22). So long as there was space, entire families shifted eastward and north, with more favorable areas developing into settlements – and either displacing the Khoi and San residents, or absorbing them into servitude (Macmillan, 1963, p. 22).

By 1778, “the roving white population” had become a fixture at the fringes of the colony’s purview (Cory, 1913, vol. 1, p. 30). Geographic separation from the Cape freed the boers from the entanglements of politics and bureaucracy, but also strained their contact with Dutch culture and organized religion (Walker, 1957, p. 99). Cattle became a form of currency (Walker, 1957, p. 98). Families returned to Cape Town or other large settlements only for a special occasion, such as a communion or baptism, sometimes bringing children in groups to be christened at once (Walker, 1957, p. 99). Farms only 60 miles from Cape Town were “already much ruder” than in more settled areas (Walker, 1957, p. 98), and visitors from the city complained that these outriders lacked the “cohesion and cleanliness” of the original Dutch (Walker, 1957, p. 99).

Cape Town’s bureaucracy blamed the outward expansion for violence with established Black African populations at the edges of its sphere (Macmillan, 1963, p. 29). That advance was not without resistance though, and in 1779, a hundred years of open warfare began between boers and established Black African populations, ending only when the Indigenous populations relocated, or acquiesced to dominion (Kaplan, 1971, p. 42). Over the next century, and with changes announced in Cape Town, the contentious expansion of White farmers evolved into a tri-

partite antipathy between the pioneers, the Indigenous nations, and the authorities on the southwestern coast (Kaplan, 1971, p. 42).

As the leading edge of the boer subculture moved northward and eastward, its connections with religion drew taut, and without a formal system to support it, education was likewise stretched thin. Literacy plummeted, and in some cases was limited to Old Testament readings (Walker, 1957, p. 99). Some of the farmers could write, or make a signature, but for the majority, “literature and the affairs of the great world” beyond their farm were unknown (Walker, 1957, p. 99). Later testimonials estimated that the children of middle-class boers had a mere six months of schooling (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. 150), and it would be many years before the collective consciousness of this new demographic recognized a need for improved education (Malherbe, 1925, p. 45).

The 19th Century

Education in South Africa in the 19th century is rooted in the complexities of that era, beginning with events in Europe in the late 1700s. The Napoleonic wars in Europe reverberated through each nation’s colonies. When the French invaded Holland, the British moved to occupy Cape Town in 1795, in fulfillment of an under-the-table treaty between singular representatives of the two nations. Both had pledged to aid one another in wartime without waiting for orders from respective homelands, and with promises to hand territories back when peace returned (Babb, 1984, p. 61; Kaplan, 1971, p. 123; Walker, 1957, p. 120). Ground forces were not party to those agreements and doubted the “aid” offered by British warships appearing in Table Bay, and so the transition generated some violence. But in September 1795, partisan efforts dissipated and the British accepted a formal surrender (Walker, 1957, p. 122). A series of occupations would follow, beginning and ending under a British flag, but with a brief interlude starting in 1802, for

a Batavian authority (Walker, 1957, p. 124).

Batavia's Liberal Experiment

This middle period was of particular interest to Malherbe (1925, p. 49), who saw a remarkable dexterity with educational leadership in Jacob Abraham de Mist, Batavia's commissioner general for the Cape. By his account, de Mist was "one of the ablest administrators and educational reformers who ever set foot in South Africa" (Malherbe, 1925, p. 49). Walker described de Mist's brief presence in South Africa in similarly glowing terms: "The period of direct rule by the Batavian Republic is one of the most tantalising in South African history" (1957, p. 133). Other authors ranked him among the "soundest educationalists of either the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries" (de Montmorency, 1902, p. 149), but by and large, most seemed enthusiastic about what might have been, and not so much by what came to be.

Education Reform. de Mist was a lifelong Dutch bureaucrat in company positions in Holland and Batavia; scholars credited him with a personal philosophy similar to Rousseau, but at the same time holding a philanthropic streak, in the strictest definition of the word (Gie, 1920, p. v). Like many others of his era, de Mist had watched from a distance as Europe shuddered at the French Revolution, and his writings reflect not only a European perspective on France's descent into the Reign of Terror, but also the prevailing disappointment in revolutionary state theories that granted unchecked individual civil liberties (Gie, 1920, p. v; van der Walt, 1992, p. 78). By the 19th century continental Europe had seen the advent of rationalism, and many of de Mist's reforms resembled those principles (Malherbe, 1925, p. 52; van der Walt, 1992, p. 79). At the same time, political philosophy had returned to the belief in the need for strong government, and scholars detected that, plus a sense of constitutional rationalism, in de Mist's writings (Gie, 1920, p. v). The commissioner general wanted to "reform everything at the Cape with 'a whole

new Chartre” (Gie, 1920, p. v). Old historical institutions were to be abolished, even to the point of redistricting urban areas with more logical numbering systems rather than haphazard names (Gie, 1920, p. v). But de Mist also felt the colonists had the right to govern themselves and create laws for their own benefit (Malherbe, 1925, p. 52), and ultimately believed that society is “first made happy by good and fair laws and institutions” (Gie, 1920, p. v; Malherbe, 1925, p. 52).

de Mist arrived in December 1802 and shortly set about recasting the remnants of the Cape administration, recently returned by the British and dangling free from the corrupt trappings of the now-defunct DEIC (Malherbe, 1925, p. 49; Walker, 1957, pp. 132, 135). He immediately redrew the cape’s local government and judicial systems, and a new governor was appointed at a more modest salary than seen in company days (Walker, 1957, pp. 134-136). The commissioner general acquainted himself with the territory and its schools, which confirmed his impressions that the education system lacked even the “regularity and consistency” expected for “maintenance and utility” (Malherbe, 1925, p. 50). School instruction had been too long a victim of “chances and changes, contradictory action and inconsistent arrangement” with no provisions for funding (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. xii).

de Mist’s subsequent rearrangement of the South African school system reflected his personal philosophy, but also mimicked school reforms in his home nation (Malherbe, 1925, p. 52-53; Theal, 1908, vol. 1, p. 121). His School Ordinance of 1804, published serially in 1805 after his departure for Holland (Malherbe, 1925, p. 49), was built in two chapters: The first established the structure of a new education system, and the second explained how it would be funded (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. xii).

The scholars were the first to succumb to the “whole new Chartre” (Gie, 1920, p. v). The work of those ineffectual functionaries was absorbed into a central education authority, this

time including the governor as chairman, plus a representative from the Council of Policy, the orphan's administration, three clergymen (including one Lutheran representative), a treasurer, and a municipality official (Malherbe, 1925, p. 50; *Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. xii).

This new central education authority also expected input from ministers and officials from country districts, who were honorary members and could attend and contribute at education meetings, when it was in the interest of their constituencies (Malherbe, 1925, p. 51).

Next, the ordinance established new standards for schoolmasters, and started the clock on a five-year grace period before uncertified teachers were removed (Malherbe, 1925, pp. 49-50). To fill demand, a new teacher training school was to be built in Cape Town staffed with instructors imported from Holland (Malherbe, 1925, p. 49), and with a curriculum that required mastery of Dutch and five other languages, plus arithmetic, geography, and mathematics before graduation (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. xiii). Grants and scholarships were created to encourage students to become educators (Malherbe, 1925, p. 50), and African students of color were given preference in entry to the school (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. 12).

Model boys' and girls' schools were planned for Cape Town (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. xiii), and it was in this moment that secondary education for both genders also made its first appearance in South Africa (Malherbe, 1925, p. 50). At the model school, boys were to pursue "the Dutch language, arithmetic, modern languages, book-keeping, mathematics, and history," with possible additions of music, fencing, dancing, and riding (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. xiii). Girls were to study "good moral principles" as well as "handiwork and housekeeping," and above all "to discontinue the needless and uncivilizing custom of attendance by female slaves, to accustom them to help and dress themselves, to take care of their own clothes, to provide for their own necessities" (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. xiii).

Other topics for girls included reading and writing in Dutch, “the first elements” of mathematics, “the most usual living languages,” elements of Christianity, and music and dancing (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. xiii). The ordinance recommended schools elsewhere in the nation follow suit, adding that separate schools for boys and girls be built apart where possible (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. xiv).

de Mist’s ordinance anchored these improvements to official functions within society, by preventing colonists born after the first day of the new century from holding office if they could not speak, read, and write Dutch (Malherbe, 1925, p. 50). Even more strict, no man could hold a government post above a certain salary, unless he had attended schools with certified teachers (Malherbe, 1925, p. 51; *Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. xiv).

These massive reorganizations would require considerable financial resources, and the second chapter of the ordinance addressed that. de Mist allowed a carryover of funds left from the DEIC scholars, plus new taxes on “amusements, vehicles, inheritances” and so forth (Malherbe, 1925, p. 51). Landowners around Cape Town were now subject to a “School Contribution” set by the Council of Policy and levied annually against a house or farm (Malherbe, 1925, p. 51). Parents paid into a school fund as well, and had the added responsibility of providing clothing and necessities to students (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. 12). Orphans were admitted to the school at a reduced rate or for free, as the school fund allowed (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. 12).

Non-religious Education. There was no doubt, either now or in his day, that de Mist’s sweeping revisions were attempts to pry education away from its religious roots, and make it a national concern:

The public schools for the education of the youth do not belong to any particular religious

denomination. . . . They are nurseries to form good citizens for the State, and, as such, are under the immediate superintendence and direction of the Government. (de Mist, 1804, as cited in Malherbe, 1925, p. 52).

This quote and the particulars of the ordinance embodied the educational zeitgeist of the day; Malherbe (1925, p. 52) noted similar philosophies in Thomas Jefferson's publications in America within the same period. In that sense, de Mist's system was secular: It would have moved school management away from the clergy and into the hands of the government (Malherbe, 1925, p. 52). This was no doubt "horrifying" to residents whose concept of education was locked within the domain of church and religion, and who had seen rampant abuse by the colony government under the DEIC (Walker, 1957, pp. 137, 37).

Had it reached full term, the ordinance would have meant education was no longer a gatekeeper for admission to a church service: Instead, it was a means toward national efficiency, establishing a common identity, and reducing religious and other divisive influences (Malherbe, 1925, p. 52). The center of control for education would have occurred at the national level, embracing a civil rationale for schooling rather than a spiritual one (Malherbe, 1925, p. 52). Of course, the body of the 1804 ordinance did not swerve from its religious foundations; the curriculum for both girls and boys explicitly included a religious subtext, but "according to the guidance of the Church to which their parents belong or have belonged" (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, pp. xiii, 15).

This is likely where de Mist's proclamation met its greatest opponents (Malherbe, 1925, p. 51). de Mist's restructuring of South African life did not stop at the schoolhouse door, and farming communities in the interior were fixed upon the theological underpinnings of education (Jansen, 1990, p. 3). School reforms were not the only avenue where the influence of the church

would have faded, either: The commissioner general allowed wider religious permissions, which threatened the DRC's "high pre-eminence" among church-goers (Walker, 1957, pp. 136-137) – something they were loath to surrender. de Mist and his new governor promised "equal protection of the law ... to all communities worshipping a Supreme Being for the promotion of virtue and good morals," and allowed Roman Catholic priests to conduct Mass in the defensive castle in Cape Town (Walker, 1957, p. 137). There was also debate on the replacement of enslaved workers with paid laborers, and whether South Africa could make the jump to a freed labor economy (Walker, 1957, pp. 136, 146-147).

But there de Mist's reforms began to abrade. Manumission rankled a society dependent on enslaved workers, and the government's encroachment on the religious domain earned him critics in several quarters (Walker, 1957, p. 137). Those topics alone might have scuttled de Mist's efforts to modernize the colony, but there is no epilogue to the commissioner general's 18-month foray into the subcontinent: Less than three years after granting the Cape to the Batavian Republic, the Napoleonic Wars in Europe altered the political landscape yet again (Beck, 2014, p. 55; Walker, 1957, pp. 139-140), and the British returned to the colony in March 1806 – this time to stay.

British Administrative Policy

An understanding of education through the remainder of the century requires a historical context for three major population groups residing in South Africa at the time – the newest British colonialists, the established Dutch contingent, and the Indigenous kingdoms beyond the colonial borders. The 1806 arrival of the British closed the book on Dutch governance, and began a new segment in South African history (Jansen, 1990, p. 3; Kaplan, 1971, p. 42). At the outset, the British did not intend to hold the colony permanently (Beck, 2014, p. 55), but nonethe-

less, their return was met with lukewarm support. On the one hand, the urban Dutch of Cape Town generally accepted British authority because, as with the Batavian interlude, the British administration was more attentive to the needs of the colonists than the DEIC had been (Beinart, 1994, p. 37; Kaplan, 1971, p. 123; Murphy, 1973, p. 42). The British wisely kept much of the bureaucratic structure in the Cape during the transition (Walker, 1957, p. 141), but this alone was no guarantee of a smooth turnover. For one, the return of the British meant a further Anglican presence in the colony, and while the DRC had been tolerant in previous years, the de Mist reforms had alerted them to threats to their dominance (Walker, 1957, p. 137). The British enacted laws allowing religious freedom, which likely reduced the potential for conflict, but larger differences between Afrikaner and British cultures still existed (Kaplan, 1971, p. 123).

English and Afrikaner. It would be tempting to assume that the British and the existing settler populations would seamlessly converge into a new South African identity – after all, they shared a European heritage, followed similar traditions, and their creeds differed only in “varying degrees of strictness and intolerance” (Malherbe, 1925, p. 59). But this was not the case. Seven generations of White settlers had made their home at the cape, and a sense of national identity had evolved from that experience (Malherbe, 1925, p. 56). European politics completely ignored this newfound identity when it swept the entire colony, part and parcel, into the British empire (Malherbe, 1925, p. 56). Perhaps understandably, many South Africans resented the change (Malherbe, 1925, p. 56).

Along with that arbitrary reassignment came new settlers. Unlike previous European immigrants to the cape, British arrivals saw themselves as more cultured and more civilized than their new neighbors – regardless of color – and did not assimilate into the community (Beck, 2014, p. 60). True, British and Afrikaners did intermingle, but the two societies were not always

accepting, and neither group fully embraced the other's language or culture (Kaplan, 1971, p. 123). Immigration and settlement patterns reinforced this at intervals: In 1820, nearly 5,000 British settlers arrived in the Cape Colony with promises of land grants (Walker, 1957, p. 156), but few of those were farmers – most were urban laborers, artisans, professionals, or doctors (Beck, 2014, p. 60; Kaplan, 1971, p. 123). Those who attempted a life beyond the cities turned back after repeated crop failures and floods, and sought better fortune in established urban areas (Beck, 2014, p. 60; Kaplan, 1971, p. 123; Walker, 1957, pp. 156-157). That, plus ongoing immigration, created a stronger British influence at municipal points than some established residents might have liked. The net effect was that among White settlers, groups tended to congregate in areas that reinforced and maintained their own customs (Kaplan, 1971, p. 123) – a tendency that persisted for centuries, evident whenever White parents sent their children to schools taught only in one language or the other (Dube, 1985, p. 87).

England's flat affect toward its new territory did not help the sense of division. To the 1806 administration, the Cape Colony was overstretched, underfunded, badly supplied, and racially divided, with a European contingent outnumbered by its enslaved population, by its Coloured population, and by the countless Black Africans beyond its formalized borders (Walker, 1957, p. 165). Where British settlers were successful in their lives at the frontier, they pinched the market for land, and worse, the colony was obliged to provide a military presence (Beck, 2014, p. 60). If the settlement did enthuse the new Cape regime or its London parent, neither displayed it: Even upstanding Britons of the day chastised the straitlaced empire as "mild, clean, honest, tactless, and inconsistent" (Doyle, 1902, p. 11).

As the 19th century unfolded, the "tactless and inconsistent" side of the government worsened. In 1801 under the first British occupation, the landless, nomadic lifestyle of the Khoi

was equated with a criminal tendency (Theal, 1898, vol. 4, pp. 90-91); the new government doubled down in 1809, demanding the Khoi keep passes showing a permanent address at a mission or with a White employer – effectively locking them into lives of labor (Beck, 2014, p. 55). In the coming centuries, this concept of pass laws for ethnic populations would resurface.

Anglicizations. Five years later, the Cape Town regime ran afoul of its boer constituencies with revisions to the judiciary. Shocked at events in France and dismayed at the loss of the American colony, the governorship at the Cape was redrawn as an autocracy, answering only to London (Malherbe, 1925, p. 57; Walker, 1957, pp. 141, 163-164). The Cape high court was emptied and restocked with civil servants who could be dismissed by the governor (Malherbe, 1925, p. 57; Walker, 1957, p. 163), and a colony-wide circuit court system began that would permit testimony – and complaints – from Black Africans and slaves (Beck, 2014, p. 55; Walker, 1957, pp. 163-164). Placing Indigenous Africans on an equal footing with White settlers drew ire. In 1815 a White farmer refused to answer charges of abuse of Khoi workers, and an attempted arrest by a detachment of Khoi soldiers ended in gunfire, killing the farmer (Beck, 2014, p. 56; Walker, 1957, pp. 153-154). A small rebellion fomented but was rapidly quashed, and the key dissenters publicly hanged (Beck, 2014, p. 56; Leibbrandt, 1902, p. 19; Theal, 1898, vol. 11, pp. 2-3). Dispatches from England praised the colonial authorities for prompt and decisive action (Theal, 1898, vol. 11, pp. 71-72), but the sight of British officers executing White farmers for insurrection “undoubtedly shocked the frontier opinion” (Walker, 1957, p. 154).

The autocracy seeped into local government as well. In 1827, centuries-old fixtures of local revenue and civil redress were scrapped completely, sending both taxes and complaints to public authorities beyond the community (Malherbe, 1925, p. 58; Walker, 1957, pp. 163, 198). While the colony’s laws did not change, local courts and revenues adopted British colonial pro-

cesses, which again were under the governor's thumb (Malherbe, 1925, p. 58; Walker, 1957, pp. 141, 163, 198). This centralized power structure could not, or perhaps would not, deal promptly or efficiently with local emergencies (Beck, 2014, p. 75; Malherbe, 1925, p. 59), and only provided "greater efficiency at the price of almost all popular share in the work of the government" (Walker, 1957, p. 165). Established Cape residents – particularly the outlying farmers – saw these changes as an interference in their lifestyle, if not a direct encroachment on their civil liberties (Malherbe, 1925, p. 56; Murphy, 1973, p. 42; Walker, 1957, p. 198). With no democratic participation in government processes, and with no sense of public representation before the governor's authority, the colony power structure quickly resembled despotism (Malherbe, 1925, p. 57).

The British also revoked the land lease system that had for so many years supported the shift of boer farms – by now part of their culture and lifestyle. In previous decades, land could be acquired through the government and grazed, then released upon meeting the terms of the agreement (Macmillan, 1963, p. 22). But that system only worked so long as open land was available. At the start of the 19th century, frontiers against Black African populations had reduced the directions available for farmers to relocate (Beck, 2014, p. 57). At the same time, agricultural land around Cape Town was beginning to lose its advantage over other nearby agrarian zones (Beinart, 1994, p. 37), necessitating more efficient agricultural methods for fertile areas. In 1813, leasing was scrapped, and a new system sold the land to the farmer at prices dependent on its surveyed value (Beck, 2014, p. 57; Macmillan, 1963, p. 44). This encouraged better farming methods, permanent improvements, and inheritance of the property (Beck, 2014, p. 57). But it was unpopular with the transient cattle farmers because of higher and unpredictable pricing, and for those reasons, some simply refused to participate (Beck, 2014, p. 57; Walker, 1957, p. 198). By the early 1830s, the system changed again, and land was only granted freely to Khoi or to

British settlers, and remainders were sold at auction (Walker, 1957, p. 180). For the boers, the changes meant their children would have to pay for what they saw as their birthright as Afrikaners (Walker, 1957, p. 180).

The list of boer grievances against the new Cape Town government grew quickly (Murphy, 1973, p. 42). Changes to the local government, or the judiciary, or to land management might have been tolerated singly; in concert, they were “galling” (Babb, 1984, p. 119). But the cruelest stroke was the forced adoption of the English language across the colony (Kaplan, 1971, p. 233; Malherbe, 1925, pp. 57-58). Admittedly, English-speaking areas were increasing which in retrospect makes the mandate “quite understandable” (Coetzee, 1968, p. 17), and scholars have noted that English is a language that “quickly spreads” (Malherbe, 1925, p. 59). But even with the inclusion of the 1820 settlers, only one in eight colony inhabitants spoke English (Malherbe, 1925, p. 57), which confirms the switch was not for convenience.

Rather, successive Cape governors saw anglicization of the colonists – to include the nationwide adoption of English – as part of their duties (Beck, 2014, p. 57; Malherbe, 1925, p. 57). Colonial Britain was adept at cultural imperialism, and the officers of the day knew education was key to that effort. Correspondence in the early part of the 19th century encouraged governors to “import teachers and the next generation will be Englishmen” (Collin, 1809, as cited in Malherbe, 1925, p. 57), that “all schools in the colony ought to be conducted by English masters” (Goulbourn, 1821, as cited in Malherbe, 1925, p. 57), and to “introduce British laws on a British system of judicature” so as to “encourage the introduction of British industry and British capital so to attract Britishers to settle at the Cape” (Hay, 1827, as cited in Malherbe, 1925, p. 57) – the last suggestion taking shape in the aforementioned judicial and local government reforms. At the start of 1825, all official documents were required to be in English, and at the start of 1828, all

court proceedings were to be in the same (Malherbe, 1925, pp. 57-58). Starting with the first British occupation, Afrikaners could hold public office so long as they declared loyalty to the empire, and perhaps for that reason, many South Africans became anglicized, and their children learned English (Beck, 2014, p. 57). But in 1814, English proficiency became mandatory for a civil servant position (Beck, 2014, p. 57; Malherbe, 1925, p. 57). To the exclusion of all others, English was to be the language of society, the press, schools, and government (Malherbe, 1925, p. 59; Walker, 1957, p. 163).

Afrikaner Resistance. The efforts to force English onto South Africa were the final straw. Malherbe (1925, p. 59) doubted the frontiersmen found fault with the language itself – in fact, the ability to speak English was a “mark of culture and education” for the livestock farmers (Malherbe, 1925, p. 59). However, the Cape Town government clearly intended their language to supplant the boer mother tongue. For example, the colony authority would, either deliberately or through ineptitude, issue written proclamations to boer representatives, knowing full well that the pioneers did not have a command of English (Macmillan, 1963, p. 95). “Hostility was at once aroused” by slights such as this (Malherbe, 1925, p. 59), contributing to the farmers’ ongoing sense of resentment and contempt toward the British government (Macmillan, 1963, p. 95; Murphy, 1973, p. 42). For its part, London seemed unwilling to act harshly toward the frontiersmen, even if the empire found it “absurd” that a colony of only 30,000 people “should be permitted to perpetuate ideas and customs” that were patently un-British (Theal, 1901, p. 110).

Cape Town could demand English of the government, courts, public schools, and perhaps even social situations. But its effort to redirect the entire body of Europeans in the country toward the imperial language backfired (Malherbe, 1925, p. 58). Parents who might have otherwise encouraged their children to learn English as a “mark of culture and education” (Malherbe, 1925,

p. 59) instead outright refused, and with the exception of largely English metropolitan areas, school attendance fell in the years when the medium of instruction switched to English (Malherbe, 1925, p. 58). In 1828 in government schools at Cape Town, 675 pupils were enrolled, but in the first years after the change, attendance dropped below 300; in 1839 attendance was only 84 students (Malherbe, 1925, p. 58).

For Malherbe (1925, p. 60), these arbitrary attempts to anglicize the colonists sowed the seed of resentment among future South Africans toward government interference. This was particularly true in education, where centralization was usually viewed “as a deprivation of some or real or imagined right, and as an infringement of liberty” (Malherbe, 1925, p. 60). The push to force English onto the colony was, for Malherbe, a primary factor in the events of the 1830s (1925, p. 59), but two more historical events still remained, before the stage was set.

Emancipation and Rights. The British parliament abolished the slave trade in 1808 (Beck, 2014, p. 55), meaning even as the British assumed control, the colony’s source of forced labor was in jeopardy (Walker, 1957, p. 199). de Mist had backed down from the possibility of a freed labor economy only a few years earlier (Walker, 1957, pp. 136, 146-147), but abolitionism had taken hold in earnest in British politics (Beck, 2014, p. 62), and London legislated the change at the imperial level, leaving no option for discussion. When the Rev. John Philip of the London Missionary Society, working in South Africa, traveled to England to lobby for rights for the Khoi on par with White settlers, the Cape governorship sought to outmaneuver him in 1828 with Ordinance 50, which gave equal rights to all British subjects in South Africa without regard for their skin color (Beck, 2014, p. 62; Christie, 1985, p. 35). The pass system installed in previous decades was no longer valid, the Khoi could own land and seek labor anywhere, and demand proper payment for their effort (Beck, 2014, p. 62). It was conceivable that Ordinance 50 was an

attempt to mollify abolitionist segments within South African society, but it had an unforeseen complication: Only six years later, British parliament passed the Emancipation Act, freeing all enslaved citizens throughout the empire (Beck, 2014, p. 62; Christie, 1985, p. 35; Dube, 1985, p. 51). Now every resident of the Cape Colony could claim equal rights – including emancipated workers (Christie, 1985, p. 35). The centuries-old social system established at the original Dutch arrival was fully upended.

In a short decade or two, this social and economic revolution took White settlers from an unassailable position of legal and financial superiority to paying full wages to workers of color who held equal status and could air a grievance in a court of law. Established Dutch gentry in the west of the colony weathered the shock of this cultural and economic liberalism, partly through legal channels, and partly through the “tot system” that paid a portion of wages in cheap wine rather than currency (Beinart, 1994, p. 37). Modern authors connected the practice to alcoholism and indebtedness (Beinart, 1994, p. 37), and even authorities of the day felt “much evil is occasioned” by the system (Theal, 1898, vol. 7, p. 111).

But for rural farmers at the extreme of Cape influence, equality for Coloured or Black Africans was a threat to the fabric of their lives (Murphy, 1973, p. 42). Through the previous hundred years, most White Africans were unswerving in their belief that their culture was superior, and Africans of any color were preordained to serve in subordinate roles (Kaplan, 1971, p. 41). In that sense, Ordinance 50 pleased neither British nor Afrikaner, who would have preferred laws that forced Indigenous Africans to labor at trivial wages (Dube, 1985, p. 91). But the one-two punch of equal rights plus emancipation “shocked the Boer’s pride of race” (Walker, 1957, p. 199), even as it undercut their economic foundations (Malherbe, 1925, p. 59). Least attractive was the prospect of losing a racially designated labor force, which conjured the specter of Whites

working for Whites (Beck, 2014, p. 75).

White Emigration

Critics looked back on English and Afrikaner interactions of the 19th century wistfully, admitting that the British administration “might have done very well had it been content to leave things as it found them” (Doyle, 1902, p. 11). The two cultures might have fused, if the British government had proven more dexterous, and less driven, in its efforts to assume colony leadership (Malherbe, 1925, p. 60). Instead, it sought to “change the habits of the most conservative of Teutonic races” (Doyle, 1902, p. 11), and “the old colonists were dismayed at seeing their ancient institutions thus rudely broken up” (Malherbe, 1925, p. 58).

The influx of British settlers was without a visible end, and they did not assimilate so much as isolate (Beck, 2014, p. 60). With that, the Dutch language and its fledgling derivative Afrikaans were either ignored, suppressed, or legislated against, as part of an overt effort to anglicize the colony (Malherbe, 1925, p. 59; Walker, 1957, p. 163). There was no sense of democratic representation while local authority and revenue were rerouted to a central government (Malherbe, 1925, p. 58; Walker, 1957, pp. 163, 198). Courts and the judiciary were at the command of a governor who answered only to London (Malherbe, 1925, p. 57; Walker, 1957, pp. 141, 163-164). Land leases were erased, and ownership was more expensive, with preferential allotment to British and Khoi residents (Walker, 1957, p. 180). But worst of all, the farmers on the fringes of the colony feared the equality afforded to residents of color, and what it would mean for their traditional sense of racial superiority (Kaplan, 1971, p. 41; Murphy, 1973, p. 42).

That fear was the prime motivation for the Great Trek, a large-scale, decades-long migration of Afrikaner farmers to the north and east, across the established borders of the colony into land that appeared largely uninhabited and suitable for settlement (Mahlangu, 1992, p. 21; Mal-

herbe, 1925, p. 59; Walker, 1957, p. 200). Thousands of ethnic Dutch colonists sought a new home in the interior to the north, beyond the reach of the British (Malherbe, 1925, p. 59). For some scholars, the trek was “one of the great events, if not the greatest, of South African history,” a “tremendous exodus of population seeking to build up for itself a form of society after its own desire” (Malherbe, 1925, p. 59). But others were less fawning, citing Ordinance 50 and the loss of dominion over Khoi workers as the real reason for the coordinated emigration (Beck, 2014, p. 74), despite what apologists and testimonials of the day might have implied (Walker, 1957, p. 199).

Depending on the source, as many as 15,000 Afrikaner men, women, and children left the colony in the 1830s and 1840s (Beck, 2014, p. 57), but other records suggested the emigrants represented “only a minority” of the Afrikaner population, primarily hailing from northern and eastern frontier districts at their start (Beinart, 1994, p. 37). At this point in Afrikaner history, the word “boer” became something of a misnomer, owing to the fact that the outward migration no longer relied on farming for an economic basis (Beinart, 1994, p. 45). Instead, hunting, pastoralism, and the spoils of war kept the wave in motion; for example, until the 1860s, the major export from the area of boer expansion was ivory (Beinart, 1994, p. 45). Furthermore, the interior expanse was less mysterious than might be suggested. *Trekboers*, or livestock farmers, had made regular forays into these regions many years before, in search of game or grazing lands (Beck, 2014, p. 75). This new collection of migrants – more accurately named *voortrekkers*, employing the Dutch root word *voor* to suggest “in front of” – fled British dominion in search of land to establish an independent Afrikaner republic (Beck, 2014, p. 75). The journeys of the *trekboers*, as well as traders and coordinated reconnaissance parties, informed the *voortrekkers* which areas were suitable, and how to get there (Beck, 2014, p. 75; Walker, 1957, pp. 180, 197).

Early Boer Republics. Loosely arranged groups of *voortrekkers* departed in hundreds of wagons, with thousands of sheep and cattle, as well as their servants and newly emancipated slaves (Beck, 2014, pp. 75-76). Not every party reached its destination; encounters with Indigenous nations claimed the lives of many travelers, and some violent confrontations extinguished entire caravans (Beck, 2014, pp. 76-78). Once arrived, the experience in the interior regions had elements of both pioneer and colonial life. The early boer republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State defined their boundaries – even when they could not reasonably control them (Beck, 2014, p. 76) – then established governments that resembled their traditional Dutch institutions both at local and national levels (Beck, 2014, p. 77). Perhaps ironically, where settlers could control large areas of land, many began taxing the African tenants as a means of income, albeit with some logistical difficulty (Beinart, 1994, p. 45). The White populations also formed military, commerce, and other relationships with Black African communities, and, as their frontier existence relied heavily on arms and ammunition, merchants and trade routes were common as well (Beinart, 1994, p. 45). In that sense, the *voortrekkers* were never truly isolated (Beinart, 1994, p. 45).

Along with their concepts of government and society came a return to the racial privilege and slavery they knew from life under the DEIC (Beck, 2014, p. 77; Walker, 1957, pp. 199-200). Black Africans in boer republics were “denied all political rights, reduced to servitude, racially segregated, and generally mistreated” (Beck, 2014, p. 77). Military units abducted Black African children as part of an “indenture” system, and forced them to work for food and clothing (Beck, 2014, p. 77; Beinart, 1994, pp. 45-46; Macmillan, 1963, pp. 193-194). When the need for labor outstripped the workforce, the boers, who had long since developed a dislike for manual labor (Murphy, 1973, p. 41), were allowed to have five African families in residence on a farm (Beck,

2014, p. 77). The “surplus” Africans were driven off, despite legitimate and documented claims to ancestral territories (Babb, 1984, pp. 137-138; Beck, 2014, p. 77).

The outward expansion of the boers exercised measures of both interdependence with, and exploitation of, the Indigenous populations (Beinart, 1994, p. 46). The emigrants relied on the spoils of conflict, and the bounty of the wildlife around them, in order to survive (Beinart, 1994, p. 46). That lifestyle fostered stereotypes of hard, violent masculinity and strong patriarchy, both of which became cultural reference points for Afrikaners in coming generations (Beinart, 1994, p. 46). Those stereotypes are not unfounded; in comparison with agrarian communities and more cultivated areas elsewhere in South Africa, the lives of many frontier families were indeed difficult (Beinart, 1994, p. 46). But for some scholars, this experience explained much of the Afrikaner mentality, with undertones of isolation, conflict, prejudice, and segregation (Beinart, 1994, p. 45; Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 59). Unfortunately, the legacy of this difficult lifestyle influenced many of the events of the urban and industrialized years to come.

The Indigenous Kingdoms

Since the 1920s, the history of Black Africans in the South African region has described a series of political conflicts and territorial upheavals during the early 1800s along the southeastern coast of Africa with the term *mfecane* (Beck, 2014, p. 70). The word itself is translated rather broadly, often depending on the author: Among the candidates are “the crushing,” “time of troubles,” “forced migration,” “upheaval,” “hammering,” and “total war,” to name but a few (Beck, 2014, p. 70; Christie, 1985, p. 39; Comaroff & Comaroff, 1986, p. 3; Walker, 1957, p. 175). Most accounts of the *mfecane* begin around 1790 and last less than 40 years (Beck, 2014, p. 70; Cobbing, 1988, p. 487; Omer-Cooper, 1966, p. 3), but share a common sequence of events: Before the close of the 18th century, a chain of internal revolutions, generated from within the Nguni

kingdoms and escalating with the rise of Shaka Zulu, triggered waves of violent migrations throughout the South African interior (Cobbing, 1988, p. 487; Hamilton, 1992, p. 2; Omer-Cooper, 1966, p. 3; Ransford, 1968, p. 37; Wright, 2006, p. 1). By some accounts, the ripples from these coastal altercations echoed through cultures and populations as far north as south-central Africa (Cobbing, 1988, p. 487; Omer-Cooper, 1966, p. 4). Shaka's militarized nation-state thrived throughout the chaos, effectively destabilizing, but more importantly depopulating, the interior of the subcontinent (Omer-Cooper, 1966, p. 4; Ransford, 1968, p. 37). In the wake of the *mfecane*, a new arrangement of Black African nations crystallized to take the stage through the remainder of the century (Wright, 2006, p. 1).

Terminology. There are some weak points to the retelling of the *mfecane*, and they do not only hover around the term itself. The word appeared in a 1928 edition of E. A. Walker's *History of Southern Africa* (Omer-Cooper, 1966, p. 5), but later editions only ascribed it to "the Bantu," with no further etymology (Walker, 1957, p. 175). More recent scholars traced the term to the Nguni language (Omer-Cooper, 1966, p. 5), but beyond that, the origins are blurred. Other critics claimed the word had no roots in any African lexicon, and was invented or borrowed for the convenience of describing the destructive "black-on-black" period reported around Shaka's rule (Cobbing, 1988, p. 487). There is the possibility that the word derived from *fetcani*, a pejorative that White settlers applied liberally to homeless Black Africans who entered the colony around this time (Beck, 2014, p. 60), but also to semi-organized bands beyond the colony borders (Macmillan, 1963, p. 69; Theal, 1898, vol. 31, p. 52). Regardless, the absence of a demonstrable link between the term and any linguistic background is disappointing.

The use of the word "Nguni" is also suspect. In this case, the term can be positively traced to the testimonials of shipwrecked Portuguese sailors, who in 1589 learned the word "vi-

rangune” for the site where they washed ashore, which became “baNguni” in the publications of colonial-era historians – in spite of the error in applying grammatical features of one language family to a word from elsewhere (Wright, 1983, pp. 1-2). From those early records, the use and derivations of “Nguni” became less clear; scattered appearances in texts over the next 300 years used a variety of spellings and references, sometimes to people, sometimes to direction, sometimes to a geographic region, and none authoritative (Wright, 1983, pp. 2-3). The name attached itself to Shaka through its use as a royal appellation, and as a collective term for Zulu citizens and those absorbed into the empire through conflict (Wright, 1983, pp. 4-5). By the early 20th century historians had commandeered the word to apply to any member of a Black African population geographically situated along the eastern coasts of the subcontinent, in some cases only because it was convenient (Wright, 1983, pp. 1, 6-8). Pivotal texts of the 1960s made the usage commonplace, albeit somewhat misapplied (Wright, 1983, p. 1). Even as recently as the 1990s, “Nguni” was used as a collective label implying the inclusion of the Zulu, and as a brace for language groups of that region (Eldredge, 1992, p. 2; Hamilton, 1992, p. 2). Furthermore, other African populations have laid claim to both the term and, obliquely, to Shaka’s legacy – perhaps most notably the Ngoni peoples of south-central Africa, who drew a direct line between themselves and forebears who fled the Zulu onslaught (Wright, 2006, p. 18). In spite of its vague origins and imprecise application, the term is apparently too well entrenched to be pried loose from academic use (Wright, 1983, p. 1).

Veracity. These difficulties with vocabulary underscore a further weakness in the common understanding of the *mfecane*: Even as the key terms are vague and likely misapplied, there is no trustworthy record of the period available for inspection (Beck, 2014, p. 70). The Indigenous cultures of the era were pre-literate, and created no records aside from oral histories (Beck,

2014, p. 70). As a result, any corroboration from that time frame was likely passed word-of-mouth until it reached an intermediary, usually a trader or missionary, who perhaps rendered it in written form, which was later reinterpreted by a historian – all combining to possibly distort the facts under exponential layers of intent, bias, racism, exaggeration, or even misrepresentation (Beck, 2014, pp. 70-71; Macmillan, 1963, p. 12; Wright, 2006, pp. 3-4, 15).

Some points of the *mfecane* are undisputed. Shaka took command of an expanding kingdom circa 1815, and built it into a formidable military presence until his death in 1828 at the hands of his half-brothers (Beck, 2014, p. 72; Kaplan, 1971, pp. 60-61; Theal, 1901, p. 179). Shaka perfected, but did not invent, several military advances at a time when conflict was commonly conducted with spears thrown over distances: Zulu forces were arranged in age-based cohorts drafted as entire regiments, deployed in deliberate pincer-style formations, and trained extensively with shields and short-shafted spears for close-quarters combat (Beck, 2014, p. 72; Cobbing, 1988, p. 488; Kaplan, 1971, p. 61). Although there is nothing in any of the Bantu-speaking cultures that predisposes them to conflict (Macmillan, 1963, pp. 12-13), the political and social structure of Zulu and neighboring kingdoms permitted Shaka and his successors to militarize the entire population – young and old, male and female – and simultaneously absorb conquered groups into their own ranks, without jeopardizing authority (Eldredge, 1992, p. 28; Omer-Cooper, 1966, pp. 212-213, 216-217). Those facts, along with possible ecological influences (Eldredge, 1992, pp. 31-32) and calamities brought on by cattle parasites and millennialist prophecies (Hofmeyr, 2018, p. 119), do support the narrative of “massive political reorganization, much havoc, and extreme suffering” (Beck, 2014, pp. 73-74). But beyond these points, some scholars have advocated to abandon the trope of a Zulu-driven *mfecane* altogether (Wright, 2006, p. 2).

Sensationalism. Unfortunately, rather than erasing the myth, the verifiable events drag still more doubts to light. For one, generations of historians painted the supposed Zulu onrush in sensationalistic terms. Theal (1901, p. 169) was particularly guilty of this, explaining in some episodes how Shaka ordered the slaughter of rival leaders and their supporters (1901, pp. 176-177), then steamrolled the survivors to “destroy every human being in his way” toward the interior of the country (1901, p. 177). Even into the mid-20th century and the apartheid era, authors depicted Shaka and the *mfecane* with a biblical flair – the “colossal upheaval was accompanied by carnage and destruction on an appalling scale,” with “ravenous hordes of pillagers” triggering “famine and anarchy” across a spread of thousands of miles (Omer-Cooper, 1966, pp. 3-4). Some histories even included outrageous accusations of cannibalism (Cobbing, 1988, pp. 493, 500, 515), describing how “many starving warriors, having acquired the taste for human flesh, formed themselves into cannibal bands whose sole purpose was to hunt down more human victims for food” (Ransford, 1968, p. 37).

At the same time, the accepted narrative for the *mfecane* corresponds uncannily with the Great Trek (Cobbing, 1988, p. 488). Accounts of White settlers invariably emphasized the fact that the land beyond the British frontier was uninhabited and free for the taking, and if it appeared depopulated, conflicts and politics among the Black African nations at that time were to blame (Malherbe, 1925, p. 59; *The Empty Land Myth*, 2019, para. 9; Walker, 1957, p. 176). “Shaka became an explanation for everything,” Cobbing explained (1988, p. 487). Even as the established Black African societies were decimated by “ravenous hordes of pillagers” (Omer-Cooper, 1966, p. 3), “whites stood on the fringes as helpless spectators” (Cobbing, 1988, p. 488). From there, the retelling of boer advances took on a White savior theme, with the effects of their own headway into the center of the subcontinent covered up by the *mfecane* myth (Hamilton,

1992, p. 2). Where the *voortrekkers* met the remnants of fractured kingdoms, it not only reinforced their belief that the land before them was empty, but it fed into their “land hunger” (Macmillan, 1963, p. 20; Malherbe, 1925, p. 59). That excuse, plus pressures from the colony behind them, and the lack of formidable resistance ahead, likely drove the *voortrekkers* further onto war-ravaged Bantu-speakers, even if contemporaneous voices warned them of the consequences of their expansion (Beck, 2014, p. 74; Macmillan, 1963, p. 20).

Later viewpoints were no more sympathetic. Successive White governments have embraced Zulu culpability for the “carnage and destruction” (Omer-Cooper, 1966, p. 4) because it characterized Black Africans as divisive, militaristic, and incapable of peaceful governance (Eldredge, 1992, p. 2). The *mfecane* in its most egregious retelling of slaughter and cannibalism not only justified the advance of the *voortrekkers*, but validated the need for White rule in South Africa (Eldredge, 1992, p. 2). And of course, the *mfecane* closed with security restored at the arrival of the Europeans, which legitimized land occupation and ideologies of separated societies (Hamilton, 1992, p. 2). In short, Shaka and the advances of the Zulu kingdom became a scapegoat for later Eurocentric governments.

Motives and manipulations aside, the Black African states that splintered in the early 1800s, as well as the Dutch descendants seeking to escape the encroaching British empire, created a political and cultural environment that would evolve through to the present day. Before the end of the century, new nations would arise, new industries would emerge, and nearly every faction would find itself at war with the others – even as the colony scrambled to find its own identity at the outset of the 20th century.

Missionary Education

Very soon after the British regained rule, the Cape authority sought a first-hand report of

conditions at the eastern frontier, in the Natal region of the colony (Beck, 2014, p. 56). Reconnaissance generated several recommendations, not the least of which was a military advance to definitively claim the region, followed with the introduction of European immigrants into the area as a cushion against incursions by Xhosa groups (Beck, 2014, p. 56; Walker, 1957, p. 153). “It would require above 6,000 settlers to people it,” the report encouraged. “It would be very desirable that a proportion of Europeans should be allotted for that purpose. . . . One thousand persons could be procured without much expense from Europe” (Theal, 1898, vol. 7, p. 103). In 1812 the colonial government took that advice and established a series of fortified settlements along the frontier, but not before it employed a total war strategy against the Black African residents – killing men and women, burning crops, and destroying villages (Beck, 2014, p. 56). This was a departure from the tactics seen in previous border conflicts, and the brutality effectively signaled an end to Xhosa resistance against White encroachment (Beck, 2014, p. 56).

The suggestion of buffering the colony’s holdings with European settlers presaged, and perhaps even enabled, an upswing in missionary activity in the subcontinent (Moore, 2016, p. 19; Murphy, 1973, p. 59). The Moravian experiment in Genadendal had reopened by 1792 (Leonie, 1965, p. 53), and seven years later, the first mission school specifically for Black Africans opened in King William’s Town (Christie, 1985, p. 36). Within 20 years, missionary efforts in South Africa had reached a new crescendo (Murphy, 1973, p. 59), with schools dedicated to the poorest portions of the subcontinent – conceived, arranged, built, and managed by missionary elements, both international and domestic (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. xl). The Moravians, the London Missionary Society, and the South African Missionary Society were joined by Scottish, Wesleyan, Anglican, and Methodist programs, as well as efforts based in Switzerland, America, France, England, and several from Germany (Low, 1958, p. 22; *Report of*

a Commission Appointed, 1863, p. xl; Robertson & Robertson, 1977, p. 11). Some societies sprang spontaneously into being, bent upon service to Black African populations (van der Walt, 1992, p. 78). Depending on the resources and goals of the mission, elementary and secondary schools were created, plus trade schools, vocational schools, and teacher training colleges in particularly successful cases (Christie, 1985, pp. 37-38; Robertson & Robertson, 1977, p. 11). At the unionization of South Africa in 1910, nearly 700 mission schools were reported within the bounds of the Cape Colony alone (Leonie, 1965, p. 60), for a census of more than 185,000 students both “white and coloured” (Malherbe, 1925, p. 99).

With almost no other option, missionary schools seemed to satisfy nearly every stakeholder demographic in South Africa in the early 1800s. For a host community, the presence of a missionary offered benefits other than religion. The Christian message was of less interest than the trade network a mission might attract, which gave access to material goods and firearms (Beck, 2014, pp. 61-62; Comaroff & Comaroff, 1986, p. 3). Missionaries were security against the materials needed for construction projects (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 412), and often possessed the technical expertise for such endeavors (Comaroff & Comaroff, 1986, p. 3). The presence of a mission was a deterrent to attacks from rival communities or White pillagers, and in some cases became a venue for western medical services (Beck, 2014, p. 62). Perhaps more importantly, missionaries could advise local leaders on how to communicate with the government of the day, or to negotiate with White settlers (Beck, 2014, p. 62; Comaroff & Comaroff, 1989, p. 271). Missionaries were also convenient first-hand witnesses to local events, and could relay their account to appropriate authorities (Kaplan, 1971, p. 59; Macmillan, 1963, p. 194). Emancipated citizens and Black African parents knew from personal experience that missionary education could provide a more “positive” direction for their children

– namely vocational training, and as a result, more employment opportunities (Moore, 2016, pp. 21-22). The missionaries themselves operated ostensibly under evangelical motives (Beck, 2014, p. 61; wa Thiong'o, 1993, p. 65), and the colonial government, which until that point had made very few gestures toward education for Black Africans (Dube, 1985, p. 90; Murphy, 1973, p. 58), eagerly added missionary settlements to its playbook (Collins, 1983, p. 366). Some demographics were begrudging in their adoption of missionary education: Boer farmers and other White settlers considered anything but rudimentary education for Black Africans to be a threat to their labor supply, and in parallel, British craftsmen feared competition from Indigenous tradesmen (Babb, 1984, p. 6; Beck, 2014, pp. 61-62). On the other hand, commerce saw missionary education as an inroad to an African market (Beck, 2014, p. 61), and some missionaries openly embraced their part in that endeavor (Livingstone, 1858, p. 34). Later in the century, heavy industry would likewise favor education, even as the outgoing colonial governments hoped education would entrench Black Africans as a cheap source of labor, and redirect them toward consumerism (Babb, 1984, p. 6).

The Missionary. However, this patchwork marriage of convenience was not nearly as synergistic as it appeared on the surface. The most obvious point of concern was the missionaries themselves, whose *raison d'être* could be interpreted on many layers. Denominations outside the DRC had increased with the arrival of the British (Walker, 1957, pp. 143-144), and while ministers among early boer movements beyond the colony had converted some Africans in the interior, missionaries returning to those areas were not always DRC preachers (Kaplan, 1971, p. 303). With a favorable location and the construction of a church, a school could follow, making the missionary the sole source of European culture or information at that distance (Kaplan, 1971, p. 303).

That gave considerable influence to a single person, both at the community level and beyond. Most missionaries of the 19th century were the products of a European philanthropic conscience, married to an individual religious fervor and a commonsense worldview that valued hard work, industry, and commerce (Beck, 2014, p. 61; van der Walt, 1992, p. 78). Fueled by a belief that the grace bestowed upon them by Christ must be shared with the “heathens” living in parts of the world only recently discovered, missionary principles dovetailed neatly with Europe’s colonial expansion in the 18th and 19th centuries (van der Walt, 1992, p. 80). Autobiographies suggested most missionaries hailed from working-class backgrounds, and could not qualify for the theological training that would allow them to become preachers or pastors in their own communities (van der Walt, 1992, p. 80). That failing, plus financial difficulties, meant “training to be a missionary seemed a God-sent opportunity for many a young man feeling the drive to preach the Gospel to the heathen” (van der Walt, 1992, p. 80). Many notable missionaries of the era testified to that urge, which was an understandable reaction to the prevailing attitudes of Europeans in the 1700s and 1800s (van der Walt, 1992, p. 80).

Missionary training was usually conducted at the society’s expense, which meant missionaries likely expected no salary during their service, and the majority were instructed to develop stations that could operate financially independent of their umbrella agency (van der Walt, 1992, p. 81) – an injunction that partly explains why funding for education at most missions came from local levels (Murphy, 1973, p. 60). Knowing only that, it is easy to see how the success or failure of a missionary could pivot on language ability; in later years, some larger missionary societies garnished wages until a missionary could prove, through a battery of examinations, a degree of proficiency in the local language (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 171).

Missionaries faced other challenges, particularly among communities critical of their intent. Boer leadership knew British missionaries and their societies sided with Indigenous Africans and were loud among the voices for improving the lot of enslaved workers or Khoi laborers (Kaplan, 1971, p. 55). By the 1830s, boer communities in the eastern portion of the sub-continent banned missionary activities, hoping to stifle the “unsettling ideas of human equality” taught in mission schools (Moore, 2016, pp. 21-22). For much the same reason, the two boer republics in existence in the latter half of the 19th century did not extend financial aid to missionary societies operating within their borders (Collins, 1983, p. 371). Other boer authorities employed subterfuge to undermine missionary forays into their areas (Livingstone, 1858, p. 44). That tone of distrust extended well beyond the 1800s; Afrikaners frequently criticized missionary schools at the opening of the 20th century and afterward, because of the large number of Black African children in attendance and because leaders of Black empowerment groups tended to be the products of those schools (Thompson & Prior, 1982, p. 117, as cited in Dube, 1985, p. 96).

Given the challenge of constructing an evangelical outpost to the benefit of a community within a foreign culture, with no finances and minimal language experience, it is not surprising that many successful missionaries became influential community and national leaders, as did their students (Kaplan, 1971, p. 303). This tends to add a gloss to missionary education as an institution; Nwandula (1988, p. 43) constructed a long list of writers from the 20th century who glorified and romanticized missionary schooling, with less regard for motives or effects. Rose-colored glasses aside, there was some doubt to the purity of motive in splicing education with religion (Dube, 1985, pp. 89-90; Molteno, 1983, p. 33). Mission societies were eager to tout educational efforts against a background of religion (Jarvis, 1985, p. 32), but more accurately put, westernization was the means toward Christianization (Steyn, 1990, p. ii). In that sense, mission-

aries were comfortable providing any educational framework, so long as it satisfied their goal to evangelize: An appropriate education was simply one that prepared children to read the Bible and participate in religious rituals (Molteno, 1983, p. 33).

Curriculum. With such a variety of missionary agencies and agents operating across the country through a span of more than a hundred years, the education available depended heavily on the school and its supervising society. As education was expected to enable Indigenous Africans to participate in a Western economic system, the curriculum often included fundamental academics alongside training in a trade or skill (Collins, 1983, pp. 368-369; Murphy, 1973, p. 60). Some missions established model farms for teaching modern agricultural methods to nearby African men, and for teaching housekeeping methods to women (Kaplan, 1971, p. 292). At less affluent missions, manual arts and crafts might have been the only available training, and even gardening and carpentry were beyond its means if resources were tight (Low, 1958, p. 22). By 1884, mission schools in the Cape included a full menu of Western scholarship, including art, Bible history, grammar, translation, geography, physics, chemistry, Latin, Greek, French, and more (Low, 1958, p. 22). Although Black African students formed a racial minority in those schools, they were subject to the same examinations as their peers, and were expected “to conform in all respects to European habits and customs” (Low, 1958, p. 22).

Of course, this was not the case in every mission school throughout the country, and with only the beginnings of government oversight, individual schools designed their own plan of study, and decided upon their own materials – not always for the better. One school operating under education authorities in a newly formed boer republic adopted English phrasebooks which contained only words needed in conversations with White settlers (Nwandula, 1988, p. 48). Perhaps using similar logic, Leonie (1965, p. 57) ascribed the slow disappearance by 1905 of the

Griqua nation – a migratory offshoot of Khoi and early White settlers – to the failings of missionary schools that operated in their communities.

Predictably, the curriculum in many mission schools included morality, manners, and discipline, with religious teaching at the option of the individual missionary (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, pp. 388, 100-101). Religious topics were not open to government inspection, so it fell to the missionary to ensure that teachers delivered those subjects properly (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 388). Moral education could be connected to critical trades as well: Once the “heathens” had been instructed on the teachings of the scripture, and after they had learned to read and write and calculate, they could read the Bible and other tracts for themselves (van der Walt, 1992, p. 82). Over time, converts tended to immigrate to the area, and they would require education in hygiene and moral lifestyles, as well as fundamental trades such as gardening, tailoring, and construction, all of which contributed to the standard of living of the community (van der Walt, 1992, p. 82). Beyond that, more advanced trades such as carpentry, masonry, blacksmithing, and others, were in demand in local White communities (van der Walt, 1992, p. 82).

Operation. Missions were not immune to the religious and political tensions of the day, nor were their missionaries free from fault. Early in the 1800s, when wars between White settlers and Indigenous Africans were frequent, schools were interrupted or even closed until hostilities ceased (Murphy, 1973, p. 60). More than one missionary-founded church was drafted as an African-staffed church – to the horror of White academics of the day (Tabata, 1974, p. 79) – because there was no assurance that the missionary would be on hand permanently (Kaplan, 1971, p. 310). In those cases, the rationale was that it was preferable for the Indigenous community to have its own leadership rather than risk a vacuum at a missionary’s departure (Kaplan, 1971, p.

310). On the other hand, there were cases where missionaries renounced their supervising agency over some disagreement, and remained with their adoptive community (Kaplan, 1971, p. 310).

While some missionary societies had obvious ties to either English or Afrikaner heritages, if a community wanted no clear affiliation, groups such as the Paris Evangelical Missionary Society were invited to establish schools (Kaplan, 1971, p. 292).

Geography and history likewise hampered missionary efforts. Cobbing (1988, p. 489) accused missionaries of engaging in the slave trade in the runup to the Emancipation Act, but other authors have gone to lengths to contradict that position (Eldredge, 1992, p. 17; Hamilton, 1992, pp. 2-3). Remote schools reached only a small population, offered minimal education, suffered poor attendance, and were likely of low quality (Murphy, 1973, p. 61). They also operated outside colonial authority and were poorly coordinated, putting neighboring institutions at loggerheads over local support and cooperation (Murphy, 1973, p. 61). Rivalries between denominations were not unheard of, and in extreme cases, individual missionaries were at odds (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 25). On the other hand, cross-societal schools existed, under the advisement of a board of missionaries and without a single umbrella agency, jointly managed with a goal of extending the school into upper grades (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, pp. 418-419).

Once a mission school reached a considerable size, missionaries hired teachers, on the basis of religious knowledge and qualifications determined by the missionary or his supervising society (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, pp. 419, 479). Those qualifications could run counter to the community's opinion of an individual, leading to situations where an applicant might be unfit as a teacher, but be popular in the community (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 479). In later years, the option for

government vetting existed (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 419), which brings to mind systems from previous centuries that screened teachers on moral grounds (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. vii). Naturally, a missionary preferred to hire a teacher who subscribed to his own belief; any favoritism on this point would have been difficult to pursue because the appointment was the responsibility of the missionary alone, not an accountable body (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 419). Testimony at the start of the 20th century could not recall any teacher who had been denied a post for insufficient religious knowledge (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 419), but there had been cases where incompetence or poor conduct prompted termination (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 398). Of course, where teachers faced dismissal, community- and school-level politics became factors (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 398). Public opinion generally held teachers in lower regard than the missionary, perhaps in part because the missionaries and their supervisory agencies saw teachers only as instructors, rather than spiritual or moral exemplars (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, pp. 345-346). In spite of that, missionary officials at the opening of the 20th century described the hired teachers of the day as “strictly honest in their relations with the authorities over them – that the work is done conscientiously and that they give a fair return for the wages paid to them” (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, pp. 345-346).

Governance. Most missionary schools relied on informal advisory committees for a measure of school governance (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 381). Missionaries reported to the advisory committee, and at the same time were accountable to government entities (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 381).

As late as 1908, established missionary elements were resistant to the idea of community oversight of school affairs – particularly in the hiring of new teachers – suggesting that school committees or councils were conscionable “so long as they do not interfere with the missionary superintendents” (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 479). Government officials echoed the belief that the missionaries were better suited to the role of school management than members of their communities:

The missionary is in close touch with the people. He is their representative and, educationally and otherwise, he is better qualified for the management of the school than – I do not say all, but than the average of his parishioners would be, and with regard to any buildings that have been put up, and in regard to fees they put up the building, and they pay the fees knowing the constitution of the school. The missionary is, in a sense, their trustee in these matters. (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, pp. 412-413)

There was no indication if this belief extended to missions run by Coloured or Black African clergymen, as existed in some parts of the colony before the close of the 19th century (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, pp. 418-419). In any case, missionary elements expressed support for community councils and advisory committees, so long as their focus remained on establishing, building, and repairing schools, and ensuring the attendance of students (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 479).

This becomes a point of contention where communities funded the creation of a school, and the missionary and agency contributed nothing (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 51). In those situations, proponents felt the missionary’s contribution was to serve as the stimulus and guiding element in the establishment of the school, combined

with a measure of personal responsibility for the project (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 412). In addition, the missionary accepted the role of representative for the community in relations with governments or elements beyond the parishioners (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 412). Whether that was a fair contribution, when compared to the financial backing of a rural and likely impoverished community, was a matter of interpretation.

However, the argument took on a new dimension in light of the admission that missionary work was temporary: “We are here as temporary agents, and should work towards our own elimination. That is the principle of all missionary work ... we should work towards our elimination from the educational system” (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 362). Ironically, the same testimony doubted South Africa was ready to relinquish missionary education, because of failings in moral and religious training on the part of teachers: “If our teachers were better qualified to give such training, then the European missionary’s influence might be lessened” (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 362). This placed teachers at the center of an odd contradiction, as other authors suggested the relationship was reversed: “Teachers cannot be raised up to continue the work of God in a heathen country” (Kotzé, 1950, p. 45). Whether religion was a prerequisite for proper teaching, or proper teachers preceded the acceptance of religion, the need for strong and dedicated teachers was clear: “If we could get good teachers, and then get the teachers to remain in the profession in larger numbers, it would probably do more than anything else to make education a success” (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 402).

Motives. Much of this speaks to the underlying motives of missionary work. Both apartheid-era and post-apartheid scholars were unforgiving of education in the missionary era,

some counting “missionary-do-goodness” among the “verbal grandiloquence” that comprised the profitable “national jingoism” pushing for colonialism in Africa (wa Thiong’o, 1993, p. 65).

Other authors were more subdued, insisting that missionary education was religious instruction, and did not hold the same value as a secular education, owing to the underlying goal of confirmation (Dube, 1985, p. 89). At the same time, several recurring themes appeared in retrospectives of missionary education, and in the writings of missionaries themselves.

Labor. The first is a constant return to labor as the role for Black Africans. As mentioned earlier in this review, most missionary stations were expected to operate financially independent from their agency (van der Walt, 1992, p. 81), which not only explains the need for local funding for mission improvements (Murphy, 1973, p. 60), but also the need for Indigenous labor at the stations, and the emphasis on vocational training in the syllabus (van der Walt, 1992, p. 81). “In this way they could procure financial independence for themselves and the station, and ensure a better living standard for their converts in the employment of whites in the vicinity of the station” (van der Walt, 1992, p. 81). While Protestant missions embraced labor as a necessary ethic (Kaplan, 1971, p. 54), the labor requirement appeared too frequently to be held to just one denomination.

For example, missionaries who established a presence among the Xhosa nation as early as 1799 built mission farms on the borders of that territory, where men learned agricultural and labor techniques, and women learned domestic skills – enabling both to seek wages in White communities (Kaplan, 1971, pp. 139, 173). At the same time, the agricultural lessons subverted the traditional male Xhosa belief that manual labor was for vassal groups, and that women cultivated while men hunted and herded (Kaplan, 1971, pp. 54, 292). The domestic training was likewise a cultural insinuation, implying that women belonged at home, and not in the public arena

(Seroto, 2018, p. 9). While skills such as sewing, needlework, and dressmaking did give women an avenue toward an independent income, the redrawn gender differentiation aligned Indigenous cultures with the expectations of White society (Seroto, 2018, p. 9). This effectively added another layer to the subjugation of Indigenous people, beyond their application to menial tasks and their utility to colonists and missionaries (Seroto, 2018, p. 9). Ultimately missionary education split Indigenous Africans from their traditional belief systems, rearranging their culture and societies to support an economical system that rerouted their work and training to the benefit of the missionary and White settlers (van der Walt, 1992, p. 75).

In this sense, the *mfecane* and concurrent events in the African kingdoms again worked to the benefit of both missionary and colonist. The destabilized interior region was vulnerable to encroachment by boers and other European elements, and this disruption of the traditional economy and way of life for Bantu-speaking populations put them at a disadvantage to the newcomers (van der Walt, 1992, p. 77). Black Africans were “virtually forced into labour” for White settlers, and missionaries reinforced this by training local Africans for service to Europeans, ostensibly to “improve the lifestyle and standard of living of the blacks” (van der Walt, 1992, p. 77). A missionary publication of the day explained the prejudice rhetorically: “Who of our South Africans work least? Is it not the heathen? And who work most? Is it not the Christianized?” (The Gospel of Work, 1878, p. 1). Another speaker at the start of the 20th century explained how interaction with White Africans led to the injection of labor into the lifestyles of Indigenous Africans: “It is not only the missionary agencies that have made natives to love work. ... Necessity compels them – their coming into contact with the Europeans” (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 132).

The focus on labor was also the ceiling for education in many cases. At many missions

manual labor was considered relevant for Black Africans, while mental activities were reserved for White Africans (Seroto, 2018, p. 8). Some missions even required seminary students to perform manual labor on a daily basis (Kaplan, 1971, p. 54). At a Swiss-run school at the northern limits of South Africa, manual labor itself was a topic of training at the end of the 19th century, rather than training in a discrete skill (Nwandula, 1988, p. 47). The focus was to teach Black Africans to work – particularly to work on White farms and in rural areas, and for that reason, they received no training in high-level skills (Nwandula, 1988, p. 47). The future of the African child, according to the mission, was on the land, in the workshop, in the garden, or in a White home, and therefore teachers were to prepare youth accordingly (Nwandula, 1988, p. 46). Education for Black Africans was acceptable, but not in an academic route, which was a “bookish affair” and “tinged with the white man’s outlook” (Nwandula, 1988, p. 46). The rationale for this, according to one of the mission’s founders, was that “the head of the native is not able to sustain the strain of mental study so well as the heads of whites” (Nwandula, 1988, p. 46).

The incessant emphasis on labor for Black Africans had another dimension: Mission stations also became outlets for modern goods available only through cash purchases – which would either require local residents to cultivate a bankable crop, or to labor under White Africans in exchange for wages (Kaplan, 1971, p. 54). This point becomes the linchpin for the entire logical train: Where missions, missionary schools, or other efforts at proselytism could entice Indigenous populations with “artificial wants” (Philip, 1828, p. 11), labor was reinforced as the means toward that end. The pattern had nearly reached the level of dogma by the end of the 19th century, with the implicit understanding that “Christianity creates needs,” and for missionaries who “want to see the natives become workers ... you must get them to need” (The Gospel of Work, 1878, pp. 1-2).

Create need and you supply stimulus for work; you enlist the worker's own will on the side of labour. Few men, anywhere, and certainly no heathen men, ever work for the mere pleasure of working. Now the speediest way of creating needs among these people is to Christianize them. As they become Christianized, they will want more clothing, better houses, furniture, books, education for the children and a hundred other things they can get by working, and only by working. ... So to Christianize a Kaffir is the shortest way, and the surest, to make him put his hand steadily and willingly to work that is waiting to be done. (The Gospel of Work, 1878, pp. 1-2)

Labor then became a crucial cog in the mechanism of missionary efforts through centuries of South African education.

Discipline. Labor also reinforced the belief that education provided discipline for Black Africans, as was evident even in the earliest efforts at Western education in the Cape (Leibbrandt, 1896, vol. 6, p. 115). With that came the implication of submission to White authority, both in education and in society. With emancipation in 1833, this idea reappeared as a necessary component for mission schools (Collins, 1983, pp. 366-367). Khoi displaced by White migrations sought work on White farms, and mission schools fulfilled their imperialist function when they “tamed this labour force by providing an ideology of obedience, discipline, and servitude” (Collins, 1983, p. 367).

Earlier still, colonial authorities demanded missionaries incorporate submission to White authority as part of their teachings. In 1803 the interim Batavian governor directed a London Missionary Society member named van der Kemp, already under fire for his belief that the Khoi “should be perfectly free, upon an equal footing with the colonist, and, by no sort of compulsion, brought under a necessity to enter into their service,” that the state of affairs at his mission

change *tout de suite* (Babb, 1984, p. 51; Leonie, 1965, p. 56). Among the 14 conditions required to continue work, the governor stipulated that the mission “has no other authority or political influence than that of the Batavian Government, and must make this clear and teach it to the Hottentots” (Theal, 1896, vol. 3, p. 236). With that came details of the jurisdiction between the mission, its parishioners, local governance, and the colony authority (Theal, 1896, vol. 3, pp. 235-236), as well as an express instruction to “exercise control over” the Khoi (Leonie, 1965, pp. 56-57).

Westernization and Colonization. Both labor and discipline lead into a third theme for missionary education: the effort to westernize Indigenous residents, or to ensconce them within colonial society. Since 1952, critics have realigned missionary education under the umbrella of colonialism, recognizing the onset of the missionary influx with the entry to the British empire (Chisholm, 2017, p. xvi; Molteno, 1983, p. 22). Westernization was a means toward the missionary’s avowed goal of evangelization (Steyn, 1990, p. ii), but with it necessarily came the structure, fixtures, and institutions of colonial life – the “missionary, the magistrate, and the trader,” as one observer testified (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 152; Cook, 1949, p. 348). This outgrowth of abolitionist philosophy gave mission education its goal of spreading a Western lifestyle among the “heathen Africans,” which in turn implied the aforementioned labor theme (Christie, 1985, p. 36; Murphy, 1973, p. 58).

Only through Christianity could Africans be free of “barbarism” and join into a relationship with the civilized world (Murphy, 1973, p. 58) – meshing neatly with the Victorian liberalism at the core of government policy in British colonies of the day (Appel, 1989, p. 545). Westernization also touched on the themes of discipline and submission, appearing in some contexts as one and the same: “Education would teach them that their true interest is to be at peace with

the colony and the folly of resistance, raise them above stealing, and fit them for coming under the colonial Government” (Macmillan, 1963, p. 79). When the Black African became “a thinking and a moral man,” rather than a “savage” or a “mere child,” he would find his place in the modern African nation and make a contribution to society (Nwandula, 1988, p. 45). And of course, the path toward that contribution was education and training (Nwandula, 1988, p. 45), implying the previous themes as well.

Westernization appeared in empirical form as the adoption of improved farming methods, or the introduction of irrigation techniques for farming where populations had previously been nomadic herders (Kaplan, 1971, pp. 139, 173; Macmillan, 1963, p. 48). In other cases, missionaries equated westernization with avenues for capitalist development, once again raising doubts over their real motives on the continent. David Livingstone, one of the best known missionaries of the day, wrote:

The promotion of commerce ought to be specially attended to, as this, more speedily than any thing [*sic*] else, demolishes that sense of isolation which heathenism engenders ... [I am] desirous to promote the preparation of the raw materials of European manufactures in Africa, for by that means we may not only put a stop to the slave-trade, but introduce the negro family into the body corporate of nations. (Livingstone, 1858, p. 34)

Livingstone was not alone in his capitalist interpretation of religion. Another missionary, writing from the northwestern region of the subcontinent, explained the connection between missionary work and business exploits.

The great success which has attended the diamond digging is [due to] the abundance of labour that has been always at hand. ... And this fact that labour has been plentiful is due largely to missionary and various other civilizing influences that have been at work for so

many years. As a contrast to this, there are the valuable [Bechuanaland] gold fields ... that cannot be worked successfully ... because native labour is dearer. Not because natives are scarce, but because missionary work and civilization have made no progress among them. (Wookey, 1884, as cited in Comaroff & Comaroff, 1989, p. 281).

Clearly, many missionaries were eager to take credit for the success of business in the westernization of Africa.

Some missionaries required converts to adopt Western dress and customs, equating gender-specific clothing to Christian respectability while separating them from traditional customs and conventions (Seroto, 2018, p. 9). Occasionally these edicts backfired; missionaries sometimes lost ground in their evangelical efforts when they insisted converts avoid certain points of their original culture, such as traditional dances or rituals that offended European sensibilities (Comaroff & Comaroff, 1986, p. 4). Here again the *mfecane* was a catalyst: Populations displaced during Shaka's conquests were physically estranged from their homelands and traditions, which made them vulnerable to foreign cultures and religious influences (van der Walt, 1992, p. 77). With so much of their own cultures and societies already in flux, emigrants were prepared to adopt new ideas and innovations, which opened them to the religious and cultural demands of the missionaries (van der Walt, 1992, p. 77). Perhaps unbeknownst to either missionary or convert, these westernizations were irreversible: Changes to one aspect of an Indigenous culture triggered permanent changes in the whole (Dubow, 1989, p. 37).

Racial Stratification. However, in some cases those changes were intentional. If missionary education was clear in its attempts to westernize Indigenous Africans and place them within the colonial hierarchy, it was equally clear that their position was at the bottom. The educational objectives of the British ruling class of the era, particularly by the 1860s, resembled those of the

apartheid government of the 1950s: rudimentary education for the mass of Black Africans; low levels of manual training as an admission to a low tier of society and to reinforce discipline and obedience; and higher education only so far as it generated teachers who could perpetuate the system (Collins, 1983, pp. 368-369). To be sure, some missionary societies refuted the notion of White intellectual superiority (Fleisch, 1995a, p. 10). But for other missions, this racial striation was so ingrained as to even appear in language lessons limited to the vocabulary of subservience – demonstrating a policy of “adaptive education” or “education along their own lines:” Outwardly it was grounded in culture, but in truth it was designed to preserve a power relationship and justify segregationist ideology (Nwandula, 1988, p. 48).

This seeming contradiction in logic required a curious mental twist for support. For example, van der Kemp, whose missionary efforts under the Batavian authority came under fire for his beliefs in equality for Khoi inhabitants (Babb, 1984, p. 51; Leonie, 1965, p. 56), did not campaign against abuses of the Khoi at the hands of colonists (Babb, 1984, p. 52). Rather, he felt that, if the government supervised the Khoi with kindness, officials would

rule a people who return their best affections for the respect and protection it affords them. Then it will not be the Hottentot serving the boer [*sic*] like his slave; but, as in all other lands, the poor shall serve the more wealthy with good-will. (Sales, 1975, p. 14, as cited in Babb, 1984, p. 52)

In essence, van der Kemp’s feud with the colonial authorities was not over the treatment of the Khoi, but rather the manner in which the resident Africans were exploited (Babb, 1984, p. 51). van der Kemp’s experience was not unusual in one sense: Other communities, both boer and British, challenged the efforts of missionaries, where “nine-tenths of the settlers were opposed to the civilization of the Caffres,” and the prevailing attitude was that “nothing but the powder and

ball would do to bring such savages to their senses” (Macmillan, 1963, pp. 78, 59).

Racial stratification entered the South African school systems first as segregation, then as an institution, both before the close of the 19th century (Dube, 1985, p. 90). As discussed, most early missionary education in the Cape was color-blind, with White, Coloured, and Black African children attending the same school, although dormitories and dining facilities may have been separated (Dube, 1985, p. 90; Kaplan, 1971, p. 233). In fact, enrollment figures were not collected along racial lines until 1895, meaning figures for school attendance for the majority of the 19th century can only estimate proportions of Black, Coloured, and White students (Malherbe, 1925, p. 174). In the short-lived boer republics of the middle to late 1800s, White and Black African children attended different schools, with Coloured children attending one or the other on the basis of their skin tone (Kaplan, 1971, p. 233). Where there were no public schools in the neighborhood of a mission, the station school would take any student who cared to attend (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 7).

Perhaps ironically, reflective testimony at the start of the 20th century blamed missionary efforts for the slow segregation of schools through the previous hundred years. In spite of the outwardly altruistic motivations of missionary work, “the worldly interests of the white population were menaced by what the missionaries were doing” (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 24). By 1838 – and possibly as a side effect of the Great Trek – more Coloured children were receiving an education than White children (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 2). Where no exclusive institution was available, White Africans “could not help” but express a “strong prejudice in sending their children to the same school” as Coloured or Black African children, who in turn purportedly held a “strong disinclination” to attending school with one another (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on

Native Education, 1908, pp. 7, 49). These disinclinations possibly contributed to the “feeling of animosity between the whites and the coloured” discussed at the start of the 1900s (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 24).

Effects. Eventually these “feelings of animosity” would mature into the categories of racism that Dube (1985, p. 90) described pervading the education system of the next century. By the 1900s, official attitudes toward mission-educated Black Africans ranged from thinking them absurd (Babb, 1984, p. 161) to suggesting they were fraudulent – “about as original as a glass of skimmed milk,” as one union-era government official stated – and recommending that the education of Indigenous Africans be redirected on the basis of their own culture (Dubow, 1989, p. 36).

The slow creep of segregation and racism were not the only effects of centuries of missionary education. In spite of evangelical efforts, the majority of Black Africans through this period still did not have access to an education, or did not receive an education, or did not attend regularly (Christie, 1985, p. 38; Jarvis, 1985, p. 32) – by some accounts, only a “minute fraction” were in school (Molteno, 1983, p. 27). This uneven access to education created an additional layer of social divisions: In addition to the racial boundaries, class separation occurred (Christie, 1985, p. 38). Class divisions could cut across color, as in the case where lower-class White and Black Africans attended school together, or where affluent missions offered tertiary education to mixed cohorts (Christie, 1985, p. 38). As race and labor placed most Black Africans at a disadvantage within society, their lower class meant their access to education was minimal (Christie, 1985, p. 38). Arguably though, the application of class structures to the missionary education period hijacks history to prove a separate point (van der Walt, 1992, p. 76).

However, strictly speaking more children in missionary schools – and more parents in the employ of missions or White households – meant fewer people were engaged in traditional pas-

toral duties (Collins, 1983, p. 368). Missionaries who encouraged students and parishioners to “drop their ‘heathen’ ways and to become the junior partners of White culture” created a new push-pull between responsibility toward White society and fidelity to conventional Indigenous roles (Collins, 1983, p. 368), especially during agricultural seasons (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 82). Missionaries and related publications commonly blamed agrarian duties – particularly cattle herding – for absenteeism among boys, and to a lesser degree, domestic chores for the absences of girls, though that connection was not so specific (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 482; Molteno, 1983, p. 31). The unfortunate follow-on effect was a belief expressed at social and government levels that the original African cultures were averse to schooling, and preferred their children remain as goatherds (Molteno, 1983, p. 31).

Of course that was an unfair generalization, and if anything, scholars concluded the exact opposite. Missionary education may have been built around evangelism, but education opened the door to other ideas as well: Once “a new convert found that he could read the Bible ... he often wanted something else” (Low, 1958, p. 22). Chisholm (2017, pp. xvi-xvii) collected a variety of sources that connected missionary education with advances in African nationalism, including an example of how one large missionary school introduced Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* as a religious text in the 1880s, leading to its translation into Xhosa, and later its adoption as a framework for debate and discourse on Black African political consciousness well into the next century – in part because of similarities to figures in Xhosa folklore (Hofmeyr, 2018, pp. 117-132).

In the same way, it would be inaccurate to draw host communities as completely pliant and passive to the evangelists in their midst. For example, while missionary efforts in the northwest of the country focused on reordering Tswana concepts at a linguistic level, the Tswana

themselves were adapting the missionary presence into their own efforts to “fashion an awareness of, and gain conceptual mastery over, a changing world” (Comaroff & Comaroff, 1989, pp. 286-287, 290). The most entertaining example is in the story of a woman who, much to the chagrin of the missionary, deconstructed and reconstructed her own rendition of holy communion, administering it to her community members as a means of communication with God (Comaroff & Comaroff, 1989, p. 287). In the uncomfortable wake of their ceremony, she and her compatriots avoided conversation with the missionary while they waited patiently for God to convince him that their rendition was right (Comaroff & Comaroff, 1989, p. 287).

By its nature, missionary education was a reflection of the racial and political structure desired in that day. Mission schools and stations with White administrators at the top created a microcosm of society, with a strongly Euro- and Christian-centric order (Seroto, 2018, p. 7). One Swiss mission in particular emphasized the superiority of White Africans to Indigenous Africans, and the hierarchy of the school was intended to prejudice students and parishioners against their own identities (Seroto, 2018, p. 7). Their efforts were successful when students said they would prefer a White man to represent them in the national parliament, because he would better safeguard their interests than a traditional chief (Nwandula, 1988, p. 49; Seroto, 2018, p. 7).

In the same way, missionary education in Africa brought its own baggage. Missionary teachings, either at a conscious or subconscious level, implied Indigenous peoples were inadequate, incomplete, or undeveloped beings who required correction through the introduction of western knowledge (Seroto, 2018, p. 5). Colonizers in general accuse the colonized of any number of defects – laziness, drunkenness, backwardness, violence, ignorance, stupidity, bad luck, damnation – that only the intervention of the colonizer will correct, solve, or cure (Mpofu, 2013, pp. 109-110). African knowledge was distorted and trivialized, displaced and defaced in an effort

to replace African-ness with European propriety (Mpofu, 2013, p. 109). Colonial power structures not only scarred traditional relationships of authority, economy, and knowledge, but also a general understanding of being (Seroto, 2018, p. 5). And as a result, the self-image of Indigenous peoples suffered.

This was particularly evident in the sphere of education, where mission schools perpetuated an incompetent and ignorant self-image among the many Africans who did not, or could not, attend a school (Nwandula, 1988, p. 48). Those feelings of incompetence and ignorance attached to the commonsense knowledge of traditional cultures, and over time they negated it (Kallaway, 1984, p. 9). As a result, graduates of missionary education ran the risk of a learned ambivalence toward their own culture and traditions – if not an outright dislike for them – and a preference for the fixtures and features of the world of their oppressors (Kallaway, 1984, p. 9). In that way, missionary education not only incorporated the undermined into colonial society, but paved the way toward the undermining of as-yet unconquered groups, and the propagation of a “culture of silence” (Kallaway, 1984, p. 9; Molteno, 1983, p. 27). Where students learned the unequal state of affairs in South Africa as the natural order of things, they developed into people who would challenge neither the school, nor the underlying ideas of any social institution (Nwandula, 1988, p. 49).

British Educational Policy

This was exactly what the British colonial administration wanted. In spite of the historical division between British and Afrikaner contingents, the two communities united over efforts to keep economic and political power White (Dube, 1985, p. 87). The colony had been forced upon Indigenous Africans, through “fighting it, trading with it, worshipping its gods, and paying its rents and taxes” (Beinart, 1994, p. 25). To that end, a minimally educated Black population –

raised in the viewpoint of the oppressor, laboring for the oppressor, and following the oppressor's religion – would embrace the ideas, values, loyalties, and authorities that were consistent with the government's interest, rather than the traditional framework that supported a retention of land and identity (Molteno, 1983, p. 28).

“Peaceful Subjugation.” The Cape government openly embraced missionary education as a means of pacifying and subjugating Black African populations (Collins, 1983, p. 366; Molteno, 1983, p. 29). Examples abound: As far back as the first British occupation, government endorsement of missionary efforts – including the aforementioned van der Kemp mission – sought, at its core, to convince Indigenous residents to accept the encroachment of White farmers (Babb, 1984, p. 62). A few decades later, the new British authorities enjoined DRC and Lutheran clergymen to employ religious instructors in efforts to contain the spread of Islam among enslaved residents (Theal, 1898, vol. 6, p. 271). In 1854, incoming governor Sir George Grey explained that local populations were fated to become an integral part of the colony economy, as “useful servants, consumers of our goods, contributors to our revenue, in short, a source of strength and wealth to the Colony, such as Providence designed them to be” (Majeke, 1952, para. 7). A year later, Grey reminded legislators:

If we leave the natives beyond our border ignorant barbarians, they will remain a race of troublesome marauders. We should try to make them a part of ourselves, with a common faith and common interests, useful servants, consumers of our goods, contributors to our revenue. Therefore, I propose that we make unremitting efforts to raise the natives in Christianity and civilization, by establishing among them missions connected with industrial schools. (Rose & Tunmer, 1975, p. 205, as cited in Christie, 1985, p. 37)

Grey's hope was that “the native races beyond our boundary, influenced by our missionaries, in-

structed in our schools, benefiting by our trade, would not make wars on our frontiers” (Rose & Tunmer, 1975, p. 205, as cited in Christie, 1985, p. 37). He and his peers fully embraced the Victorian belief that humans could be perfected, and that Black Africans could be uplifted through assimilation: “That is, to ‘civilize’ the Africans by turning them into Black Europeans” (Appel, 1989, pp. 545-546).

The 1863 governorship likewise advocated the “peaceful subjugation” policy in the spread of British civilization, specifically through schooling that encouraged industrial skills for Black Africans in rural border areas, as a step toward political security and social progress (Majeke, 1952, para. 25). That administration, and others that followed it, believed the combined influence of missionary schools and military power would weaken resistance to subjugation, to the point where Black African communities would permit economic exploitation under the rule of Europeans (Babb, 1984, p. 279) – even describing how successful missionary education “acted like dynamite on tribal solidarity” (Molteno, 1983, p. 28).

Role of the Missionaries. This overlapped cleanly with the views of most missionaries of the day. For example, the Rev. John Philip, later the head of the London Missionary Society and one of the most influential evangelists in southern African history, explained in 1843 that liberal policies toward the Khoi would make them “more productive, there will be an increased consumption of British manufactures, taxes will be paid and farmers will have no cause to complain of a lack of labour” (Majeke, 1952, para. 8). More specific to the spread of the British domain:

While our missionaries are everywhere scattering the seeds of civilization ... they are extending British interest, British influences and the British empire. ... Wherever the missionary places his standard among the savage tribe, their prejudices against the colonial

government give way, their dependence upon the colony is increased by the creation of artificial wants. ... Industry, trade, and agriculture spring up. (Philip, 1828, p. 11)

Philip's other writings likewise seeped from the religious sphere into the political theater: "We have conquered some of the tribes in the Cape Colony, but the problem is how to govern them. We have to annex the territory up to the tropics. We have to establish a system of civil administration" (as cited in Tabata, 1974, p. 79). Philip also applied the language of imperialism to the spread of Christianity:

The progress of Christianity in Africa must be slow ... every new missionary establishment must keep what has been gained, while it is extending its conquests in the regions beyond it. The growth of Christianity ... should be like that of an empire; which is enriched and strengthened by every inch of new territory, which extends the line of its frontier. (Philip, 1833, pp. 25-26).

This reflexive use of religious and political language suggests Philip held the two areas in equal estimation, if not equal identity.

Education was only one of many social services that the colony government sought to leverage against Black African resistance (Molteno, 1983, p. 29; Seroto, 1999, p. 21). A deft politician, Grey explained in 1854 that the schooling campaign was part of a larger outreach to support Indigenous groups, even as he framed it as a tool for frontier subjugation.

The plan I propose to pursue with a view to the general adjustment of [frontier policy] is, to attempt to gain an influence over all the tribes included between the present north-eastern boundary of this colony ... by employing them upon public works, which will tend to open their country; by establishing institutions for the education of the children, and the relief of their sick; by introducing among them institutions of a civil character suited to

their present condition; and by these and other like means to attempt to win them to civilisation and Christianity; and thus to change by degrees our present unconquered and apparently irreclaimable foes into friends who may have common interests with ourselves.

(Rose & Tunmer, 1975, p. 204, as cited in Molteno, 1983, p. 29)

Later governments reiterated the need to include education among tools for border pacification.

In 1868, the superintendent-general of education for the Cape explained that “the spread of civilisation by school-instruction and the encouragement of industrial habits among the Natives in the Border districts, are of importance to the political security and social progress of the Colony”

(*Report of the Interdepartmental Committee on Native Education*, 1936, p. 12). The same official

later described schools for Black Africans as “hostages for peace” (*Report of the Interdepartmental Committee on Native Education*, 1936, p. 13), a perhaps surprising label to come from an education official.

Colonial Education Efforts. But to be clear, in its encouragement of missionary education, the colonial government expected to make only the minimum contribution. Unconvinced that schooling for non-European communities held any sway over their administrative responsibility, colony authorities in the early part of the 19th century assigned it a low priority (Molteno, 1983, p. 27). Mission schools “diffusing secular instruction” took on the task knowing that the government expected the work would “be carried out by themselves, irrespective of Government aid” (*Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. lviii). Observing the surge of missionary education, British administrators relaxed in the belief that Black African education could be left in the hands of religion (Christie, 1985, p. 37; Ludlow, 2017, p. 1238). Education for Indigenous groups was allowed to develop at its own slow rate under that laissez-faire arrangement for many years to come (Molteno, 1983, p. 27).

At the same time though, the British authorities made efforts to bolster the education system, in the humanitarian and egalitarian spirit of the era (Kaplan, 1971, p. 233; Ludlow, 2017, p. 1238). By 1812, disappointment in the state of schooling led the earliest British governors to establish a Bible and School Commission, a short-lived attempt to tie schools to churches in a way the scholars of previous centuries did (Malherbe, 1925, pp. 60-62; *Report of a Commission Appointed*, 1863, p. xxx). A year later the commission built a series of free English-medium “church clerk” schools in the Cape Town area, for needy students of any race or sex (Beck, 2014, p. 57; Ludlow, 2017, p. 1238). Plans called for English-language schools throughout the colony, and in the decade that followed, English-speaking teachers started free public schools for White Africans in developed areas, receiving a salary bonus for teaching to inland populations (Beck, 2014, p. 57). By 1839 the colony’s first formal Department of Education superseded the Bible and School Commission (Molteno, 1983, p. 27), and oversaw the “Established System” of English-medium government-run elementary schools, taught by well-qualified teachers and open to any student (Ludlow, 2017, p. 1238). Unfortunately these early public schools were slow to meet success, not because they were instruments of failed policies to anglicize South Africa, but because insufficient funding did not allow effective operation (Ludlow, 2017, p. 1238).

Ever distrustful, Afrikaans and DRC elements had by 1875 begun their own efforts to draw an educational line between English and Afrikaner. When a Dutch immigrant to South Africa wrote to the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1874 to suggest an Afrikaans translation, they referred him S. J. du Toit, a DRC minister outside Cape Town (Giliomee, 2004, p. 5). du Toit and his peers considered the proposal, but after discussion, they instead began efforts to leverage Afrikaans against the political, cultural, and economic dominance of the British (Giliomee, 2004, p. 5). Among those efforts was a curriculum intended to preserve the features of

Dutch schools seen in previous centuries, which evolved into one of the defining features of the next century: Christian National Education (Hexham, 1975, p. 112).

State Aid to Schools. The government took a new tack in 1841, and began grant disbursements to mission schools, the remaining church clerk schools, and small-scale farm schools (Ludlow, 2017, p. 1238; Molteno, 1983, p. 27) “for the schooling of children of the ‘poorer classes’ of any race” (Murphy, 1973, p. 61). Grants of £60 per year supplemented teacher salaries in schools, with the proviso that schools provided the buildings; that schools could be inspected by the new Department of Education; that secular subjects were to be included in addition to religion; and that English was to be taught, and if possible, to be the medium of instruction (Collins, 1983, p. 366; Malherbe, 1925, p. 116). Where government forays into English-medium public education had fizzled, new administrations found new ways to encourage the imperial language.

Some scholars considered this grant-in-aid system an acknowledgment of the work done by missionary segments (Leonie, 1965, p. 62), or believed it indicated missionary work was “valuable in pacification of African areas” (Kaplan, 1971, p. 233). However, others reversed that logic and noted that the heavy government investment in Black African education, through the instrument of mission schools, corresponded to an uptick in missionary schooling nationwide (Babb, 1984, p. 279; Collins, 1983, p. 366; Mahlangu, 1992, p. 27). In the years of government grants to missionary education, some of South Africa’s largest schools and stations got their start (Mahlangu, 1992, p. 27; Murphy, 1973, p. 61).

Education for Black Africans was primarily within mission schools in the years to come, drawing assistance from provincial sources, which were in turn funded by the central government (Jarvis, 1985, p. 32). At the same time, official policy in the early half of the 19th century pushed costs onto local populations, by granting municipal and representative governments

(Ludlow, 2017, p. 1238). Until 1841, most missionaries had only their local communities as a possible source of financial support (Murphy, 1973, p. 61), meaning funds were almost always tight (Molteno, 1983, p. 27). Through the decade, the price tag for Indigenous education had continued to mount, and by 1854 the colonial parliament applied a sense of thrift to the national education expenditure (Ludlow, 2017, p. 1238). The humanitarian egalitarianism that had been the earmark of education projects in the first half of the century gave way to a less empathetic and more economic tone (Ludlow, 2017, p. 1238). Through the end of the 19th century and well into the 20th, funding repeatedly became a difficulty for the central government, and over the same time frame, became unequal with regard to race (Babb, 1984, p. 279; Jarvis, 1985, p. 32).

As the government's *laissez-faire* stance shifted to one of detached interest, school quality showed little improvement. The "schools of subjugation" (Babb, 1984, p. 279) had low standards of teaching with little or no secondary education available, offered only the rare option of teacher training as a tertiary pursuit, and as mentioned, were available to only a "minute fraction" of Black African children (Molteno, 1983, p. 27). At the outset of the 20th century, only a "tiny percentage" of Black African students advanced past the first three years of schooling (Murphy, 1973, p. 64). In 1907, with the missionary school system entrenched for roughly a hundred years, the Cape government paid out £25,000 to educate 45,000 Black African children; analyses of previous years projected 60% of those students would never reach the third grade (Murphy, 1973, p. 64). Ironically, scholars of early 20th century felt the enthusiasm of missionaries and churches deserved credit that "coloured education was in this respect better off at the time," as it was unruffled by changes in policy at the arrival of each new governor (Malherbe, 1925, p. 71).

The grants-in-aid system signaled increased government involvement, but the system re-

mained a missionary undertaking, so that there was “neither a purely missionary system, nor a purely State system” for Black African education (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. v). Grey’s arrival in 1854 extended the government’s reach at his creation of a special fund for academic and industrial education for Black African areas (Mahlangu, 1992, p. 27), even as he made it clear that education was a weapon in the subjugation of original peoples (Molteno, 1983, p. 29; Seroto, 1999, p. 21). Grey also persuaded the London government to subsidize missionary schools that taught Black African youths to work as interpreters, schoolmasters, or evangelists in Indigenous communities (Seroto, 1999, p. 21), thereby redirecting the products of the missionary education system back into the target population. All the while, government funding continued to increase, and government involvement increased as well (Mahlangu, 1992, p. 27).

Contradictory Motives. Perhaps ironically, the cultivation of an educated African populace was neither in the interest of traditional African leadership, nor of the Cape Town government. Young Black Africans with their newly acquired education were capable of challenging the established leadership of the 1800s:

The Kaffirs see in the school the agency that weakens and then effaces all tribal bonds and customs. The levelling tendency of popular instruction is not consistent with their traditions, and the Chiefs specially watch the growth of schools with suspicion. (*Report of the Interdepartmental Committee on Native Education*, 1936, p. 13)

At the same time, the colonial administrators were equally suspicious of Black Africans pursuing a higher education (Christie, 1985, p. 38). Outwardly, British authorities worried missionary education would lift those students beyond their place both in White culture and their own, which in turn would expose them to the vices of White society:

To give a higher education to Kaffir boys and then to leave them isolated from their own people in thoughts and habits and to some extent in language, and without any prospect of useful and settled occupation in another sphere of labor is only to increase the existing temptation of the so-called school Kaffir to fall into the vices of the low Europeans with whom they come into contact. (Rose & Tunmer, 1975, p. 204, as cited in Collins, 1983, p. 368)

To prevent that, the government sought “native teachers” who lacked the desire to “elevate the individual too much above his fellows” (Rose & Tunmer, 1975, p. 204, as cited in Collins, 1983, p. 368).

There was obviously another motive at work here. Government officials were quick to explain that Black Africans with higher education would find no position in the colony to match their credentials.

For the educated Kaffir there is no opening; he may be qualified to fill the post of a clerk in a public office or mercantile house, but either there is no demand for such persons, or prejudice operates against persons of colour being so employed. (Rose & Tunmer, 1975, p. 204, as cited in Collins, 1983, p. 368)

As a consequence, missionaries had instructions to provide higher education only to a portion of Black African students, “to raise up among them what might be called an educated class, from which might be selected teachers of the young, catechists, evangelists and ultimately even fully-qualified preachers of the gospel” (Majeke, 1952, para. 25). This led to a segment of well-educated Black Africans fully qualified to work as teachers, clerks, and interpreters, with Black African teachers and missionaries receiving government grants in supplement of their salary or income (Christie, 1985, p. 38; Majeke, 1952, para. 25).

Non-racial Qualified Franchise. As that class grew, the government found itself in a dilemma: The Cape exercised a non-racial qualified franchise (Christie, 1985, p. 38). This meant that anyone, of any color, could vote in colonial proceedings so long as they held certain educational qualifications – meaning by the end of the 1800s, a considerable number of middle-class Black Africans held a voice in the government (Christie, 1985, p. 38). While the vast majority of Black Africans had no education and therefore posed no threat to colonial politics, these educated citizens enjoyed a measure of economic and political standing (Christie, 1985, p. 38). If missionary education continued to produce Black Africans with an input into, and an influence over, colony politics, the White minority ran the risk of losing ground.

The press to educate Black Africans – but not so far as to allow them to usurp the power of the White minority – presented an ethical paradox for many liberal South Africans of the day. At the close of the 19th century, testimony before government committees illustrated how this ideological conflict struggled at rational explanation.

I would not keep any form of education from the native, provided he showed a desire for it, and was able to pay for it. There is no form of education that I would prevent him from going on with. At the same time, I would consider it a waste of money to begin with higher education before you had laid the foundation of elementary and secondary education. (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, pp. 48-49)

Similarly reflective analyses of 18th-century education imply the state's growing involvement, coupled with a stronger interest on behalf of Indigenous populations, led to the expansion of the content available to Black African students (Malherbe, 1925, p. 458). In line with that, "Native Education," as politicians of the coming century would call it, had seen "more or less" adequate supervision and support, as successive governors assigned it a lower or higher priority during

their administrations (Malherbe, 1925, p. 458). This led into the recommendations of a 1908 government investigative committee to establish an institution of higher education specific to Black African students – who were otherwise seeking an education outside the country – with the caveat that “manual training be an integral part of the college course” (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, pp. xiii-xiv).

In some senses, the convenient partnership between the government and missionary education yielded what both groups were after, but in other ways it did not (Christie, 1985, p. 37). Colony authorities complained that missionary education too often emphasized religious content, and was not practical enough (Christie, 1985, p. 37). Missionaries, for their part, were more vexed by the bedeviling portions of European culture, complaining that Indigenous groups “have not only gained nothing by their intercourse with the colony, but they have greatly deteriorated” (Macmillan, 1963, p. 78).

By 1892, the de facto separation of the races in social, economic, or geographic terms had become so ingrained that racism was a hallmark of the education system (Dube, 1985, p. 91; Jarvis, 1985, p. 32). The arbitrary establishment of equal rights for Indigenous citizens displeased both Afrikaans- and English-speaking populations, and the role missionaries played in that event led many White South Africans to fear integrated education as a threat to their supremacy (Dube, 1985, p. 91).

At the same time, successful Black Africans were capable of finding employment of their preference, and were not satisfied with subsistence wages (Dube, 1985, p. 91). This placed educated Black Africans in a position to compete with White Africans, if not for specific jobs, then in comparable economic and social classes (Dube, 1985, p. 91). Perhaps worst of all, the specter of a multiracial society meant White Africans would realize their status as a minority, and poli-

tics would become the domain of Black Africans – a change that would likely expose past racial transgressions to international attention (Dube, 1985, p. 91). Racism had entered into the foundational agencies of society over the course of centuries, and its formal institutionalization was the only means of propagating the system that existed at beginning of the 20th century.

History would not allow the bureaucrat nor the evangelist a graceful exit from the 19th century: The discovery of diamonds in 1865 and gold in 1866 in the boer republics reversed the Cape's erstwhile indifferent posture toward the Afrikaner territories. In the space of mere decades, the subcontinent's headlong rush into mineral and industrial capitalism pressed all three groups – the British, the boers, and the Indigenous populations – into urbanized societies (Beck, 2014, p. 87-90; Collins, 1983, p. 370). Eager to capitalize on the sudden wealth, the British moved to draw the *voortrekker* nations within its holdings, putting both White belligerents on the war footing they had anticipated for nearly a hundred years (Beck, 2014, p. 87; Collins, 1983, p. 370). Before the close of the century, the English would first drive the Xhosa, then the Zulu and Tswana into submission before engaging in the short but painful South African War – a war triggered, in essence, by “the effects of gold” (Beinart, 1994, p. 61). From that conflict, Britain would emerge as the dominant force in the southern tip of the continent – for a very short period of time (Beck, 2000, p. xix; Beck, 2014, pp. 91-105).

The 20th Century

On May 31, 1910, Louis Botha became the first prime minister of the Union of South Africa, with Jan Smuts as his deputy (Beck, 2014, p. 112). Eight years earlier to the day, Botha, with Smuts in attendance, was a signatory to the Treaty of Vereeniging, surrendering republic military forces to the British and formally closing the South African War (Beck, 2014, p. 110). The curious twist that put two former Afrikaner generals in power over Britain's newest domin-

ion was just one of many threads of history that were poised to intertwine as South Africa entered the 20th century.

The South African War. The anglo-boer conflict opened with clear divisions. On one side, hardened boer frontiersmen were armed with little more than their “exceptional skill with weapons and in horsemanship,” and their instinct for a terrain “eminently suited to the tactics of the huntsman, the marksman, and the rider” (Doyle, 1902, p. 7). On the other were the might and resources of a centuries-old empire with holdings around the world. For two and a half years the republicans held their own against the British (Beck, 2000, pp. 92-93), earning their reputation as “the most formidable antagonist who ever crossed the path of Imperial Britain” (Doyle, 1902, p. 7). As one British author described it, “Napoleon and all his veterans have never treated us so roughly as these hard-bitten farmers with their ancient theology and their inconveniently modern rifles” (Doyle, 1902, p. 7).

Britain expected a quick end to the war, and early Afrikaner successes threw the empire onto its back foot (Beck, 2000, pp. 92-93). When it became clear that the war would continue beyond a few months, London responded decisively, deploying more and more resources to the arena, until it had committed 450,000 troops from its worldwide holdings – a force that at one point outstripped the Afrikaner contingent by a ratio of nearly 5 to 1 (Beck, 2000, p. 92). Swept backward by overwhelming numbers, republic forces fell into traditional *kommando* units: small-scale, horseback militia structures that had served as the boers’ defensive posture for hundreds of years (Beck, 2000, p. 38). Highly mobile and living off the land, boer kommandos could penetrate quickly and deeply into British territories, disrupt railway lines, raid supply depots, harass troop columns, or recruit sympathizers from local populations (Beck, 2000, p. 93). Both Smuts and Botha led kommandos during the war years (Beck, 2000, p. 93).

Britain eventually regained municipal points, but could not extinguish the kommandos in their rural advantage (Beck, 2000, p. 93). Faced with an elusive, mobile, and taxing enemy that refused to stand and fight, did not wear a uniform, and disappeared into the countryside, British commanders broke with convention and instead waged war against the entire boer population (Beck, 2000, p. 93). Nearly 3,700 miles of crisscrossed barbed wire fences were installed to curb the mobility of the horseback guerrillas, and a system of defensive blockhouses protected railway lines (Beck, 2000, pp. 93-94; Pretorius, 2009, p. 196). Captured boer combatants were “banished” – physically transplanted to elsewhere in the empire, slowly and permanently siphoning off the strength of the republics (Pretorius, 2009, p. 206). And the British had found support among Black and Coloured African populations, which further diminished the effects of kommando soldiery (Pretorius, 2009, p. 205).

The First “Total War.” The conflict became the century’s first “total war”: British troops destroyed tens of thousands of farmsteads, burned crops, and confiscated livestock (Beck, 2000, p. 93). Schools were closed, the republics’ departments of education shuttered, and classes came to a stop (Malherbe, 1925, p. 297). Women, children, and the elderly were imprisoned in concentration camps, and as the empire lacked the infrastructure for long-term care for more than 280,000 prisoners, disease ran rampant (Beck, 2000, p. 93; Walker, 1957, p. 498). Scholars estimated 28,000 White prisoners – more than three-fourths of those children – died of dysentery, pneumonia, or measles, and casualties among Black African prisoners numbered 14,000 or more (Beck, 2000, pp. 93-94; Walker, 1957, p. 498). Understandably, the tragedy of the concentration camps and the destruction of homesteads “left a deep mark on the Afrikaner consciousness” (Walker, 1957, p. 498). But even from the empire’s standpoint, the camps were a titanic failure: In essence, “the British cared for the women and children” – albeit poorly – “while the men

fought” (Walker, 1957, pp. 498-499). That realization, plus the outcry among boer sympathizers and humanitarians outside South Africa, did much more than just “leave a bitter memory in the Afrikaner community” (Beck, 2000, p. 94).

By 1902, only about 22,000 Afrikaner soldiers continued the fight, many of them exhausted and hungry, having lost their conviction, their farms, their families, and even their mounts: By war’s end, nearly a third of the kommandos were horseless, and republic officers acknowledged that “without a horse, the Boer is useless as a fighter” (Beck, 2000, p. 94; Pretorius, 2009, p. 210). In mid-May of that year, a representative body of Afrikaner officers met in Pretoria to determine if the end of their struggle had come (Pretorius, 2009, pp. 198-199). As one representative put it,

It is argued that we must fight to the bitter end. ... I think each one must decide that for himself. It must be borne in mind that everything – cattle, goods, money, man, woman and child – has been sacrificed. In my division many people go almost naked. ... Is this not the bitter end? (Kestell & van Velden, 1912, pp. 88-89)

Botha was likewise concerned at the prospect of continued battle.

It has been said that we must fight “to the bitter end,” but no one tells us where that bitter end is. Is it there where everyone lies in his grave or is banished? In my opinion we must not consider the time when everyone lies in his grave as the “bitter end.” If we do so, and act upon that view, we become the cause of the death of our people. (Kestell & van Velden, 1912, p. 84)

The final debate began on May 29, with three possibilities put before the officers: continued conflict, acceptance of British terms, or unconditional surrender (Pretorius, 2009, p. 202). Three days of debate yielded a series of incontrovertible facts: British tactics had devastated the re-

sources and means for boer farmers; concentration camps had subjected women and children to unthinkable conditions that inflicted disease and death; Black Africans had contributed to the war, largely on the side of the British; further proclamations threatened to confiscate boer properties; boers taken prisoner were physically removed from the colony, thereby draining republic forces; and finally, the overwhelming odds gave no prospect for reasonable victory (Pretorius, 2009, pp. 205-206). The conclusion was therefore inevitable:

This Meeting is therefore of opinion that there is no reasonable ground to expect that by carrying on the war the People will be able to retain their independence, and considers that, under the circumstances, the People are not justified in proceeding with the war, since such can only tend to the social and material ruin, not only of ourselves, but also of our posterity. Forced by the above-mentioned circumstances and motives, this Meeting instructs both Governments to accept the proposal of His Majesty's Government, and to sign the same on behalf of the People of both the Republics. (Kestell & van Velden, 1912, p. 205)

At a vote of 54 to 6, Botha and his peers signed the Treaty of Vereeniging on May 31, 1902, in what has been labeled as a "humiliating" defeat (Pretorius, 2009, p. 196).

Terms of the Treaty. However, the treaty itself contributed as much to the formation of the union as it did to governments that followed it. With the agreement, the British imagined a White-ruled South Africa much like contemporaneous Canada or Australia, where imperial ties could be maintained, and Indigenous populations could be ignored (Beck, 2000, p. 96). Indeed, the interests of the huge majority of inhabitants – which is to say, Africans of color – were completely dismissed in the treaty and the subsequent unionization (Dube, 1985, pp. 87-88). Rather, the treaty made provisions for eventual self-rule and delayed the question of political status for

Black Africans until that time (Beck, 2000, p. 96). Knowing now that the union government would take two Afrikaner generals as its first leaders means that, through the treaty, London effectively abandoned any century-long humanitarian efforts that may have guided race relations in South Africa (Beck, 2000, p. 96). Once again, the two White communities had found a common interest in the suppression of their neighbors (Dube, 1985, p. 87).

The treaty did accede some important points – republican forces would lay down their arms, citizens could retain firearms with a license, banished prisoners would be repatriated, no special taxes would be levied, and no criminal or civil action would be taken against boer combatants (*Peace treaty of Vereeniging*, 1902, pp. 1-2). More relevant to the immediate needs of the farmers, a restoration fund of £3 million provided support to “those who, owing to war losses, are unable to provide for themselves” – including food, shelter, seeds, and farming implements, as such things were “indispensable to the resumption of their normal occupations” (*Peace treaty of Vereeniging*, 1902, p. 3; Walker, 1957, p. 504).

The remaining point of the treaty seemed innocent, but snowballed into the defining feature of the century. The Vereeniging agreement conceded that Dutch would be taught in schools where parents desired it, and would be allowed in courts of law “when necessary for the better and more effectual Administration of Justice” (*Peace treaty of Vereeniging*, 1902, p. 3). On the surface this appeared to put an end to century-long attempts to anglicize the colony, but within a few years, the issue had boiled over once more. Both sides moved to limit the other: British officials blatantly reneged on the terms of the treaty (Beinart, 1994, p. 70) even as former republics enacted provincial-level laws restricting English use in class (Brand, 1909, p. 11). In 1905, authorities mandated English as the medium of instruction, with Dutch limited to only five hours per week (Beck, 2000, p. 96; Walker, 1957, p. 513). A 1907 education act further complicated the

issue, no longer requiring Dutch-speaking children to be taught in English below Standard 3, but fixing English as the medium in all but two subjects in each standard thereafter (Cowlin, 2018, p. 52; Walker, 1957, p. 542). Worse, the English language determined promotion from standard to standard, effectively making it, once again, a compulsory subject for the Afrikaner (Shingler, 1974, p. 109). Like the anglicization efforts of the previous century, these attempts backfired – this time, catastrophically.

Cultural and Political Redefinition. With this fresh insult, and with the war in recent memory, Afrikaner nationalism rebounded (Beck, 2000, p. 96). Defeated on the battlefield, the conflict had nonetheless “taught the Afrikaners they were a people,” and they proceeded to re-define themselves along cultural, then political lines (Walker, 1957, p. 513). Afrikaners had appealed to Holland as early as the war era for help in establishing private Dutch schools, and now, as a counter to the English-medium schools, the Dutch counterpart followed a curriculum entitled *Christelike Nasionale Onderwijs* – Christian National Education (CNE) (Walker, 1957, p. 514). Those events now within recent memory, Malherbe (1925, p. 321) insisted prejudice toward English was not the motivation for the schools. Instead, parents worried that neglect of Afrikaans would allow their children’s education to suffer, “by having to be taught the rudiments of knowledge through the medium of an unknown language” (Malherbe, 1925, p. 321). In post-war years, the CNE structure had evolved to include a curriculum and examining board, with roughly 200 schools in the two ex-republics organized under a Central Committee, and each school advised by boards elected by parents (Malherbe, 1925, p. 322; Walker, 1957, p. 514). Seeing an entire privatized school system evolve without their oversight, the government used the same 1907 act that made concessions for language in lower grades as an effort to establish government oversight for CNE schools (Malherbe, 1925, p. 12), with lukewarm results. While

nowhere near the span of centuries of missionary education, these schools still demonstrated the Afrikaners' resolve to defend their culture, tradition, and language (Beck, 2000, p. 96), and within decades CNE would pervade South African education, society, economics, culture, policy, politics, government, and history – even through to the 21st century.

As a precursor to self-government, elections were held in the conquered boer republics, as well as in the Cape (Beck, 2000, p. 96). In 1907, Botha and Smuts, the former Afrikaner generals, won elections in the Transvaal Colony, and in the Orange Free Colony the pre-war president and a signatory to the Treaty of Vereeniging were victorious (Beck, 2000, pp. 96-97). Less than a year later, anti-imperial sentiment won out in the Cape, leaving only the Natal colony in the southeast of the subcontinent aligned with Britain – even as a liberal government in London prepared to make good on the promise of self-rule (Beck, 2000, pp. 96-97). So it was that just five years after the close of the war, both of the former republics were again ruled by Afrikaners and a third colony showed solidarity, owing in part to post-war backlash (Beck, 2000, p. 97).

A federal government was in the interest of all four colonies, regardless of their leanings (Beck, 2000, p. 98). A central entity could regulate rail services, manage trade, exact tariffs, and perhaps most importantly, legislate supremacy for White citizens at a national level (Beck, 2000, p. 98). At the same time though, the remnants of colonial British administration hoped to strengthen imperial influence in South Africa, while Afrikaner leaders hoped to weaken it (Beck, 2000, p. 98). An inter-colonial convention began work toward a draft constitution for a united South Africa in May 1908, with a total of 30 delegates – all White males, 16 of British descent and the remainder Afrikaners – meeting in October of the same year (Beck, 2000, p. 98; Walker, 1957, pp. 531-532). The convention deliberated on federal versus unitary government, franchise, electoral allocation, and the status of Dutch and English languages, with a draft constitution com-

pleted in May 1909 (Beck, 2000, p. 98). That draft became the South Africa Bill, which British parliament enacted without changes, and which gained royal assent in September of that year (Beck, 2000, p. 98).

In its final form, the constitution established a strong central government with each colony allowed only provincial powers (Beck, 2000, p. 98). Parliament was split into a Senate and a House of Assembly, with executive powers in a governor-general who represented the British Crown, and a prime minister accountable to the Parliament of South Africa (Beck, 2000, p. 98). In an attempt to spread the power across competing colonies, the legislature resided in Cape Town, with the judicial seat a thousand miles away in Bloemfontein, and the executive and civil service branches in Pretoria, another 300 miles further north (Beck, 2000, p. 98; Walker, 1957, p. 535).

Unionization. Retrospect allows us to connect the union constitution to later events of the 20th century. Dutch and English – but no other languages – were given equal weight at the union level (Beck, 2000, p. 98), thereby improving Afrikaner access to the new machinery of state (Beinart, 1994, p. 76). There was no bill of rights, and nearly any article of the constitution could be amended or altered with only a simple parliamentary majority (Beck, 2000, p. 98). This negated the judiciary's power, and allowed a majority party a free hand to implement rules and regulations unchecked (Beck, 2000, p. 98). Until unionization, the right to vote varied from colony to colony: Non-European citizens had no franchise in either of the former boer republics, with only limited representation in the southeast (Beck, 2000, p. 99). In the former Cape Colony, any adult male could vote, provided they met criteria for property or earnings (Beck, 2000, p. 99). With an impasse looming between the ex-republics and the Cape, a compromise was reached: Provinces could establish their own franchise laws, but entry into the Parliament of

South Africa was restricted to White Africans (Beck, 2000, p. 99). Naturally this drew fire from political organizations representing racial groups, and in an attempt to answer that criticism, the union “entrenched” the Cape franchise for Black Africans, legislating that it could not be removed without a two-thirds majority of both houses (Beck, 2000, p. 98).

In spite of that “entrenched clause,” the constitution erased any effective representation for non-European populations, and gave White Africans – themselves a racial minority by any calculation – a monopoly on political power (Beck, 2000, pp. 101, 99). Electoral allotment further anchored White influence on government, applying a simple formula to seats in the lower house of parliament, dividing a province’s allocation by the number of voters and permitting a sway of 15% up or down, depending on population density or sparsity (Beck, 2000, p. 99; Walker, 1957, p. 534). “Weighting” constituencies favored rural areas, where fewer voters held representation equal to larger numbers in urban areas (Beck, 2000, p. 99). As Afrikaner political parties held a larger share of the rural White vote, weighting became a critical factor in the 1948 election that ushered in the apartheid era (Beck, 2000, p. 99).

With a constitution that ignored racial majority populations and a government intended to enshrine White politics, Botha took office as the first prime minister a year after London gave its blessing to self-rule (Beck, 2000, p. 98). Less than a decade after the submission at Vereeniging, South Africa was a British dominion, but Afrikaners held political power – not just over their former republics, but now the entire nation (Beck, 2000, p. 98). Black Africans had no political power, no voice in the government, and continued to suffer racial discrimination and economic exploitation at the hands of a White minority (Beck, 2000, p. 98).

The Union Era

A long list of issues awaited the opening of the union parliament. Finance between the

central government and the provinces needed clarification (Walker, 1957, p. 539). South Africa's status as a dominion, as opposed to a republic, needed debate as well (Beck, 2000, p. 103). Provincial laws needed consolidation under the new system (Walker, 1957, p. 539). Perhaps the largest and most convoluted topic was the "race question," which sought to find a common ground between the two White subcultures, but also implied the "native problem" – the role Black South Africans could play in the new society (Beck, 2000, p. 103). As those issues, as well as their political and economic contexts, affected the administration of education for Black Africans, those topics must be discussed, along with the issues they imply: language, finance, and perhaps curiously, White labor (Beck, 2000, p. 103; Davis, 1984b, p. 135; Walker, 1957, p. 539).

White Labor. The last point perhaps deserves attention first. The prosperity of the South African economy owed much of its success to the gold industry, and the industry owed much of its success to the abundance of Black African laborers – this in turn derived partly from rural poverty, and partly from the centuries-old missionary efforts to instill "needs" and "wants" (Beck, 2014, pp. 111-112; Comaroff & Comaroff; 1989, p. 281). English-speakers initially saw most of that prosperity, as they formed the majority of the commercial, industrial, and financial sectors (Beck, 2014, pp. 111-112). Afrikaans-speaking White Africans were still primarily farmers, but were losing ground – not just metaphorically in the aftermath of the South African War, but also literally, to devastating droughts in the 1880s, and to commercial agricultural enterprises that drove them off their land in the early 1900s (Beck, 2014, pp. 111-112; Dube, 1985, p. 92). Rather than perform common farm labor – "kaffir work," as they called it – they became "poor whites" instead (Beck, 2014, pp. 111-112).

This largely unskilled and largely uneducated labor pool migrated to urban areas, and

competed with Black Africans for work (Beck, 2014, pp. 111-112). Through the 1910s and 1920s, as many as 200,000 Black Africans were employed in the mining industry alone, with another 100,000 in co-located non-mining positions (Beinart, 1994, pp. 106, 98). In 1913 and 1914, White mine workers struck to protest working conditions and competition from Black Africans – and in both years, the government broke the strikes with force (Beck, 2000, pp. 106-107; Shingler, 1974, p. 10). Through the first World War, while White mine workers fulfilled military obligations, Black Africans and White migrants from rural areas took over semiskilled and supervisory positions (Beck, 2000, pp. 107-108). Inflation soared and production costs rose, but gold prices remained low, leading mine owners to replace expensive, semiskilled White laborers with Black Africans, who could be legally paid less under a wage bar (Beck, 2000, p. 107). As a compromise in the ensuing dispute, mine owners proposed hiring arrangements that favored White workers, but in 1922 gold prices fell again, and the owners withdrew their deal (Beck, 2000, p. 108). The strike that ensued took on a revolutionary tone, and was again put down through force (Beck, 2000, p. 108; Shingler, 1974, p. 10).

Into the 1930s and 1940s, manufacturing gained further prominence in the Union of South Africa, over agriculture and minerals (Collins, 1983, p. 372; Davis, 1984b, p. 134). This led to continued urbanization, with White migrants, again protected by color and wage bars, moving into cities while Black Africans took the least-skilled positions (Collins, 1983, p. 372). In doing so, impoverished White Africans became a visible reminder of the toll of rapid industrialization, and threatened the collective myth of White superiority (Willoughby-Herard, 2003, p. 7). Even as early as 1913, education pundits realized providing primary education alone could not guarantee graduates would enter the White labor aristocracy (Berger, 1983, p. 155).

The Carnegie Investigation. Against this backdrop, and in the years leading into the

Great Depression, the Carnegie Investigation into Poverty began its examination of the “poor white problem,” culminating in the 1932 report that labeled roughly 300,000 of the 1.8 million White South Africans as “paupers” (Beck, 2000, p. 109; Willoughby-Herard, 2003, p. 4). Nearly 50,000 families received questionnaires through the study, and 17,000 children were given intelligence tests across 170 schools in the Cape, Natal, and the Transvaal (Fleisch, 1995a, p. 10; Willoughby-Herard, 2003, p. 4). The report underscored the effects of isolation and impoverishment on rural White women and children (Beinart, 1994, p. 115) – a holdover from the common myth that the *voortrekkers* were alone in the migration of a hundred years earlier (Beinart, 1994, p. 45). As a solution, the report recommended social welfare and education programs that would allow women to play a role in the construction of a new Afrikaner nation (Beinart, 1994, p. 115). Even so, the investigators dwelt on the enduring social legacy of the Great Trek in their efforts to explain how the urban and industrial society had dispossessed the Afrikaner people (Beinart, 1994, p. 46). In one way, the intellectuals who guided the research team demonstrated a commitment to early forms of social work, but at the same time, their adherence to Afrikaner nationalism meant they “struggled over the theories, cultural markers, and social policies that would mar South Africa’s political order for four decades” (Willoughby-Herard, 2003, p. 6).

Answerable only to the White population, the political trend of pandering to the racial minority continued throughout this time frame (Beck, 2000, pp. 108-109). Politicians responded to the “poor white” problem with an agenda that gave preference to that specific demographic, often at the expense or to the detriment of Black South Africans. The aforementioned wage bars were one example; others included social welfare programs only for White Africans, reserved job positions, or White-only subsidies and loans (Beck, 2000, p. 109; Beck, 2014, p. 112). Pro-Afrikaner policies worked to specifically improve conditions for that 55% of the electorate

(Beck, 2000, p. 108; Beck, 2014, p. 112); for example, an Inspectorate of White Labour substituted White counterparts for South Africans of color on public works projects, such as road and rail construction, or even in skilled positions such as cabinetry (Willoughby-Herard, 2003, p. 1). And yet, in spite of modest improvements over the four decades of union rule, conditions for rural and urban Afrikaners continued their hundred-year slide (Beck, 2000, p. 109; Beck, 2014, p. 112).

The Afrikaner Broederbond. During the same time frame, subversive Afrikaner movements reappeared at intervals, in hopes of splintering or dismantling the union. During the first World War, a rebellion by former republic generals was quickly stamped out (Shingler, 1974, p. 11). In 1919, a nationalist contingent, led by one signatory to the Treaty of Vereeniging and one future prime minister of the apartheid government, attended the Versailles Conference in hopes of dissolving the fledgling union (Shingler, 1974, p. 11). In the 1930s and 1940s Afrikaner nationalism reached a peak, in part due to the clandestine work of the *Afrikaner Broederbond*, a quasi-secret society advancing Afrikaner interests, which began in the wake of World War I as a modest organization seeking preservation of Afrikaner language and culture (Beck, 2000, p. 110). Over time, the *Broederbond* conspired to place members in key positions nationwide, thereby dominating government and society (The Education League, 1949, p. 28). A narrow vote put South Africa on the side of the Allies in the second World War (Beinart, 1994, p. 117), but even so, breakaway efforts continued during that conflict, including a pro-Nazi paramilitary group that capitalized on a minority of Afrikaners who sympathized with fascism and national socialism (Beck, 2000, pp. 112, 121; Bloomberg, 1990, p. 2; Shingler, 1974, p. 11). While Afrikaner separatists were never a serious threat to the union, there existed a clear undercurrent of distinction between Afrikaans-speaking White Africans and their English-speaking brethren

(Beck, 2000, p. 110; Shingler, 1974, p. 12).

As was the case so many times in the past, the two groups found common purpose in the repression of people of color (Dube, 1985, p. 87). South Africa was moving quickly toward an urban and industrial nation in the first third of the 20th century; in 1904, 22% of the total population resided in urban areas, and in 1936 that had grown to 31%, with two-thirds of the White and Indian African populations in towns (Beinart, 1994, p. 47). The urban Black population tripled between 1921 and 1946, and in that last year, almost one in four Black Africans lived in urban areas (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 65). City residents had a far greater average income per capita, implying the urban markets were more important than those percentages suggest (Beinart, 1994, p. 47).

Foundations for Apartheid. The 1921 census estimated 1.5 million of South Africa's residents were European, and 5.4 million were non-European, with more than two-thirds of that number in the Black African population (Macmillan, 1963, p. 20). Plainly outnumbered, the centuries-old Afrikaner fear that equality would upend racial superiority drove the central government. Between 1910 and 1924, the union government – still under the direction of Botha, but later Smuts – enabled much of the legislation that would form the underpinnings of the apartheid regime (Beck, 2000, p. 113). In quick succession, the rights and opportunities for Black Africans were systematically altered, curtailed, or eliminated at a national level, beginning with the Mines and Works Act of 1911, which reserved jobs for White Africans in mines and railroads nationwide (Beck, 2000, p. 113). In 1913, the Natives' Land Act limited land ownership for Black Africans to a series of homeland reserves – commonly referred to in later years as “Bantustans” – comprising a mere 7% of the Union's total area (Beck, 2000, p. 113). A 1936 act expanded that to roughly 13% of the union area, but with prime properties already owned by White farmers or

mines (Beck, 2000, p. 113). Mathematically this suggests that 87% of the nation's land area was in possession of 15% of its population, but that number is "misleading," because it does not take into account unproductive areas, or variations in ownership and demographics (Dubow, 2014, p. 11). In 1923, pass laws, much like those the British used to hook Khoi into White farm labor, reappeared under the Urban Areas Act (Beck, 2000, p. 113; Beck, 2014, p. 55). Implying that municipal areas were reserved for White citizens and Black Africans could only enter for reasons of work, the law also established townships in close proximity to urban centers, and allowed unemployed Black Africans to be deported to the Bantustans (Beck, 2014, pp. 113-114).

The disenfranchisement of Black Africans continued in following decades, with a 1927 Native Administration Act giving the central government a free hand to legislate against Black Africans without the need to involve parliament (Beck, 2000, p. 114). It also allowed the governor-general to appoint chiefs or headmen, relocate entire ethnic groups, and redraw tribal boundaries (Beck, 2000, p. 114). As a final stroke, the Native Representation Act of 1936 stripped Black Africans residing in the Cape province of their right to vote, allowing them to instead elect a White representative to the Senate or House of Assembly (Beck, 2000, p. 114). Only 10 years shy of the apartheid government, many of the limitations associated with that regime were already in place.

Native Education

While South Africa drifted into legislated segregation, its school system already bore the hallmarks of a nation split by race. For White students, universal schooling and compulsory education between the ages of seven and 16 years was introduced gradually beginning in 1905, but the law did not apply to populations of color – suggesting another instance of institutionalized racism and the education of "children for the aims and objects of imperialist exploitation"

(Chisholm, 2012, p. 84; Dube, 1985, p. 93; Ford, 1931, p. 12). Within the same time frame, local school control and language parity between Dutch and English became the norm for White populations (Walker, 1957, p. 541). White communities could exercise their traditional role in teacher selection, although education departments, school boards, and local school committees shared in that process (Chisholm, 2012, p. 84). Per capita, the state regularly outspent schooling for Black African students in favor of White students between 1930 and 1945 by a factor of 10 to one (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 62), and legislators argued for limits to the amount paid for Black African schooling (*Debates of the House of Assembly*, 1937, col. 5927). Hand in hand with those developments, Dutch schools and Christian National Education continued to evolve.

Administration. But the arrival of the union had little to no impact on education for Black African students (Malherbe, 1925, p. 459). While the act of union itself made all matters relating to Black Africans a national concern, education for the same population was relegated to the provinces – a demotion that would remain in place for another 35 years (Davis, 1984b, p. 127; Malherbe, 1925, p. 459). Throughout the transition from colony to union, Black Africans were not treated as equal subjects with regard to school administration, but instead were treated as a disadvantaged group of second-class citizens (Davis, 1984b, p. 127). By the mid-1920s, each of the four provinces had established sub-departments for Black African schools within their existing departments of education, directed by chief inspectors of native education (Davis, 1984b, p. 131). Education boards, generally comprised of White missionaries who were usually acquainted with conditions in Black African schools, advised the provincial administrators (Davis, 1984b, p. 131). In some cases, Black Africans with close ties to missions or churches sat on the boards as well (Davis, 1984b, p. 131).

Criticisms. Handed down to lower authorities, education for Black Africans continued in

its missionary character until the 1950s, albeit with slow government encroachment (Collins, 1983, p. 373). The collective references to “native education” in previous centuries slowly ossified into “Native Education” around 1920 (Dube, 1985, p. 93), the same year the central government took a firmer grip on education policy for Black Africans with the establishment of the Union Native Affairs Commission (Davis, 1984b, p. 128). Meanwhile, mission schools continued in the same manner as past centuries, with few changes. Mission societies propagated their objectives through Black African pastors and teachers at times, but with the exception of the Cape, where some Black African ministers ran schools, school leaders were predominantly White (Collins, 1983, p. 372; Davis, 1984b, p. 132). Depending on the school, there may or may not have been a local school committee; where one existed its role was strictly advisory (Davis, 1984b, p. 132). To be sure, missions were not the only source of schooling for Black Africans in this era: A small number of state, community, and tribal schools also offered education (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 62). But regardless of supervisory agency, facilities were handicapped by segregation, underfunding, and regulations that differed from White schools (Davis, 1984b, p. 128). In that sense, missionary education continued through the first half of the 20th century much as it had in the two centuries previous – as isolated educational enclaves, with no standardization or administrative arrangements short of denominational allegiances, under government policies designed to perpetuate racial inequality (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 62; Jarvis, 1985, p. 32).

By the 1920s and 1930s, critics had already begun to deride missionary education as “in every respect very unsatisfactory” (Malherbe, 1925, p. 343). Rapid social changes had highlighted the plight of urban Black Africans, as well as the emergence of a mission-educated Black African intelligentsia, and as a result, interest in education for “natives” increased (Cross, 1986,

p. 189). In previous decades, the shortcomings of missionary education had been discussed, and although education officials acknowledged defects, they were keen to place some blame on decade after decade of halfhearted colonial reforms.

The real fact is that the missionaries have done what the Government did not do. The Government, at some stage or other in the history of the country, should have taken up this question of native education, and formed something like a definite policy regarding it, and pursued that policy. They let it alone. The missionaries developed it on their own lines, namely, on the lines that the children should be able to read and write a little, so that they might be good members of their church, and so forth; and then, after the missionaries had done all this, the Government came in and was naturally saddled with what was really missionary education. (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, pp. 24-25)

This neatly summarized the failure of centuries of independently administered, religious-based education. Even as South Africa lurched into an industrial, urbanized society, development in education for Black Africans was slow (Collins, 1983, p. 372; Troup, 1976, p. 14). In 1905, only 2.1% of the entire Black African population was in school, and none of those beyond primary school (Troup, 1976, p. 14). Twenty years later, school attendance reached 4.1%, with a little more than 3,750 post-primary students (Troup, 1976, p. 14). In the first decade of the 20th century, five Black African students graduated post-primary classes; between 1910 and 1920, a total of 22 graduated (Troup, 1976, p. 14). Very few Black Africans in rural areas were educated, and almost no Black African workers in urban areas were receiving any education; those who did were likely only getting general or fundamental schooling (Collins, 1983, p. 372). In 1907, more than 900 Black Africans were enrolled to become teachers in the coastal colonies (Murphy, 1973,

p. 64), but aside from missionary programs to train teachers, only one mission in the entire sub-continent offered higher education to Black African students that year (Murphy, 1973, p. 64). This omission of higher education was remedied in one small respect with the opening of the South African Native College in 1916 (Cook, 1949, p. 351), but it remained the sole option for secular university education for many decades to come.

Finance. Funding became a constant stressor. By and large, schooling for Black Africans was under the control of missions receiving state aid, and at the inception of the union, each province funded Black African schools from its own tax revenues (Davis, 1984b, pp. 132, 129). When the Transvaal province enacted a direct levy against Black Africans for education, the central government responded with the Financial Relations Act of 1922, which removed the right of the provinces to tax Black Africans, and returned that role to the central government (Davis, 1984b, p. 129; Malherbe, 1925, p. 459). In effect, funding for “native education” became the full responsibility of the union government (Davis, 1984b, p. 129; Malherbe, 1925, p. 459). Three years later, the Parliament of South Africa earmarked part of its general fund for Black African education, relieving the provinces of spending any of their own revenue on education for students of color, and taking over some of the burden of teacher salaries from churches (Davis, 1984b, p. 129; Leonie, 1965, p. 62).

But that amount was fixed, and then supplemented with a proportion of national taxes paid by Black South Africans (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 62). Growth easily outpaced those static government allotments: Black African enrollment increased more than threefold between 1925 and 1945, placing a strain on mission resources (Chisholm, 2012, p. 84; Davis, 1984b, p. 130). Education for Black Africans quickly slipped into an ongoing state of financial crisis (Davis, 1984b, p. 130), a fact complicated by a union government that pursued no educational

goals beyond what it inherited from two centuries of colonialism (Collins, 1983, p. 372). As late as 1943, critics alternated between “appalling” and “pitiful” to describe classrooms, teacher salaries, and teaching equipment under Native Education; “the teachers are seriously overloaded, and one teacher will occasionally be found to be teaching from eighty to one hundred pupils in two or three different standards all in the same room” (Horrell, 1963, p. 55, as cited in Dube, 1985, p. 94).

Curriculum. As finance shifted to a national level, curriculum came into focus. Both the Transvaal and the Orange Free State had published provincial curricula specific to Black African students by 1919 (Malherbe, 1925, p. 459), but none of the provinces wandered far from the curriculum established for White students in their versions for Black Africans, except in the medium of instruction at the lower levels (Davis, 1984b, p. 132). In 1922, a formalized national curriculum was available for Native Education (Cook, 1949, p. 351); in later union years, as mission schools continued to accept state funds, they begrudgingly adopted the national curriculum as well (Chisholm, 2012, p. 85).

Disparities. But as the union matured, conditions stagnated, and the disparities between Native Education and White African education grew stronger. Native Education called for Black African children to begin school at age six; White students began at five (Dube, 1985, p. 94). White children spent a year in preschool, but Black African children had to spend two years in preschool before beginning primary lessons (Dube, 1985, p. 94). On average, Black African children needed 13 years of schooling to qualify for university entrance; White students needed 11 (Dube, 1985, p. 94). Finally, the syllabus for Black African students was disjointed and culminated in general education, with little content in mathematics or science, while the syllabus for White learners included both of those topics from primary school onward, and closed with prepa-

rations for university (Dube, 1985, p. 94).

In that sense, the defining characteristic of Native Education was its unbalanced nature: The content was unbalanced, its financing was unbalanced, and the curriculum was unbalanced. Even its administration was unbalanced, in the sense that sub-departments in each provincial department of education managed schooling for Black African students, but the central government footed the bill.

Welsh Commission. It is no wonder that South Africa's ongoing preoccupation with the "native problem" produced a string of commissions that hoped to "solve" it, perhaps the most significant of those being the Interdepartmental Committee on Native Education of 1936 (Jarvis, 1985, p. 33). Informally entitled the Welsh Commission, the committee investigated whether the union should adopt full administration of Black African education, as well as its direct financing (Jarvis, 1985, p. 33). The commissioners reported a considerable number of arguments in complete opposition to Native Education, in any degree.

From the evidence before the Committees it seems clear that there still exists opposition to the education of the native on the grounds that (a) it makes him lazy and unfit for manual work; (b) it makes him cheeky and less docile as a servant; and (c) it estranges him from his own people and often leads him to despise his own culture. ... Those who bring forward such criticisms in some cases add that it is not to education as such that they object, but to the wrong (present) type of education. While these criticisms of the present system are not without foundation, the aim that most of such critics have at the back of their minds is that we must give the Native an education which will keep him in his place.

(Report of the Interdepartmental Committee on Native Education, 1936, p. 86)

Many of these "criticisms" of Native Education would resurface in coming decades, as underpin-

nings to apartheid's brand of education for Black African students.

The commission also examined the relationship between the state and missionary bodies, plus the aims, scopes, and methods of education (Jarvis, 1985, p. 33). The prospect of transfer of mission schools to central authority was not a new idea; the proposal had been debated in conferences and appeared in journals in colonial times, and was an ongoing topic through to the 1950s (Chisholm, 2017, p. xix). More contentious though, was the process of the transfer, and the form state oversight would take (Chisholm, 2017, p. 9). Inspectors in favor of state control challenged missionary notions by putting temporal needs over spiritual priorities, at the same time coming ominously close to a system that placed Black African schooling on par with that of White students (Chisholm, 2017, p. 9). On the other hand, segregationists – which included E. G. Malherbe and his contemporaries – felt an umbrella native affairs department would allow the management of the economic, political, and social issues of Black Africans as a whole (Chisholm, 2017, p. 9).

The report offered a stark assessment of missionary education. Students attended school on average less than three years, and a majority did not continue school beyond Standard 1 (Mahlangu, 1992, p. 34). Approximately 70% of Black African children were not in schools, and thousands more who wanted education could not get it because a lack of facilities (Mahlangu, 1992, p. 34). Funding, as discussed earlier, was woefully insufficient; White children received educational support in a far greater amount than their Black African peers (Malherbe, 1992, pp. 33-34). Schools were overcrowded and understaffed (Dube, 1985, p. 94; Mahlangu, 1992, p. 34). Rather than turn away students where schools lacked teachers, missionary societies would hire teachers, many of whom “knew little more than the pupils,” at a trivial salary (Dube, 1985, p. 94; Msomi, 1978, p. 45, as cited in Mahlangu, 1992, p. 34). Among other suggestions, such as the

use of the vernacular in early grades, the committee ultimately recommended a full union takeover of education for Black South Africans – a recommendation which was never acted upon (Jarvis, 1985, p. 33).

Regardless of the outcome, missions could sense an impending loss of power and control (Chisholm, 2017, p. 9). Indeed, mission schooling had reached a logical terminus, and the overwhelming opinion among academics and bureaucrats was that something needed to change (Chisholm, 2017, p. xix). This consensus, as well as crises at mission schools in later years, explained why leading missionary societies surrendered their schools to the state at the midpoint of the century, rather than retaining control without government aid (Chisholm, 2017, p. xix). That decision, as well as the crescendo in Afrikaner nationalism and the need to tie education to continued economic success, likewise contributed to the advent of the apartheid government, only a dozen years later (Chisholm, 2017, p. xix; Davis, 1984b, p. 135).

Scientific Racism

While the union's mismanagement of Black African education was also symptomatic of earlier governments, its unbalanced nature stemmed from a philosophical quandary: Admitting that Black Africans would benefit from education begged the question of what education was appropriate (Cross, 1986, p. 189). Liberal South Africans – the word having no connection to modern political definitions – were divided in their responses, with much of their perspectives built on racist and eugenicist ideologies that were commonplace among early 20th century academics worldwide (Cross, 1986, p. 189; Stepan, 1982, pp. 111-112). To clarify, liberalism in the South African context centered on the idea that White government should act to reform conditions for oppressed Black Africans, with a goal of creating a “harmonious capitalist society” (Cross, 1986, p. 188). As with van der Kemp, who advocated for Khoi populations in earlier centuries (Babb,

1984, pp. 51-52), South African liberals did not seek to abolish the system that oppressed Black Africans; instead, they sought to guide government policy toward two complementary solutions: segregation of White and Black Africans, and parallel institutions (Cross, 1986, p. 188; Davis, 1984a, p. 109). To an American ear, this sounds suspiciously close to the “separate but equal” legal doctrine of the same era in U.S. history. With those two solutions in hand, the liberal minority of White South Africa believed they could gradually win over the remainder of their White peers to a position that tolerated equal rights for all “civilized” men (Davis, 1984a, p. 109).

Occasionally, liberal ideology is associated with English-heritage South Africans, with contrasting conservative or repressionist philosophies aligned with Afrikaner perspectives; this may be true in some cases, but there existed English-speaking South African elements that contributed to the beginnings of the apartheid era as well (Davis, 1984b, p. 134). From the perspective of Black Africans, the key difference was that Afrikaners displayed their racism as a badge of honor, while English-speaking South Africans demurred, instead deferring to Afrikaner displays of discrimination (Dube, 1985, p. 86). Regardless, both the overt and covert racism that Dube (1985, pp. 88, 93) described can be seen in the descriptions of Native Education, and its devolution into a “road to nowhere” (Dube, 1985, p. 95).

Parallel Institutions. The theory of parallel institutions remained at the forefront of liberalism in South Africa through the 1930s, with an understanding that the Bantustans would be the centers for Black African rejuvenation, politically and economically (Cross, 1986, p. 188). If instituted correctly, liberals believed parallel institutions could sufficiently train Black South Africans for life in a modern society without posing a threat to White control (Davis, 1984a, p. 108). The liberal element relied on science to justify separated educational systems for Black and White Africans (Appel, 1989, pp. 547-548), with Charles T. Loram, a Cambridge- and Columbia-

educated member of the union's Native Affairs Commission and later a Yale professor, as a central figure in the overlap between education, science, and racial policy development (Appel, 1989, p. 548; Mahlangu, 1992, p. 47).

Loram's belief that a department of Native Education should oversee Black African schooling was founded on two premises: "Whites would rule, and Africans would be ruled" (Davis, 1984b, p. 133; Loram, 1917, p. 266). Much of his effort to support those premises appeared in his dissertation at Columbia, which was published in book form in 1917 as *The Education of the South African Native*. The difficulty in solving the "native problem," Loram explained, lie primarily in the dearth of scientific examination of the "particular physiology and psychology of the Bantu," which would properly inform educational policy (Loram, 1917, pp. vii-viii). From there, the failings of scattered governments to establish a definite policy and keep detailed records compounded the "problem" (Loram, 1917, p. viii). For Loram, a solution could only be found through "unassailable facts," gleaned from government publications, journals, statistics and experiments, and the testimonies of education professionals (Loram, 1917, pp. ix-xi).

Confirming Biases. To that end, Loram approached the "native problem" with scientific care. He began with a historical analysis of education in South Africa, moved to a review of policies through the colonies and republics, and then to an overview of coetaneous schooling (Loram, 1917, p. 1). With a completed review, Loram's work reported the results of tests delivered to students in his home province of Natal (1917, p. 162) as well as tests of students of different races in America, and in some cases he replicated those tests at home in South Africa (1917, pp. 195, 201). His conclusions were unsurprising to him: "As was to be expected, the achievement of the Native pupils ranks considerably below that of the Europeans," he reported in one analysis (Loram, 1917, p. 177), adding later that results corroborated "the common opinion that the South

African Native is slower than the European in all types of activity” (Loram, 1917, pp. 191-192).

Invariably, Loram’s results reinforced common preconceptions about the capacities of Black South Africans:

The slowness of the South African Native has become proverbial, and in their political, social, and domestic dealings with the Natives the greatest mistakes made by the Europeans have been in neglecting to make allowance for the slowness of the Native people. (Loram, 1917, p. 192).

Following American investigations, Loram tested students in Natal province, concluding that

Our tentative judgment would therefore be that the Native pupil is at present distinctly inferior to the European and Indian in those mental qualities involved in school work, but that the inferiority is not so great as has been commonly believed. A common course of study for Europeans and Natives is unsound on psychological as well as social and economical grounds. (Loram, 1917, pp. 206-207)

Loram’s work presented the scientific rationale for the racism that prevailed not only in South African society, but was also a fixture in the education system of the era (Dube, 1985, p. 93).

In some cases, Loram presented his findings as refutations to some common myths of his time, in particular the prevailing belief among White South Africans of an “arrest of mental development in the native.”

In the case of the Bantu people, the weakness of the higher mental powers, compared with the strength of the earlier processes of sensation and memory, coupled with a lessening of these earlier powers more noticeable than in the case of Whites, has led to the generally accepted hypothesis that there is a marked arrest in the mental development in the Negro. This arrest, occurring for the most part in the early stages of adolescence, has in-

duced the further hypothesis that the arrest takes place at, or shortly after, the pubertal period. The wide extent of this belief among colonials and others who have had dealings with the Negro peoples, and the necessity for taking cognisance of it, if it be true, in any schemes of education, warrant us in dealing with the subject at some length. (Loram, 1917, p. 209)

To his credit, Loram surveyed missionary teachers and superintendents, which returned an emphatic denial of an “arrest,” with some respondents acutely equating the “pubertal period” to the challenges that late-start adult learners might face.

What does occur in Native schools is this: When pupils ... begin school work at the age of ten or twelve they are liable to come to a dead-stop later on, and probably more so beginning later on; it is more marked with pupils beginning, in many cases, after puberty. (Loram, 1917, p. 215)

While his renouncement of the myth had an air of nobility, the question of mental “arrest” had no proponents in official circles, and had in fact been refuted publicly in the previous decade, when government inquiries sought insight into similar misconceptions – and denied them emphatically. A 1908 committee on Black African education stated in no uncertain terms that “the inability of the native to develop at a normal rate is not supported by facts,” and any belief on the limits of Black African minds must be regarded “as a deduction from insufficient evidence” (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. vi). Loram’s results, while scientifically presented, reiterated what had already been asserted in South African bureaucracy, a decade before.

As to the reasons for the misconception of under-performance among Black African students, Loram struck upon some underlying obstacles to Native Education, more than once.

The curriculum of the Native schools is either wholly or in part that of the Europeans; the subjects taught are generally outside the experience of the pupils; and the medium of instruction is for the most part a foreign tongue. ... We have forced the Native child through a course of study the purpose of which he can only dimly conceive. We have taught him subjects foreign to his experience, and in a language which he cannot understand. (Loram, 1917, pp. 222-223)

Unfortunately, even with these realizations in hand, Loram swung wide and connected them to a need for a separate system of education for Black South Africans, describing in great detail a sequence of schooling from primary to tertiary, its finance, the training of its teachers, and its administration at national and provincial levels (1917, pp. 263-312).

Science, Racism, and Eugenics. While admirable in its detail, Loram's suggestions were couched in racist and eugenicist ideologies, not only ascribing sub-par academic performance to Black African students, but also blaming Indigenous cultures for "moral and social dangers to the Europeans" (Loram, 1917, p. 12). More than once Loram reassured the reader of the "continued dominance of the European" (1917, p. 192) or proposed selective breeding (1917, p. 225), even as he cited American eugenicists and White supremacists as basis for his work – including famed educational psychologist Edward L. Thorndike, who stubbornly endorsed eugenics as late as 1940 (Thorndike, 1940, p. 957); Edward Gardner Murphy, an avowed White supremacist and educational reformer who considered the African American to be a "weakling whom we must overpower" (Murphy, 1909, p. 81); and Marion J. Mayo, a New York educational researcher who, like Loram, employed science in his attempt to cement the inferiority of African Americans in his 1913 book, *The Mental Capacity of the American Negro* (Mayo, 1913, p. 9). Masked in a concern for Black African welfare, Loram and his White peers employed science to reinforce their

belief of their own superiority, at the same time “proving” to Black African children that their subordinate position was due to an inherited mental deficiency (Davis, 1984a, p. 109; Dube, 1985, p. 93).

Loram was not the only, nor the authoritative, nor the final voice speaking to a scientific rationale for a separate educational system for Black South Africans. One of Loram’s fellow Natal segregationists in 1911 insisted that education should be designed to “prevent overlapping of the races, with its possible friction and animosities” (Wilson & Thompson, 1971, p. 222). By 1930, the belief that science supported different treatment for separate races was acknowledged in government as well as academia, with conferences of the South African Association for the Advancement of Science (SAAAS), and its fledgling *South African Journal of Science*, propagating notions of eugenics and racial superiority (Appel, 1989, p. 548). From its earliest days, the SAAAS and the journal dwelt on issues of race and class, with a long list of articles from the first few decades of the 20th century committed to the “native problem,” and along with that, “the poor white problem” (Appel, 1989, p. 549). Researchers and scientists discussed race and eugenics with an eye toward the “health and welfare of our own descendants,” at the same time “improving the conditions which are the primary causes of racial deterioration” (Balmforth, 1910, as cited in Appel, 1989, p. 549; Leipoldt, 1915, as cited in Appel, 1989, p. 549).

Perhaps revealing the immaturity of science in their era, researchers regularly presented data as support for their own prejudices, much as Loram had done. In 1923 South Africa’s commissioner on mental disorders, J. T. Dunston, contributed a discussion of mental disabilities among “native children,” citing the results of Stanford-Binet and derived tests as indicators that “the intellectual capacity of the average native is very much lower than that of the average European” (Dunston, 1923, p. 155). Alongside that, Dunston offered an overview of Black African

culture as congruent evidence.

They display little foresight, worry little about the future, and learn very little by experience in the larger sense. ... They are orientated in time in the vaguest way, and generally have little idea of how old they are or of the passage of time. Generally speaking, they are poor mechanics and artisans. They have never had a written language. Their art is of the crudest. Even their dancing, of which they are very fond, presents no delicate motions – an important psychological point which should be carefully studied. Their music is also elementary, and their musical instruments immature. (Dunston, 1923, p. 154)

Coupled with the intelligence tests, these observations permitted Dunston to announce his scientific evaluation of Black African mental capability.

All the considerations I have placed before you, and many others, suggest that in natives there is such a deficiency of brain cells, that neither education, nor environment, nor any other factor except a mutation, can lead to their rising to the level of advancement of the higher races. (Dunston, 1923, p. 155)

In a final and peculiar twist, he concluded that this “deficiency” had an upside: The absence of a reported case of paranoia among Black Africans of his day suggested “they have not reasoning power enough to become paranoiacs” (Dunston, 1923, p. 155).

Dunston corroborated his findings with peers in America, and perhaps not surprisingly, their examinations validated his own (Dunston, 1923, pp. 154-155). This suggested to him that proximity to White culture and civilization was unlikely to correct the deficiencies he found.

There are, however, *prima facie* grounds which suggest that the native, even of the best tribes, possibly belongs to a race which is mentally inferior to ours. ... It is interesting to note that in all these generations the natives have made very little progress in any of the

arts of civilisation on their own initiative, and, though they have been for the last two or three hundred years in closer and closer contact with a white civilisation, their [community] life has been little influenced. (Dunston, 1923, p. 154).

This notion ran parallel to the motivations of other segments of South African society, where again “civilization” seemed to serve as a litmus test for racial hierarchy.

Evolution of Civilizations. Racism and racial stratification had long been embraced by a missionary segment, but Loram and other South African liberals felt government investigations and education commissions validated their goal of segregation in education (Nwandula, 1988, p. 47) – always supposedly to the benefit of Black African civilization. But the idea of racial equality was as unattractive as the continued repression of Black Africans, as Loram explained: “The believers in race equality need to be reminded that there can be no real equality between a people with many centuries of civilisation behind them, and a race which is just emerging from barbarism” (1917, p. 22).

The belief that Black African civilization was late to evolve, or was somehow tardy in its development, became a fallback theme for South African liberals as well as future apartheid apologists. The recurring insistence that Black Africans suffered very real social and economic oppression would appear with a caveat in tow, that the civilization was still in an immature state (Davis, 1984a, p. 109). Apartheid supporters were familiar with this mantra, and recited it well into the 1950s, with representatives of the Federal Council of Dutch Reformed Churches repeating the theme in interviews with international correspondents.

The race which is in a lesser state of development is by far the majority here. ... Everything [White Africans] have done in the last 300 years, and built up in the church and in the state, should be preserved, and not be swallowed up by an – I wouldn't say inferior

race, because it I don't believe it is an inferior race – but a lesser race which is in a lesser state of development. (*Apartheid in South Africa*, 1957, 5:51)

As apartheid won critics on the world stage, the theory of late or tardy civilization became entangled again in the pseudoscience of biological development, combining to become a footnote to the denial of race inferiority.

I think it is a generally accepted fact today, that the non-European is at the lower stage of development than the European. That does not mean to say that they are inherently inferior. The circumstances amongst which they have grown up, and well, their whole cultural background and everything, their whole diet which would lead to physical or physiological changes in their nervous system, would all lead to a general idea of inferiority amongst them, when you compare the average non-European with the European. But I do not believe that the non-European as such is inherently inferior, he is merely at a much lower state of development, at the present state. (*Apartheid in South Africa*, 1957, 27:08)

From there, the rationale for White domination unfolded logically: Black Africans, as they were in a process of development, were in need of betterment, and for that reason “whites had to decide what was best for [Black] Africans” (Davis 1984a, p. 109). To assess a civilization – particularly in matters with political weight – education was a convenient measuring stick: “It is much to be doubted ... whether the present franchise affords a proper test for civilization. ... Many natives without any sufficient education are on the [voter] roll” (Brand, 1909, pp. 105-106). Secure in the belief that science supported their racist worldview, White academics could coach government in its masquerade as a civilizing force, even as it systematically oppressed a disadvantaged racial majority.

The rise of Nazi ideology in the 1930s and the horrors of the second World War extin-

guished eugenics as a legitimate scientific pursuit (Appel, 1989, p. 555; Stepan, 1982, p. 140). By 1933 the *South African Journal of Science* no longer carried references to its own Eugenics and Genetics Standing Committee, and scholars tied that abrupt omission to Hitler's preoccupation with eugenics, and his rise to power in Germany (Appel, 1989, p. 555). Loram's presentations in the mid-1930s likewise took a softer tone, commending Black African schools for a "far greater" responsibility than their European counterparts, and a need for schools to have the help of "the African communities, the missionaries, and the governments" to perform their work effectively (Loram, 1935, p. 4). By 1939, geneticists worldwide were adamant in their condemnation of eugenics, racism, and Nazi philosophies (Stepan, 1982, p. 140). While national socialism had proponents in South Africa (Beck, 2000, p. 121), elitist discussions of eugenics could not find much ground in a nation where a majority of White Africans were poor and uneducated, even if they did hold the right to vote (Appel, 1989, p. 555). Liberalism, on the other hand, continued to evolve in following decades, albeit with less overt reliance on scientific racism (Cross, 1986, pp. 187-188, 191).

Christian National Education

By the 1930s and 1940s, Afrikaner influence was quickly nearing its apogee. With nearly uncontested influence over the union government, education became key to protecting Afrikaner cultural identity from the two remaining threats: English-speaking White Africans, and the Black African majority (Jones, 1966, p. 92).

Religion, Nationalism, and Education. A vehicle was already in place that would serve this purpose. Christian National Education (CNE) had its roots with S. J. du Toit, a 19th-century DRC minister who hoped applying Calvinism to all areas of South African life would duplicate a Dutch Calvinist revival underway in Holland, and the movement toward Christian schools, trade

unions, and political parties that accompanied it (Hexham, 1975, p. 112). With du Toit as an early proponent, CNE tied Afrikaner history to the Afrikaans language and the established Dutch Reformed religion (Giliomee, 2004, p. 5), giving it brief support under the boer republics (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235) even though the cost of private schooling was high, then and later (Carter, 1959, p. 261). CNE resurfaced after the South African War, when the victorious British colonial government backed down from the language parity specified in the Treaty of Vereeniging, and instead curtailed church involvement in education, denied parents a voice in their children's schooling, and of course, set the medium of instruction once again to English (Beinart, 1994, pp. 70, 76; Muir, 1968, p. 34). Opposition was inevitable, in response to both the industrialization and imperialism of the previous century, and to British "race patriotism" (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 74; Muir, 1968, p. 34). CNE became a means for Dutch Reformed churches to boost the morale of defeated Afrikaners (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235; Malherbe, 1925, pp. 321-322) while making a stand against state schools that sought to denationalize a people and transform Afrikaner children into English-speaking colonists (Malherbe, 1925, p. 315; Muir, 1968, p. 34).

CNE's religious and nationalistic core fulfilled a demand for separate, but state-aided, church schools where Afrikaner children would be taught Calvinism in the Dutch language (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235; Lavin, 1965, p. 429). With this reiteration and interpretation of Afrikaner values and beliefs, the linguistic and cultural renaissance heralded by du Toit and his peers in the previous century became a chief concern (Cross, 1986, p. 186). Through the 1920s, the Dutch Reformed Church had issued pronouncements supporting segregation, but in 1935 in a federal council, the reformed churches adopted a common policy on the color question (Dubow, 2014, p. 19). The urgency of public perception of economic and social vulnerability led to the affirmation of "the right of every nation to be itself" (Dubow, 2014, p. 19). While segregation had a histori-

cal pattern of success, there was doubt that the theory and practice would be adequate in the future, leading logically to the concept of apartheid (Dubow, 2014, p. 19). By 1911 an Association for Christian National Education had formed, with a goal of instituting “school education on the foundation of the Bible ... in order duly to establish in actual working the divinely appointed relation between home, school, Church and State” (Cape of Good Hope Education Commission, 1912, p. 135).

However, where the union government conceded education reforms, as with the Smuts education act of 1907 (Walker, 1957, p. 542), it sapped the strength of CNE as a national movement, and churches shifted their involvement to school committees (Beck, 2000, p. 96; Kaplan, 1971, p. 235). Without a nationwide endorsement as the church of state though, the DRC was losing its means of dominating the education of young Afrikaners (Colquhoun, 1906, p. 197). To remedy that, Afrikaner churches provided an underlying philosophy that appeared in CNE as an emphasis on the Calvinist concepts of a fundamentalist church and an authoritarian state (Cowlin, 2018, p. 52; Lavin, 1965, p. 429). The churches sponsored the first Christian-National Education Conference in 1918 (Lavin, 1965, p. 429), and by the 1930s, Christian national ideology had entered a new phase that assigned Afrikaners a divine purpose, supplanting the strictly ethnic nationalism of previous decades (Dubow, 2014, p. 22). When provincial-level efforts at dual-medium schooling in the 1940s reignited debate over the official medium of instruction, the most conservative branches of the reformed churches revived CNE with a new sense of vigor (Carter, 1959, p. 262; Kaplan, 1971, p. 235). The language of instruction became a crucial debate, as it had been so many times in South Africa’s past (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 227)

The Language Dilemma. Educated Afrikaners faced a particular dilemma. Prior to the South African War and for some time afterward, Afrikaans was not appropriate for educated con-

versation, owing to the fact that it was not proper Dutch, but rather an unrefined Cape patois (Moodie, 1975, p. 40). This meant in public speaking or formal writing, cultured Afrikaners had to choose between two foreign languages: the classical Dutch of their forebears, or the competing English of the colony (Moodie, 1975, p. 40). Dutch was primarily for use in churches and classrooms, but English was heard everywhere, and for that reason, educated Afrikaners tended to rely on the latter (Moodie, 1975, p. 41).

The early decades of the union saw advances for Afrikaans as a language; in 1914 it was admitted as a school subject, six years later it was permitted as a medium of instruction, and in 1925 the government embraced it as the second official language in place of High Dutch (Carter, 1959, p. 261; The Education League, 1949, p. 30). British colonial policy had discriminated against a “lower-middle-class intelligentsia” in commerce, law, government, journalism, and teaching, and Afrikaans as a language rebounded from that (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 74). Afrikaans-medium schools quickly proliferated (Carter, 1959, p. 261). Over time, it became commonplace for school inspectors to determine the primary school where a child would enroll, based on the language he or she understood best (Carter, 1959, p. 261). In the opening years of apartheid this became mandatory, completely removing the right of parents to select their child’s school (Lavin, 1965, p. 432) – even preventing Afrikaans-speaking parents from sending their children to English-medium schools, unless it was a private denominational institution (Carter, 1959, pp. 261-262).

But for the educated South African elite, the language question was of trivial significance (Collins, 1983, p. 376). By 1930, political control was in the hands of upper-class Afrikaners, educated in rural Afrikaans state schools and Afrikaans universities (Collins, 1983, p. 376). This power aristocracy was in agreement with its English-speaking industrial peers, themselves the

products of private schools in Cape Town and Johannesburg (Collins, 1983, p. 376). Instead of holding serious import, the language debate was a convenient dog whistle for populist movements for dispossessed Afrikaners, with Afrikaans as a common means to mobilize that demographic toward economic recovery – and schools as the tool toward that aim (Collins, 1983, p. 376).

The *Beleid*. An “Afrikaner civil religion” began to take shape, growing out of Calvinism, the lasting effects of the South African War, and the sudden appreciation for the Afrikaans language (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 74). Beginning in the 1920s, the concern for the survival of Afrikanerdom shifted toward a need for Afrikaner preeminence in state, and the redefinition of cross-race relations that CNE would later dictate (Cross, 1986, p. 186). The Federation of Afrikaans Cultural Societies (FAK) emerged under the discreet auspices of the *Afrikaner Broederbond* (Lavin, 1965, pp. 429-430), and at a 1939 conference the FAK in turn established the Institute for Christian-National Education (ICNO). Formally, the ICNO had a mandate to reassert and publicize the ideals of CNE, but in reality, it formed a bulwark against dual-medium instruction as well (Carter, 1959, pp. 261, 262). Within a decade, the ICNO had realigned CNE to match the goals of the FAK, and therefore the *Broederbond*, with the publication of the *Christelike Nasionale Onderwysbeleid*, or Christian National Education Policy (Lavin, 1965, p. 430). The preface of the *Beleid* attributed the contents of the policy to “the whole of Afrikanerdom, in so far as it is represented by the F.A.K.” (The Education League, 1949, p. 31). It went on to frame the goals of the ICNO and CNE in confrontational terms.

[This policy is] a guide in our cultural struggle, which is now also a school struggle. ...

Our culture must be carried into the school and that cannot be done merely by having our language as medium. More is needed. Our Afrikaans schools must not merely be mother-

tongue schools; they must be places where our children will be saturated with the Christian and National spiritual cultural stuff of our nation. (The Education League, 1949, pp. 30-31)

With that adversarial tone, the preface to the *Beleid* permitted no concession toward integration of any kind.

We want no mixing of languages, no mixing of cultures, no mixing of religions, no mixing of races. We are winning the medium [of instruction] struggle. The struggle for the Christian and National school still lies before us. (The Education League, 1949, pp. 30-31)

CNE apologists likewise embraced a theme of separateness, often along religious lines, but with other divisions implied.

We reject in principle any domination of our schools by the state, the church or the home. The C.N.E. school should be free to function within the limits assigned to it by our principle of sovereignty in its own orbit. ... We as Calvinistic Afrikaners will have our C.N.E. schools: Anglicans, Lutherans, Roman Catholics, Jews, liberalists and atheists will have their own schools. (Coetzee, 1968, pp. 27, 30)

The *Beleid* and its supporters left no doubt that the goal of the ICNO was to see CNE in schools, and the goal of CNE was to propagate cultural and social divisions in education, as defined by the layers of the ICNO, FAK, and *Broederbond*.

Cultural Separation. The core principle of CNE in its 1948 resurgence was the existence of a separate cultural identity for each portion of South African society – in other words, that all peoples have their own distinctive culture, and education should strengthen it (Kaplan, 1971, p. 234; Lavin, 1965, p. 429). For the part of White Africans, the *Beleid* envisaged, as its name sug-

gested, a curriculum that was not only framed in religion, but instilled an Afrikaner-centric worldview, in precise detail (Carter, 1959, p. 263; Macmillan, 1967, p. 42).

Article 2: Christian education. The key subject in school should be religion (the study of the bible and the three Afrikaner creeds); and the religious spirit should permeate all subjects and the entire school.

Article 3: Nationalist education. Teaching should also be nationalist, the child to become an heir to and worthy carrier-on of the national culture. (The Education League, 1949, p. 32).

For Afrikaans-speaking children, the Dutch Reformed faith was to be the foundation of education, with the fundamentalism and authoritarianism that implied (Kaplan, 1971, p. 234). The Christian component of CNE instilled the religious foundation, while the nationalist component sought to impart a love for one's own country, culture, language, and history, and the racial divisions that were necessary to that worldview (Kaplan, 1971, p. 234).

In principle, education would strengthen children's faith in Afrikanerdom throughout their school careers, thereby emphasizing racial and ethnic divisions, and loyalty to one's own group (Kaplan, 1971, p. 469). In practice, CNE tended to brace the concept of separateness in Christian faith and patriotic fervor, providing nationalism in general with a "mystical religious aura" (Brookes & Macaulay, 1958, p. 113). Where subjects, languages, or government intervention might jeopardize that result, the *Beleid* explicitly prohibited them.

The spirit of all teaching must be Christian-nationalist; in no subject may anti-Christian or non-Christian or anti-nationalist or non-nationalist propaganda be made. ... Bilingualism cannot be the aim of education, and the second official language should not be taught until the child has a thorough knowledge of his mother-tongue. (The Education League,

1949, pp. 32-33)

Each school subject – the *Beleid* listed four in detail: religion, civics, geography, and history (The Education League, 1949, p. 33) – was to be taught in line with those two main concepts: Christianity and nationalism (Kaplan, 1971, p. 234).

School Management. School management under the *Beleid* fell to organized parents' groups, embodied as school committees (Carter, 1959, p. 263; Kaplan, 1971, p. 235). Those committees were to nominate and supervise teachers, with the tenor of the curriculum monitored by the church (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235). Into the apartheid era, a system of church oversight and limited parent control evolved, with many rural areas admitting a preacher from their local Dutch Reformed Church into the role of chairman over the school committee (Carter, 1959, p. 263). This allowed for the insinuation of religion as well as politics into teacher selection, and in spite of the fact that religious tests were not allowed in the appointment process, some schools required Afrikaner teachers to include a testimonial from a religious authority as part of the application process (Carter, 1959, p. 263).

While the *Beleid* is specific in its discussion of school structure from pre-primary through to tertiary education, it is less detailed in its discussion of teacher qualifications (Jones, 1966, p. 90). However, it does require that, "being a substitute for the parent, the teacher does the parent's work as the parent himself would do it were he able. Unless, therefore, he is a Christian, he is a deadly danger to us" (The Education League, 1949, p. 35). No more guidance is available from the *Beleid*, although it does state that teachers, as "our substitutes," should be trained in "Christianity and in the secular subjects, especially pedagogy" (Jones, 1966, p. 91; The Education League, 1949, p. 35). Critics of the apartheid era complained the CNE school management system, with the insertion of the church and the ready use of politics in teacher screening, imposed

restrictions on intellectual and religious freedom for Afrikaans-speaking teachers, in turn affecting their professional performance (Carter, 1959, p. 263). The end results were Afrikaans-speaking students who had been isolated from mainstream Western thought (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235).

Education for Other Races. The closing articles of the *Beleid* may have had the most far-reaching effect of the entire publication. In its discussion of education for Coloured Africans, the *Beleid* set the tone for education for decades to come.

Article 14: Coloured education. The education of coloureds should be seen as a subordinate part of the Afrikaners' task of Christianising the non-white races of our fatherland. It is the Afrikaners' sacred duty to see that the coloureds are brought up Christian-nationalist. Only when he is christianised can the coloured be truly happy; and he will then be proof against foreign ideologies which give him an illusion of happiness but leave him in the long run unsatisfied and unhappy. He must also be nationalist. The welfare and happiness of the coloured lies in his understanding that he belongs to a separate racial group (hence apartheid is necessary in education), and in his being proud of it. (The Education League, 1949, p. 37)

The application of separateness – apartheid – in education would ensure the race consciousness of Coloured Africans, with mother-tongue instruction implying Afrikaans, as it was the home language of a large portion of Coloured populations (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235; Lavin, 1965, pp. 430-431). The paternalistic elevation of Afrikaners to the role of trusteeship over other skin colors bestowed a sense of responsibility upon Afrikaans-speaking White Africans, charging them to ensure fellow South African citizens were educated through CNE (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235; Lavin, 1965, pp. 430-431). Furthermore, the *Beleid* partitioned Black Africans into a distinct racial identity from Coloured Africans (Lavin, 1965, p. 431), supplying a separate and final article for “Na-

tive Education.”

Article 15: Native education. The white South African's duty to the native is to Christianise him and help him on culturally. Native education should be based on the principles of trusteeship, non-equality and segregation; its aim should be to inculcate the white man's view of life, especially that of the Boer nation, which is the senior trustee. (The Education League, 1949, p. 38)

The *Beleid* again asserts itself over education for Indigenous populations, implying both segregation and trusteeship, and insinuating Black Africans should not be placed at the same level as White Africans (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235; Lavin, 1965, pp. 430-431). As further insult, Black African education would portray a European worldview, with Afrikaners as a senior guardian (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235; Lavin, 1965, pp. 430-431).

In the same moment, the recurring theme of underdeveloped civilization reappeared, this time within the context of mother tongue instruction.

The mother tongue should be the basis of native education but the two official languages should be learned as keys to the cultures from which the native will have to borrow in order to progress. Owing to the cultural infancy of the native, the state, in cooperation with the protestant churches should at present provide Native education. (The Education League, 1949, p. 38)

Mother tongue education was to be the basis for instruction, with required study in the official languages of the union, as a means of advancing Black African culture (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235). And yet the over-arching justification for CNE remained “religious, psychological-educational and national-cultural grounds, for the maintenance of Afrikaner identity” (Coetzee, 1948, as cited in Cross, 1986, p. 186).

The irony of imposing White languages upon Black African students in a document that defied the imposition of a White language upon Afrikaner children was not lost. British insistence on English in schools instigated the *Beleid*, and yet Afrikaners apparently “learned nothing from the experience and reproduced the same antagonism between themselves and the Black students of South Africa” (Rebusoajoang, 1979, p. 237). Unfortunately, the echoes of this antagonism would persist through the apartheid era and into the next century.

In describing the goals of education for Black Africans, the *Beleid* was far less inconsistent. The policy made clear that “the native should be fitted to undertake his own education as soon as possible, under control and guidance of the state. Native education should lead to the development of an independent, self-supporting Christian-nationalist Native community” (The Education League, 1949, p. 38). This also drew a clear line between CNE and concurrent liberal South African views of education: Acceptance of Black Africans was not the aim (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235). Instead, CNE would lead Black Africans toward a self-supporting, African community that could provide for itself in every way (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235). Teaching and teacher education were the responsibility of Black African communities, under the guidance of the government (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235). And within the entirety of this structure, neither Coloured nor Black African education could, as a rule of the *Beleid*, be financed at the expense of White students (The Education League, 1949, pp. 37, 38).

Effects and Support. The lasting effects of the *Beleid* are clear in the careers of its framers, and their strong ties to nationalist elements. Among the sponsors of the ICNO in 1948 were a serving minister of the interior who would later lead the Nationalist Party in the Cape province; a standing minister of native affairs and future governor-general under apartheid; a professor of education at the University of Stellenbosch, a primarily Afrikaans-speaking univer-

sity; a future superintendent-general of education for the Cape province; a future rector of the Afrikaans University of Potchefstroom, which at the time was a locus of the smallest but most fundamentalist of the Dutch Reformed churches; and the head of the Afrikaner Teachers' Association for the Transvaal (Carter, 1959, p. 264; Lavin, 1965, p. 430). In spite of key support within official circles, plus the implied momentum of the FAK and the *Broederbond*, when the policy surfaced in parliament in 1949 it was met with "cautious approval from top men" (Lavin, 1965, p. 430). Even ICNO members who participated in its creation and held legislative positions neither spoke in favor of it, nor against it (Lavin, 1965, p. 430).

Support at the provincial level was much more vocal. Soon after its publication, the *Beleid* had the backing of the Dutch Reformed Synod in the Orange Free State (Lavin, 1965, p. 430). The Nationalist Party in the Cape announced it supported the policy in principle, and a month later, its analogue in the Transvaal urged immediate adoption (Lavin, 1965, p. 430). In all four provinces, Afrikaans teachers' associations announced their "unshaken faith" in the ICNO's document (Lavin, 1965, p. 430). The nationalist press was likewise open in its endorsement of CNE, with a series of Afrikaans-language newspapers reporting its effects upon the greater White community (Carter, 1959, pp. 264-265). Not surprisingly, media for Dutch Reformed churches likewise supported it, even if the Ecumenical Synod in Amsterdam did not give its blessing (Carter, 1959, p. 265). Even into the apartheid era, when a provincial education official refused to adopt CNE within his ambit, nationalist media feigned pity for the students, then reminded readers that as a principle CNE could still operate without official sanction (Carter, 1959, p. 265).

Indeed, as a philosophical perspective on education, supporters repeated that CNE was "meant for Calvinist-Christian minded people" (Coetzee, 1968, p. 21) – and they likely did so

“with the best of consciences” (Carter, 1959, p. 265). Proponents accepted the existence of “different, separate races, nations, peoples, languages, countries,” even admitting that “no country, language, race, and nation is better before God than any other” (Coetzee, 1968, p. 21). This gave rise to the belief that separate schools should logically follow for “separate religious and non-religious groups in the same nation” (Rose, 1965, p. 208). Where universal state-run schooling failed was in its all-inclusive aspect, which disenfranchised the Christian and national components that CNE supporters sought.

We reject in principle and in practice a system of state schools. No state can satisfy us in the ideal of C.N.E. The state is always neutral in matters of philosophy and religion. A modern state school is essentially neutral in teaching religion and life and world view, because children of all shades of opinion attend it. ... State school education, if systematically and conscientiously given on the principle of neutrality, is completely colourless, senseless and useless. (Coetzee, 1968, p. 27)

At the same time, both the *Beleid* and its apologists were insistent that “neither home, church nor state should dominate but all three should co-operate in school education” (The Education League, 1949, p. 35). Neither were purely church schools an option, “because the church should be concerned only with matters of religious teaching, and school teaching means more than mere religious teaching” (Coetzee, 1968, p. 28). Home, church, and state were necessarily involved in education, but no single entity could monopolize the process, suggesting that

There exists to our minds only one solution to this problem: a general system of state-aided schools, free from the domination of the state, the church and the home, but in full cooperation with the state, the church and the home. (Coetzee, 1968, p. 28)

Perhaps in its simplest reduction, CNE could have found supporters beyond its target audience.

Writ large, CNE theorists expressed a concern over cultural decay among Black Africans, and recommended a Christian transformation for Black African societies, but not at the expense of their Bantu heritage (Cross, 1986, pp. 186-187). Others felt a need to preserve Black African culture, insisting education should be in the mother tongue to ensure “the national pride of the Africans is not harmed” (Fourier, 1940, as cited in Cross, 1986, pp. 186-187). In general, Christian nationalist writers felt complete segregation and mother tongue instruction would assist in a restoration of Black African culture, while a measure of Christianity would provide a minimum of Western influence (Cross, 1986, pp. 186-187). These arguments, and the application of CNE as a solution, were adopted by key theorists with an anthropological orientation – including Hendrik Verwoerd – who eventually held prominent government posts, and grafted these principles into the apartheid state of the 1950s and 1960s (Cross, 1986, p. 187).

Weaponized Education. From any perspective the *Beleid* was audacious, paternalistic, confrontational, and racist. The arrangement and presentation of the policy reflected more upon the tenets of its umbrella organizations than the wistful expectations of CNE supporters; Christian nationalism was a defense of Afrikaner nationalism and the Afrikaner hegemony, even as it called for the subjugation of Black Africans and their summary separation from economic, social, and political power (Bloomberg, 1990, p. 1). From the start of the century, the liberal tradition that emphasized schooling for Black South Africans had confronted the nationalist – and later conservative – ideas popular among CNE theorists and pundits, who preferred the “total segregation of Africans” (Cross, 1986, pp. 187-188). The liberal propositions of equality and assimilation were roundly rejected, for “blacks would lose their culture and Afrikaners would sink to the level of kaffirs, and would ultimately be dominated by them” (Cross, 1986, p. 187).

Scholars occasionally pointed to this as a defining distinction between the liberal pro-

posal for segregation coupled with parallel institutions, and the nationalist and conservative apartheid governments that evolved at mid-century (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 12). Segregation was grounded in the exploration of heredity and Darwinian social evolutionary theory, along with principles of cultural relativism in social anthropology (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 12). Apartheid on the other hand, was based on Christian national ideology, and sought to justify a partitioned state on religious scripture and the sacred role of the Afrikaner (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 12).

Regardless, the schism between liberal and national perspectives corresponded to the emergence of the ICNO and FAK, which propagated two key motifs of *Broederbond* ideology: A Christian-national premise, demarcating an Afrikaner nation allied with western Christian civilization; and an expectation that each racial group would pursue its own development, under the watchful eye of White African leadership (Seroto, 2013, p. 98). Central to those ideas, and therefore obvious in CNE, was the belief that Afrikaners were “destined to be the ‘master’ race of Africa,” tasked with “bringing the proverbial light to the continent’s dark savages” (Soudien, 2005, p. 52). This notion of racial superiority was essential for CNE to function (Enslin, 1984, p. 140). The emphasis the ICNO placed on the subordination of Black Africans, and the type of education they would receive, left little doubt the nongovernmental organization envisioned a form of territorial apartheid, as well as the forthcoming Bantu Education Act of 1953, which would be an instrument in applying CNE nationwide (Jarvis, 1985, p. 38; Jones, 1966, pp. 93-94). Advocates for CNE felt schools served a community of like-minded parents, and later education policies required children “to be taught by their own people and in accordance with their intellectual, spiritual, cultural, and economic development” (Rose, 1965, p. 208). Separate development became a euphemism for security for White South Africans, and in later years, education commissions recommended state-controlled CNE for Black African populations as a means to create op-

portunities for Black Africans within their own communities – a recurring theme in nationalist politics (Moore, 2016, p. 9). This stance had a far-reaching effect on the quality of education afforded to Black African students (Moore, 2016, p. 33), and in that sense, apartheid was both the starting point and the end objective of CNE (Rose & Tunmer, 1975, p. 140).

As might be expected, there was occasional evidence of an overlap between CNE and missionary education. Nwandula (1988, p. 45) discussed a Swiss mission that stressed training scholars how to think, and how to express thoughts clearly and simply, with the implication that thinking and learning should be taught “within the intellectual limits of a supposedly inferior and backward nation.” Similarly, the mission felt the backgrounds of Black African children were different than European children, and the syllabus should reflect that (Nwandula, 1988, p. 45). Both CNE and the mission stressed cultural differences, with the goal of the mission’s education program in the acceptance of inequality as part of the natural order for Indigenous people (Nwandula, 1988, p. 48). Where the Dutch Reformed faith supported CNE’s separatist pronouncements, the Swiss mission reached the same conclusion through its own religious and cultural perceptions, having advocated a form of apartheid long before the 1948 election (Nwandula, 1988, p. 48). However, it should be noted that, due to the isolated nature of missionary education and the centuries without oversight, the views of the Swiss missionaries might not be shared by other mission schools or societies.

Opposition. The *Beleid*, and CNE in general, were not without opposition. The *Beleid*’s brash and unapologetic orthodoxy won criticism from every demographic, including both English- and Afrikaans-speaking White Africans (Coetzee, 1968, p. 19). Educational groups, prominent Afrikaners, and general members of the public voiced opposition to the policy (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235). Academics noted how nationalism shifted in the early part of the century, and

called out the *Beleid*'s authors where they walked back against statements appearing in the published policy (van Heyningen, 1960, pp. 51, 50). For some, CNE was a blatant power grab.

Nationalist leaders don't really care about the mother tongue. They care about power. They don't really care about Afrikaners. To them, an Afrikaner is not an Afrikaner by reason of the fact that he is one. Facts, truths, don't count. By an Afrikaner they mean, in their secret hearts, "someone who agrees with me about everything, and will do exactly what I want." (van Heyningen, 1960, p. 52)

The Black African press likewise scolded CNE adherents for infringing upon "the eternal right of the African parent to say what form of education shall be given to his child" (Moore, 2016, p. 33), while Black African authors saw CNE as an assault on Indigenous identity.

One of the deep-seated intentions of this type of education is to erase all African leadership. ... But the erasure of African leadership is felt to be a good thing by nearly all whites, who want leaders who will not lead, and that is why they have consented to the emasculation of our education. They are requiring our teachers to help enslave the hearts and minds of our children. (Luthuli, 1962, p. 52)

Others marveled at the FAK's and ICNO's acumen for solving immutable social conundrums, while taking aim at the unscientific basis for CNE.

It would appear that the Afrikaner Christian-Nationalist knows all the answers to the questions that have baffled scientists through the ages as to the origin and the precise development of man. It would seem that all the patient researches of armies of scientists, the archaeologists, geologists, zoologists, anthropologists, ethnologists, etc. – not to speak of the historians – are superfluous. (Tabata, 1959, p. 33)

Neither was the insinuation of the *Broederbond* without notice.

This is the inner circle of Afrikaner control directing penetration into every sphere. ...

When we consider that more than 60 per cent of the Dutch Reformed clergy belong to the *Broederbond* and that in the Nationalist Government itself the majority, from the Prime Minister to cabinet ministers downwards, are members of one or other of the organizations affiliated to the F.A.K., then we have some idea of the vast organization of Afrikanerdom, whose aim is no less than a Christian-National Calvinist republic. (Tabata, 1959, p. 26)

For both White and Black African intellectuals in post-World War II South Africa, the similarity between Christian nationalism and the national socialism of the Third Reich was a real threat:

“The system of education in Nazi Germany, National Socialistic Education, is the model for their Christian-National Education policy in South Africa” (Tabata, 1959, p. 34). More explicitly,

The parallel between National Socialistic Education in Nazi Germany and the Christian-National education formulated by the Afrikaner Nationalists is all too painfully close. Just as the Nazis had to reorganize the whole German population and indoctrinate it with the ideas of fascism, so the Afrikaner Nationalist conceived the idea of Christian National education in preparation for establishing the South African Fascist State under a *Boerenasie* [farmer nation] republic. (Tabata, 1959, p. 36)

The allusions to national socialism were not just post-war alarmist sensationalism. While it is true that Germany’s defeat made fascism less appealing, many nationalist leaders were known as Nazi sympathizers during the war (Dubow, 2014, pp. 3, 7), and Afrikaner intellectuals who had studied in Germany, including one future president of the republic of South Africa and a later chairman of the South African Broadcasting Company, borrowed ideas from German national socialism in articles, pamphlets, books, and speeches (Thompson, 2001, p. 184). And decades later,

the apartheid government's Department of Information was patterned after Nazi Germany's propaganda machine, with both an internal and external organ for disseminating the apartheid message (Morris-Hale, 1996, p. 227). The marked resemblance between Christian nationalism and wartime German politics was evident to others as well.

Largely under the influence of pre-war Nazi propaganda, Nationalism has totally changed its character in the last twenty-five years, and is supported by intelligent Nationalists only because they are bred to regard disloyalty to party as somehow cowardly and shameful. (van Heyningen, 1960, pp. 52-53)

The same writer warned of CNE's possible lasting effects on the Afrikaner people at large.

My deepest reason for hating C.N.E. is that it has aimed at making the Afrikaans people inferior; and unless they can break through the irrational, inherited party loyalty that binds them to the leaders who are doing this to them, the Afrikaans people will, in less than another generation, be inferior. (van Heyningen, 1960, pp. 52-53)

As CNE evolved from 1948 into the apartheid era, opposing voices grew in number and volume, as will be seen later.

Fundamental Pedagogy. In the post-World War II era, CNE's greatest omission was a scientific pretext. In later years, where CNE intersected with science, an educational approach entitled "fundamental pedagogics" evolved. With an early beginning in Holland in 1944, fundamental pedagogics had made inroads to South Africa within a decade (Enslin, 1984, p. 140). By the 1960s it had become a systematic theoretical commitment, in particular at Afrikaans-speaking universities and their satellite institutions providing higher education to Black African scholars (Chisholm, 2017, p. 159; Cross, 1986, p. 187). The approach reached a watershed in 1971 with the publication of *Fundamental Pedagogics* by Thomas Viljoen and Jacobus Pienaar (Cross,

1986, p. 187). By the 1980s, *Fundamental Pedagogics* had possibly become “the most widely-prescribed book in the sphere of education in South Africa over the past decade” (Cross, 1986, p. 187), and its theories had proponents at the university level around the country (Enslin, 1984, p. 141). Among Christian nationalist theorists, fundamental pedagogics became the “science of education,” even as it betrayed a desire to rationalize racist and separatist ideologies through the supposedly apolitical high ground of science (Appel, 1989, p. 556).

As a discipline, fundamental pedagogics applied a phenomenological approach to the experience of education, generating a series of pedagogic categories (Enslin, 1984, pp. 141-142).

Fundamental Pedagogics established three stages or moments in scientific research.

The *pre-scientific* (pre-reflective) life-world in which the original phenomena reveal themselves, and which rouse the wonderment of the scientist; the *scientific* reflection on the phenomenon and the universal, verifiable logically systemised body of knowledge offered by such reflection; and the *post-scientific* meaningful implementation of this body of knowledge in society. (Viljoen & Pienaar, 1971, p. 10, as cited in Enslin, 1984, p. 142)

Fundamental pedagogicians emphasized a strictly value-free scientific stage, but permitted the inclusion of values in either the pre- or post-scientific stages (Enslin, 1984, p. 142). During a scientific investigation, a researcher was expected to “bracket all faith, superstition, dogma, opinions, theories, and philosophies of life and the world” in pursuit of the “universal essences of education” (Viljoen & Peinaar, 1971, pp. 38, 10, as cited in Cross, 1986, p. 187). However, the results of the investigation would be used to the enrichment of the culture or group to which the researcher belonged (Viljoen & Pienaar, 1971, p. 10, as cited in Cross, 1986, p. 187).

This division allowed the full practice of education by teachers or educators, but reserved educational theory for “the pedagogician or educationist as scientist” (Enslin 1984, p. 142). For

proponents of the approach, CNE and fundamental pedagogics intersected in the before- and after-stages, where values were permitted.

Education is a particular occurrence in accordance with accepted values and norms of the educator and eventually also of the group to which he belongs. He is engaged in accompanying the child on the way to self-realisation, but this realisation must be in accordance with the demands of the community and in compliance with the philosophy of life of the group to which he belongs. In this way, the South African child has to be educated according to Christian National principles. (Viljoen & Pienaar, 1971, p. 95, as cited in Enslin, 1984, p. 142)

Fundamental pedagogics permitted educators and educational theorists to embrace their discipline as a science, to admit their own moral or political values as they reflected the community, and to use science as a criterion in the evaluation of educational practice (Enslin, 1984, p. 143). In other words, fundamental pedagogics attempted to insert a value-free scientific basis into education in South Africa, even as CNE “bracketed” the scientific center with the racist and separatist political values that seeped into education.

This conveniently absolved educational theory from the task of considering the political or ethical values that were inextricable from education, particularly in apartheid-era South Africa (Enslin, 1984, pp. 142-143). Likewise, educators could deflect moral or ethical issues as they had no grounding in science, even if they were part and parcel of apartheid-era education (Le Grange, 2010, p. 183). The unfortunate side effect was that, rather than producing “universally valid” investigations of education that were free from “metaphysics, dogmatics, and ideology,” fundamental pedagogics allowed educators to turn blind eye to CNE (Le Grange, 2010, p. 183). And as fundamental pedagogics became the ideological underpinning to teacher education in the

apartheid heyday (Chisholm, 2017, p. 159), it contributed to the reproduction of the ruling ideology (Le Grange, 2010, p. 183). Perhaps in a strange way, it managed to disprove itself, by demonstrating the impossibility of a neutral education (Shaull, 2000, p. 34).

Legacies. Christian National Education, and its offshoot fundamental pedagogics, established its legacy in a variety of ways. First and foremost, CNE became the blueprint for educational legislation under the nationalist government, most prominently in the aforementioned Bantu Education Act, passed only years after the 1948 publication of the *Beleid* (Lavin, 1965, p. 432). From that high perch, CNE supported apartheid “just as it was once used to stiffen the backbone of emerging Afrikanerdom” (Lavin, 1965, p. 432). If the *Beleid* established the battle plan for White superiority, apartheid-era legislation put that plan into action. The concept of South Africa espoused by the union government was no longer a reality; nationality was henceforth to be determined by language and race (Lavin, 1965, p. 432). Even before “non-white” Africans were forbidden to enter universities, English-speaking and Afrikaans-speaking White students were separated from one another in schools (Lavin, 1965, p. 432). With Afrikaner culture as its main concern, provinces implemented CNE to stipulate that White children must be taught in their home language (Lavin, 1965, p. 432). For all its saber-rattling over English as the medium of instruction, the embodiment of CNE in following decades denied parents the right to choose a school for their children, or even have a say in what was the home language (Lavin, 1965, p. 432).

But beyond that, CNE also marked the closure of missionary education, and its declining favor. While both CNE and missionary education seemed to hold common ground, discontinuity appeared in the role religion played toward a “national” element (Steyn, 1990, p. i). Missionary education had always embraced the religious content, in accordance with the goals of the mission

society and the boundaries of dogma. But the Nationalist Party heavily emphasized the “national” component of Christian National Education – something which could not be found in missionary education, even if the Christian component was obvious (Steyn, 1990, p. i). That national component becomes the point of disagreement between CNE and its missionary counterpart (Steyn, 1990, p. i). Even though both systems professed an aim of westernization, missionary education saw that as a means toward Christianization, while apartheid governments saw it as a step in the process of becoming a good citizen (Steyn, 1990, p. ii). Despite that similarity, nationalism became the line between mission-based schooling of previous centuries, and Bantu Education to come.

CNE, and the traditions of conservatism and nationalism, dominated scholarly investigations into South African educational history both before and after apartheid took root in education (Cross, 1986, p. 186). This resulted in a survey of educational history that tended to glorify a “traditional Afrikaner value” and further promote Afrikaner nationalism, as well as an excessively “white-centered” view on the history of education in South Africa (Cross, 1986, p. 186). Although some of its tenets were shared among educational theorists in English-speaking academia, another legacy of CNE is that it historically appeared as an attribute of Afrikaans-speaking academes (Cross, 1986, p. 186).

CNE formed the basis of an education system of the mid-20th century, but its most enduring – and perhaps most disappointing – legacy has been its reappearance in the minds of teachers and teacher educators, through to the new millennium. As recently as 2008, academics from teacher education colleges still embraced a “fundamental pedagogics approach,” on the basis that it helped rationalize modules, qualifications, and program structures in curriculum changes, even though fundamental pedagogics had long since been discredited, and its use was discouraged

(Kruss, 2009, p. 86). Similarly, educators and academics framed ideological and pedagogical differences in teacher education as “Afrikaans” or “English” approaches – or more precisely, “Christian National Education” or “People’s Education,” a reference to a 1980s-era view of education that opposed apartheid school policies (Kruss, 2009, p. 86; Morphet, 1987, p. 3). In either case, the persistence of CNE in the perspectives of 21st-century teachers and teacher education, long after its elimination from the curriculum, speaks not only to its fierce controversy as an educational philosophy, but to its effect on schools, students, teachers, and school leaders.

Apartheid

In some ways, the ascension of the Nationalist Party to the helm of South African government in 1948 was a predictable intertwining of any number of historical threads. For decades, access to power for non-European South Africans had eroded. Institutionalized racism had capitalized on the newfound science of genetics to justify the desire of White Africans to prolong colonial prejudices, and subjugate segments of society with darker skin. Segregated institutions were unable to cope with urbanization, social change, and the political mood. Missionary education was clearly failing, but union leadership could muster no better replacement than Native Education, which was itself too unbalanced to efficiently take over from the evangelists. Boer culture had rebounded from the humiliation of Vereeniging to establish an Afrikaner dynasty over the union government. And Christian National Education, the ideological grandchild of the *Afrikaner Broederbond*, had made its debut, ensuring the geographical, social, cultural, and racial separation of South Africa would find adherents in younger generations.

Principles and Phases. Scholars have proposed several fundamental principles to the 46 years of apartheid rule (Beck, 2000, p. 126; Beck, 2014, p. 136; Chisholm, 2012, p. 84), some of which were inherited from the union or from colonial governments that preceded it. First,

apartheid relied on a classification of four “racial groups” of South Africans, namely “white,” “black,” “coloured,” and “Asian” (Beck, 2000, p. 126; Beck, 2014, p. 136; Thompson, 2001, p. 190). Second, because White Africans were the only “civilized” race – which returns again to the idea of incomplete development of Indigenous civilizations – they exercised complete political power over the remaining three (Beck, 2000, p. 126; Beck, 2014, p. 136; Thompson, 2001, p. 190). Third, the conditions for, or the interests of, White Africans were prioritized over other racial groups (Beck, 2000, p. 126; Beck, 2014, p. 136; Thompson, 2001, p. 190). And finally, regardless of European origins, all White Africans were classified as “white” (Beck, 2000, p. 126; Beck, 2014, p. 136; Thompson, 2001, p. 190). This last point bears explanation: The government routinely broke apart Black African populations into nine or 10 subgroups, and labeled Asian South Africans as aliens (Beck, 2000, p. 126; Beck, 2014, p. 136; Thompson, 2001, p. 190). This worked against Black African unity at a policy level, but more importantly, it afforded White Africans the mental salve of numerical superiority over any other single fragmented population (Thompson, 2001, p. 190).

Those four principles supported apartheid through three phases. First, the classical era was marked with the 1948 election on one end, and the introduction in 1959 of self-government of Black African reserves, intended for separate development (Beck, 2000, p. 126; Beck, 2014, p. 136). In this phase, apartheid as an ideology became law, and the union made preparations to recast itself as a republic – a major ethnic objective (Beck, 2000, p. 126; Beck, 2014, p. 136; Thompson, 2001, p. 188).

The second phase continued until the early 1970s, and marked the high point of the apartheid state and Afrikaner nationalism (Beck, 2000, p. 126; Beck, 2014, p. 136). Within this same era, opposition built against separate development, and anti-apartheid efforts began to

spark violence (Beck, 2000, p. 126; Beck, 2014, p. 136).

The third phase represented the government's gradual acknowledgment that apartheid policy was a failure, the continual state of emergency after 1985, the slow relaxation of restrictions on Coloured and Asian Africans, and concessions to the internal and external forces demanding change (Beck, 2000, p. 126; Beck, 2014, p. 136). With this framework, the apartheid era closes at the 1994 election of Nelson Mandela as South African president (Beck, 2000, p. 126; Beck, 2014, p. 136).

Implications of the Term. Apartheid as an idea and an ideology was in some ways a victim of its own convenience (Dubow, 2014, p. x). The philosophy was appealing to both the ordinary voters and opinionated intellectuals of the 1940s because it condensed a series of fears and hopes – Black African domination, miscegenation, White superiority, communism, and the complacency of the incumbent government, to name a few – into a single taut word (Dubow, 2014, pp. 7-8, x). Over time though, the use of that word unpacked a long string of unsavory images of South Africa on both the domestic and international stage, not the least of which were racial discrimination and exploitation, thereby providing a convenient byword for opposition to rally around (Dubow, 2014, p. x). The Afrikaner alliance that assumed control in 1948 owed much of its success to that one word and the images it conjured in the electorate; the forces that wore down the apartheid machine likewise owed much of their success to what the word came to represent in later decades (Dubow, 2014, p. x).

In a similar way, it is obvious with hindsight that the apartheid government enacted much of the same colonial mechanism over Indigenous populations that it professed to escape (Chisholm, 2017, p. 186). Nationalist seizure of the political sphere was a providential victory for the Afrikaner people in their fight for recognition, a fight they traced through the White emi-

gration of the 1830s, the inhumanity of the South African War, and the opening of the union in 1910 (Dubow, 2014, p. 3; Lavin, 1965, p. 429). D. F. Malan, leader of the Nationalist Party, arriving in Pretoria after the election results of 1948, encapsulated that view.

In the past ... we felt like strangers in our own country, but today South Africa belongs to us once more. For the first time since Union, South Africa is our own. May God grant that it always remains our own. (Thompson, 2001, p. 186)

That triumphant tone was no surprise; it complemented the bitterness between English- and Afrikaans-speaking White Africans, as well as the struggle for parity for Afrikaans as a language (Jones, 1966, pp. 85-86). But more than that, apartheid and White supremacy allowed the pretext of protecting “the purity of African ethnicities” – the “various nations of South Africa as God-created entities” (Ross, 1999, p. 116) as conveniently defined by the government (Chisholm, 2017, p. 186). In practice, the shift to apartheid and separate development was “one form of white control ... simply replaced by another” (Chisholm, 2017, p. 186), particularly in the field of education. De-colonization, as the apartheid government framed it, in fact entailed a re-colonization, invoking a new contrivance of colonialism at the moment it claimed to eradicate it (Chisholm, 2017, p. 186).

At a deeper level, the apartheid government, institutionalized racism, and religious nationalism failed because they could not recognize the simple reality of hundreds of years of cross-cultural interactions. The idea of “keeping the races apart” had its proponents for centuries, most hoping that clear us-and-them divisions would preempt the “entanglements of a mixed community” where different cultures already worked together (Macmillan, 1963, p. 58). But segregation, and later the separation invoked by apartheid, broke down at every attempt in the sub-continent’s history because “it ignored the fact that relationships had already been established”

(Macmillan, 1963, p. 58). Surprisingly, Charles Loram expressed this inherent flaw both in separation and segregation quite eloquently, if slightly checkered by the vocabulary of his era.

The majority of the whites fail to see that a million and a half Europeans cannot shut themselves off from the four and a half millions of Natives in their midst. They do not yet realize that their own development, particularly in its economic aspects, is bound up with the development of the Natives. (Loram, 1926, p. 9)

Put succinctly, the problem that segregation and apartheid hoped to avoid was already a foregone matter: “Fitting relationships must be maintained between white and coloured people in so far as they have already come to live and work together” (Macmillan, 1963, p. 58). The doctrines of the *Afrikaner Broederbond*, the policies of apartheid, and combative posture of the CNE failed in some ways because they all sought to prevent something that had already happened.

Political Strategies. One of the strongest ironies of the apartheid era was that the Nationalist Party arrived in government in 1948 without any clear plan (Beinart, 1994, p. 139; Kallaway, 2002, p. 13; Ross, 1999, p. 115). The ouster of the long-standing Smuts government by Malan and his slender agreement between like-minded parties was unexpected on all fronts (Dubow, 2014, p. 1; Ross, 1999, p. 114). The nationalist segment had promised “apartheid,” so a clear understanding for the word was needed (Ross, 2008, pp. 123-124). While the term had its roots in Dutch Reformed Church discussions (Dubow, 2014, p. 19), it was more of a tactical ploy than a clearly defined policy (Dubow, 2014, pp. 9-10).

The nationalist government owed its slim edge in the Parliament of South Africa in a small part to clever political maneuvering, but in a greater portion to a campaign platform that put the ruling party on the defensive (Dubow, 2014, pp. 2, 6). Smuts was a venerable statesman on the world stage, but he had lost touch with domestic issues (Dubow, 2014, p. 2; Thompson,

2001, p. 186). Segregation had fallen out of favor through the war years, and was considered a decrepit policy incapable of coping with burgeoning urban populations – something Smuts himself hinted at (Dubow, 2014, p. 12). At the same time, Afrikaner nationalists resented Smuts for twice siding with Britain in world wars, and for a track record of breaking strikes with violence (Dubow, 2014, p. 2). Meanwhile, rapid economic growth and extensive social programs had mitigated White poverty, but urbanization continued to hinder White African city dwellers (Dubow, 2014, p. 4). In 1910, less than a third of urban populations were Afrikaners; by 1936, that number had rocketed to 50%, and in 1948 as many or more Afrikaners lived in cities as lived in rural areas (Dubow, 2014, pp. 4-5). And yet, new Afrikaner arrivals in urban centers were still struck with feelings of inferiority and insecurity, particularly in English-majority Cape Town or Johannesburg (Dubow, 2014, p. 4). Working-class urban Afrikaners saw themselves pinned between an English-speaking over-class, and an encroaching majority of urban Black Africans (Dubow, 2014, p. 5; Thompson, 2001, p. 185).

Nationalist campaigners concentrated on fears for White supremacy and Christian civilization, playing heavily on the theme of Black African domination (Dubow, 2014, p. 7). Smuts had attempted in war years to legitimize Black African trade unions, ease the pass law system, and improve social welfare and education for Black Africans (Dubow, 2014, pp. 5-6), and nationalists pounced upon those halfhearted measures as threats to White superiority, or slights against Afrikaners (Dubow, 2014, pp. 6, 9). In previous elections, the issues of “mixed marriages,” racial populism, and miscegenation had proven successful; the “apartheid” slogan distilled those anxieties, the incompetence and discrimination perceived in the Smuts government, and the looming specter of communism, into a clever, but undefined, catchword (Dubow, 2014, pp. 6-7, 9). Nationalists effectively challenged voters to choose between “integration and national suicide” on

one hand, or “protection of the pure white race” on the other (Dubow, 2014, p. 9).

Definition and Redefinition. Clearly, the reluctance of nationalists to pin down a meaning for “apartheid” did not detract from its usefulness as a word (Dubow, 2014, p. 10). While nationalists were hesitant to attach the word to a definition, it was universally clear that an apartheid policy would be more “systematic and stringent” than its predecessors (Dubow, 2014, p. 11). Institutional segregation was a staple of the union government since its birth in 1910, and that government had, in turn, drawn upon the segregationist attitudes of colonial governments through previous centuries (Dubow, 2014, p. 11). Pushed to characterize apartheid, Malan distinguished it from segregation, but painted it in a favorable light, suggesting the policy intended to “give the various races the opportunity of uplifting themselves on the basis of what is their own” (Dubow, 2014, p. 10).

This convenient rephrasing of apartheid would continue in coming years, most often to match the audience. Verwoerd told the London Sunday Times in 1961 that “apartheid is widely identified with race prejudice, whereas its very purpose is to remove prejudice and create harmony” (Morris-Hale, 1996, p. 227). In 1948, not yet prime minister, he denied apartheid implied “total” segregation, suggesting instead that the word represented an ideal that could not reasonably be put into practice (Dubow, 2014, p. 13). In that same year, Malan expanded on the concept, suggesting it would allow Black Africans to develop their own institutions and enjoy self-government in the reserves, enabling them to “retain their own national character” (Dubow, 2014, p. 32). A few years later, Malan equated apartheid to racial policies that had been grandfathered in over the previous 300 years (Dubow, 2014, p. 13). He also pitched apartheid as a “positive and non-repressive policy” based on the divine calling of the Afrikaner and his privilege to convert “the heathen” without conceding his national identity (Dubow, 2014, p. 13). At the same

time though, Malan insisted the policy would take “very many years” to implement, and that it was an “experiment which is as yet only in its initial stages” (Dubow, 2014, p. 13).

In truth though, Malan and his peers had clear ideas for apartheid, and discussions of the concept and its workings had appeared in print long before the 1948 election (Dubow, 2014, p. 13). Late in 1948 Malan issued an internal policy memorandum that argued union-era segregation was an inadequate solution, and instead argued for separation on social, residential, political, and industrial grounds (Dubow, 2014, p. 16). In 1963 and well into the confrontational years of apartheid, Verwoerd spoke to the Parliament of South Africa as prime minister, and made apartheid’s goals abundantly clear.

Reduced to its simplest form the problem is nothing else than this: We want to keep South Africa White. ... If we are agreed that it is the desire of the people that the White man should be able to continue to protect himself by retaining White domination, one must ask oneself how can that be done. ... We say that it can be achieved by separation development. (*Debates of the House of Assembly*, 1963, col. 212)

Where apartheid in its earliest days was framed as a more stringent and disciplined application of the segregation seen in previous decades, or as an efficient guarantee of White security, or as a means of self-actualization and development among South Africa’s Indigenous populations (Dubow, 2014, p. 13), later proclamations left no doubt that White supremacy and racial subordination were its chief goals.

Legislating Racism. The nationalist government had only a shaky hold over parliament in 1948, and for many, the unexpected victory was merely a temporary quirk, a byproduct of a system “weighted” toward its rural constituencies (Dubow, 2014, p. 2; Ross, 2008, p. 123). Indeed, the nationalists had come under fire in previous years from even further right-wing ele-

ments – including pro-Nazi parliamentary factions and paramilitary groups from wartime years (Dubow, 2014, p. 6). For that reason, the top priority of the nationalist government was to ensure it would remain in power (Ross, 2008, p. 123). The first step was the addition of voters in the mandated territory of South West Africa – now Namibia – whose Afrikaans- and German-speakers would likely support nationalist politics (Ross, 2008, p. 123). Next, the government began a “long and constitutionally messy” process that required “a blend of legalism and cunning” to remove Cape Province Coloured Africans from the voter rolls, with an eye toward adding those parliamentary seats to the Nationalist Party (Ross, 2008, p. 123; Thompson, 2001, p. 191). Those moves, along with a measure of gerrymandering, the intercessions of the *Broederbond*, and a continued “weighting” of White rural votes, cemented White domination of parliamentary power (Dubow, 2014, p. 6; Ross, 2008, p. 123; Worden, 1994, p. 97).

Population Registration Act. Almost immediately, the new government set to legislating racial “purity” and separating the citizenry on the basis of skin color (Beck, 2000, p. 127). The Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act of 1949 punished White Africans who married or had sexual relations with people from other racial groups, and a 1950 extension of a 1927 Immorality Act further criminalized the “immorality” of heterosexual relationships across color lines (Beck, 2000, p. 127; Ross, 2008, p. 124; Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 1998, vol. 1, pp. 450, 453). With the same pernicious goal, the Population Registration Act of 1950 assigned every child a racial category at birth (Dubow, 2014, p. 37), and led to the creation of a full national racial register (Dubow, 2014, p. 38). Hundreds of times a year in coming decades, a Race Classification Board, at its prerogative, reassigned family members to different racial groups on the basis of appearance, broke apart their families, and geographically separated them (Beck, 2000, p. 127; Ross, 2008, p. 124).

As one example, in the 1960s in a small, predominantly Afrikaner town in the Transvaal, students complained that one of their classmates “looked coloured,” and although her family were all White Afrikaners, she was reclassified as “coloured,” expelled from her school, and out-cast from the community (Beck, 2000, p. 127). In another case within the same decade, a population registration board decided through a majority vote that an entire Johannesburg family of eight – the two parents and six children – was to be reclassified as “coloured” *en masse*, in spite of the fact that they had been listed as “white” in the 1951 census, and were considered to be “white” by the community (Ratele & Laubscher, 2013, p. 115). At a hearing, the chairman of the board, a former judge, decreed that everyone in the family was “white” except the father, but two other board members argued the father and four children were not “white” (Ratele & Laubscher, 2013, p. 115). In the ensuing vote, the majority ruled the whole family was to be reclassified as “coloured” (Ratele & Laubscher, 2013, p. 115), with apparently no more evidence or testimony than the fact that they looked “swarthier” than “the type of white person normally seen in South Africa” (Ratele & Laubscher, 2013, p. 116).

In many ways, the Population Registration Act exemplified the apartheid government’s enshrinement of racial distinctions – “anathema in the post-Holocaust and post-colonial world” (Beinart, 1994, p. 138) – at the center of government policy. It formed one of the fundamental mechanisms of the apartheid state, as assignment of citizens to a specific birth race could influence their social status, rights, residency, employment, and even citizenship (Dubow, 2014, p. 38). By attaching the idea of social status to biological ancestry in every facet of society, apartheid created a South Africa that featured “the most oppressive system of racial rule in the post-war world” (Dubow, 2014, p. 38).

And yet, despite its attempt at bureaucratic exactness, the legislation itself was unwork-

able without the inclusion of inexact criteria, such as “appearance” or “social acceptance,” which meant that some racial groups could only be defined by their exclusion from others – most notably “coloureds,” who were “not a white person or a native” (Dubow, 2014, p. 38). In one particularly repugnant example from the 1980s, police conducted “tests” on a hair from an abandoned infant in order to establish a racial category for the child, in spite of the fact that no scientific classifications for hair types were available as an official policy (Cooper, et al., 1984, p. 103, as cited in Ratele & Laubscher, 2013, p. 113). This untenable attempt at pigeonholing citizens resulted in legal formulations that reinforced popular racism, and vice-versa, with the long-term effects being the internalization of the Population Registration Act’s system into the common consciousness of all South Africans (Dubow, 2014, p. 38), even into the next century.

Group Areas Act. In some cases, apartheid legislation borrowed heavily from precedent. Black African voting rights were all but extinguished by 1936, and land ownership was restricted to the “native reserves,” held in trust by the union government, but with promises of future expansions (Dubow, 2014, pp. 11, 12). Building on that and other legislation, the Group Areas Act of 1950 assigned geographic locations for the use of particular racial groups (Dubow, 2014, p. 37; Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 1998, vol. 1, p. 453), thereby segregating residential and commercial areas by color (Beck, 2000, p. 127). That act, and later acts that paralleled it, nullified existing property rights and reserved urban centers for White businesses (Beck, 2000, p. 127). Black Africans who had centuries-old claims to property were evicted as municipal centers were recast White-only (Beck, 2000, p. 127). Similarly, South Africans of Indian descent who owned businesses in city centers and lived above their shops had to sell their property and relocate to an area designated Indian African-only, most likely at a distance to lucrative city centers (Beck, 2000, p. 127).

It was now compulsory for people to live in an area designated for their group (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 1998, vol. 1, p. 453), and in some cases, residences that had been the legal property of Black Africans as far back as early days of the union, were seized and re-zoned for White-only occupation (Thomas, 2001, p. 194). With a degree of insensitivity challenged only by the policy itself, these concentrations of Black Africans were dubbed “black spots” – even in government documents (*Report of the Native Affairs Commission for the Years 1939 and 1940*, 1947, p. 4) – and mercilessly cleared (Ross, 2008, p. 147). Inhabitants were forced off the land into a new location or their respective homeland, from where they had to commute, sometimes for hours by bus, to their workplaces (Ross, 2008, p. 146). The Group Areas Act resulted in countless numbers of these “removals;” one of the most notorious was the 1955 relocation of Sofiatown, only four miles from the center of Johannesburg, to a location 12 miles outside the city (Thomas, 2001, p. 194). Sofiatown was re-zoned for White Africans only, and with no small measure of sardonicism, renamed *Triomf*, meaning “triumph” (Thompson, 2001, p. 194). In some cases the mass removal of residents resulted in such a high population density that the policy had created a new township: By 1980, a tiny reserve south of Johannesburg was home to more than 157,000 Black Africans compressed within only 239 square miles (Thompson, 2001, pp. 193-194).

The infiltration of apartheid into the fabric of South African society did not go without challenges, both social and legal. But where the courts ruled against the implications of separate development, nationalist legislators simply rewrote the law in their favor. When a court ruled in 1953 that segregation was unlawful without corresponding facilities for different racial groups, such as waiting rooms in railroad stations, parliament passed the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act in 1954 to legalize inequalities in services or provisions (Beck, 2000, p. 128; Thompson,

2001, p. 190). The law permitted separate but not necessarily equal public facilities, which resulted in signs designating “whites only” or “non-whites only” in train cars or on park benches (Beck, 2000, p. 128). At a time when pro-human rights and anti-racism trends were gaining ground in Europe and the United States – perhaps most notably *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* in 1954, which overturned America’s “separate but equal” doctrine – apartheid was committed to the opposite course (Beck, 2000, p. 128).

Suppression of Communism Act. As a similar strategy, when South African citizens of any color stood in opposition to the apartheid juggernaut, the nationalist parliament simply criminalized opposition (Beck, 2000, p. 128). As might be inferred from the name, the Suppression of Communism Act of 1950 prohibited a list of organizations and persons from promoting “communism” (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 1998, vol. 1, p. 453). This effectively forced the South African Communist Party underground, resulting in its eventual disbandment (Beck, 2000, p. 129; Dubow, 2014, p. 37; Ross, 2008, p. 132). However, the definition of “communism” was loosely interpreted (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 1998, vol. 1, p. 453), leading to willful misapplications of the law to punish any opponent of apartheid (Worden, 1994, p. 97).

The act also gave the minister of justice summary powers over anyone or anything he felt likely to promote the aims of communism (Thompson, 2001, p. 197), including “any organization or individual whose views were considered to be radical” (Dubow, 2014, p. 37). The minister could “ban” a person or a group, which prevented organizations from holding meetings, publicizing their cause, or publishing literature, and exposed their membership to arrest (Beck, 2000, p. 129). For individuals, a ban restricted movement, required them to report regularly to the police, prevented him or her from joining organizations, blocked communications with other banned South Africans, forbid publications or speeches, removed them from the political arena,

and confined them to their residence without visitors (Beck, 2000, p. 129; Ross, 2008, p. 134; Thompson, 2001, p. 198). The minister did not have to justify the punishment, and the victim had no legal recourse – effectively becoming a power framed in an anti-communism law that sharply smacked of a communist regime (Beck, 2000, p. 129).

Over the years the act, and several others like it, became a preferred method for controlling dissent, and a method of appeasing skittish White African voters through the criminalization of opposition (Beck, 2000, pp. 129-130; Dubow, 2014, p. 37). By the mid-1950s, 11 of the 27 members of the African National Congress' executive were under bans, as were many other members of opposition political parties (Ross, 2008, p. 134). After the death of Steve Biko in police custody in 1977, the government placed a blanket ban on all Black Consciousness Movement organizations (Worden, 1994, p. 118). Nelson Mandela was banned three times in the 1950s, and the practice was not limited to Black Africans: Anglican priest Trevor Huddleston was banned; Helen Joseph, an outspoken anti-apartheid activist, was banned four times beginning in 1957; and Beyers Naudé, a leader within the Dutch Reformed Church and a member of the *Afrikaner Broederbond*, was banned for seven years, then expelled from the DRC for anti-apartheid activities (Beck, 2000, pp. 136-137; Dubow, 2014, p. 167).

In spite of its harshness and wide-ranging application, the act provided a critical entitlement: It was a Cold War-era tool that allied the apartheid regime with the West. Through the 1950s and beyond, European and American leaders were willing to excuse South Africa (as well as right-wing dictatorships in Latin and Central America and southeast Asia) for human and civil rights abuses because the law professed to fight communism (Beck, 2000, p. 129; Ross, 2008, p. 124; Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 1998, vol. 1, pp. 15-16). In that way, the Suppression of Communism Act was one of many oppressive laws that allowed the apartheid regime to

act with impunity, while the international community conveniently turned a blind eye (Beck, 2000, p. 129).

Bantu Authorities Act. Apartheid did not stop at the civil or human rights of the individual; it contorted local government as well. The premise of the 1951 Bantu Authorities Act was to create “tribal authorities” in rural African reserves (Dubow, 2014, p. 64), but made no provisions for Black African representation in towns or “white” rural areas (Worden, 1994, pp. 96-97). Similar in a fashion to legislation of past decades that allowed the governor-general a free hand in appointing chiefs or headmen (Beck, 2000, p. 114), the 1951 act permitted the apartheid union to empower an artificial hierarchy of chiefs and councilors, regardless of their legitimacy among the target population (Beinart, 1994, p. 154; Dubow, 2014, p. 64). As outwardly “tribal” authorities, the surrogate chiefs and headmen performed traditional duties, but now as agents of White authority (Beck, 2000, p. 133; Thompson, 2001, p. 191). Black Africans vehemently opposed the act and its legitimacy on the grounds that it constituted government retribalization, eroded the rights of citizenship, and extended rural taxation (Dubow, 2014, pp. 64, 78). The process bestowed power on select proxies, and for that reason the act and its implementation had a sliver of support within Black African communities – but where the original chiefs or leaders were popular, their removal triggered a strong backlash (Dubow, 2014, pp. 64, 78). Into the 1960s, apartheid opponents highlighted shortfalls among professional classes in South Africa and blamed them on the “hare-brained schemes of retribalization ... in defiance of the demands of a modern industrial economy” (Tabata, 1959, p. 55). Political commentators in the previous decade saw the act as an admission that apartheid as a whole had no support among Black African communities, particularly when official mouthpieces claimed otherwise. Duma Nokwe, who led the African National Congress through much of the 1960s, explained that

The African people are realizing that apartheid means nothing else but oppression and exploitation. If [the government's] contention is correct, then why do we have the unrest in the countryside in the most desperate areas of the country? If [the government's] information is also correct, then why do we have the deposition of chiefs, why do we have the government agents moving around in the rural areas to find out what is going on?

(Apartheid in South Africa, 1957, 17:10)

Nokwe's rebuttal concluded with the insistence that, if the people of South Africa were contented with apartheid, it would not be necessary to install agents to watch over them (*Apartheid in South Africa, 1957, 17:47*), illustrating the opposition view to the legislation.

Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act. The real impact of the Bantu Authorities Act was seen in later years. The law now provided the White government with both direct and indirect influence at a local level, and linked each homeland reserve to a specific ethnic group (Beck, 2000, pp. 133-134). This paved the way for the Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act of 1959, and the creation of the Bantustans – supposedly independent states for Black Africans that represented the pinnacle of apartheid social engineering (Beck, 2000, pp. 133-134; Dubow, 2014, p. 64). On paper, each reserve would appear to be a separate “nation” (Beck, 2000, p. 133) within its own geographic homeland, and each Black African “nation” was to “develop along its own lines,” affording its citizens all the rights that were denied to them in White-run South Africa (Thompson, 2001, p. 191). This was a keystone of the apartheid promise: to redirect the endeavors of educated and motivated Black Africans away from major cities and back toward their home communities, where they would guide the vision of separate and independent development (Beinart, 1994, p. 208). “We have the choice of giving whites their own territory and the Bantu theirs,” Malan explained, “or of giving everybody one state and seeing the Bantu govern”

(Beinart, 1994, p. 152). Public relations representatives for the Department of Native Affairs underscored this concept in interviews with foreign correspondents in the late 1950s.

In the political field we are creating an outlet, in that we are proclaiming Bantu Authorities in all the major Bantu areas of the union. We have already brought into life more than 300 such authorities, where Bantu who have the inclination, the training, and the moral courage to start developing their own people can do so with all possible assistance from the government. (*Apartheid in South Africa*, 1957, 15:23)

To apartheid adherents, the eventual goal of this forcible bootstrapping was a self-sufficient political entity with the endorsement of the White government in Pretoria (Thompson, 2001, p. 191). Between 1963 and 1981, five different Bantustans supposedly became “self-governing” and “independent,” even if the homeland governments invariably relied on Pretoria for subsidies (Thompson, 2001, p. 191-192). But because Black Africans themselves had no voice in their establishment, and because the South African minister of affairs appointed the chiefs and headmen, the entire Bantustan exercise was little more than a facade (Beck, 2000, pp. 133-134). No foreign nation ever recognized the sovereignty of an “independent” South African homeland (Thompson, 2001, p. 193).

Moreover, the Bantustan endeavor was ridiculously self-defeating to a modern eye. Most homelands were hopelessly fragmented: Bureaucrats, geography, and White-owned farms arbitrarily splintered the reserves into the least convenient arrangements (Thompson, 2001, p. 191). Bophutatswana, a traditional homeland of the Tswana in the northwestern portion of the country, was a collection of 19 fragments, separated in some cases by hundreds of miles, many of which were arid, sub-desert zones (Thompson, 2001, p. 191). KwaZulu, a region comprising the traditional home of the Zulu nation, was splintered into 29 larger and 41 smaller fragments (Thomp-

son, 2001, p. 191). This puzzle-piece arrangement worked against Black African unity, even as it drained the economic potential for entire ethnic groups: The South African nation enjoyed a buoyant market through the 1950s and 1960s, but the Bantustans were economic backwaters (Thompson, 2001, p. 191). As apartheid evolved the homelands continued to suffer, unable to provide subsistence to a growing proportion of their people year after year (Thomson, 2001, pp. 191-192). With no local option for employment – Verwoerd even forbade White capitalists from investing in the homelands (Thompson, 2001, pp. 191-192) – Black Africans had no choice except to seek wage labor in industrial regions in the Transvaal, Cape Town, or along the southeastern coast (Thompson, 2001, p. 193). And that, of course, compounded the original issue of urbanization that apartheid professed to solve (Beinart, 1994, p. 208).

Opposition to such a lopsided society could not be constrained without a considerable degree of force. The apartheid regime boasted the best-equipped and best-trained police on the continent, with full-time and reserves numbering 75,000 police by the mid-1970s (Beck, 2000, p. 130). However, as with other totalitarian regimes, the apartheid government committed most of its police manpower and resources not to the pursuit of criminal elements, but rather to the stifling of political opponents and to quell anti-apartheid voices (Beck, 2000, p. 130). Offenses against White Africans were pursued and punished severely; violence, drugs, and crime in Black African communities saw little attention from White authorities (Beck, 2000, p. 130). South Africa had one of the highest capital punishment rates in the world, but death row was nearly entirely Black Africans (Beck, 2000, p. 130). In 1969, domestic law enforcement was complemented by an internal information service that operated in secret and without parliamentary oversight; in some cases it interrogated political opponents, conducted clandestine military operations against anti-apartheid organizations, destabilized neighboring governments in Angola and

Mozambique, and supplied military aid to insurgent forces in other nations (Beck, 2000, p. 130). Some of the most brutal detainment, torture, and assassinations of the later phases of apartheid – when “the repressive apparatus of the state was unleashed on an unprecedented scale” (Beinart, 1994, p. 246) – were never brought to light until apartheid faltered and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission convened in the late 1990s (Beck, 2000, p. 130).

The Eiselen Commission. Despite all these political and social machinations, apartheid could not hope to survive beyond a generation or two without education as a means of propagation. For that reason, and as so many governments had done before, the nationalist government appointed a commission in 1949 to consider the future of Black African education (Christopher, 1994, p. 150). Indeed, so many commissions had assembled to investigate education and other aspects of South African life, and their investigations were so marked by their one-sidedness, that history often regards them as either “hegemonic discourse” or as “intellectual amplifications of ruling class ideology” (Soudien, 2005, pp. 41-42).

Regardless, *The Eiselen Commission Report* placed a definite marker in the educational pathway of the nation. Commission director W. W. M. Eiselen, himself the son of a German missionary and a member of the *Afrikaner Broederbond*, maintained throughout his career that racial groups overlapped in their intellectual abilities, and for that reason genetics was not a reliable foundation for apartheid policy (Dubow, 2014, p. 16; Seroto, 2013, pp. 91-92). For him, the separation of South African citizens on the basis of race was first an issue of cultural preservation for Bantu populations, and second a benefit to racial domination (Seroto, 2013, pp. 99-100). Education for Black Africans, the commission explained, should be “within the African’s inherent racial qualities and their distinctive characteristics and aptitudes” – interpreted by some to mean within the confines of a supposedly inferior nation, and not part of the South African community

(Nwandula, 1988, p. 45).

Many of the commission's testimonials, as they were collected from the "intellectual amplifications of ruling class ideology," carried the hallmarks of Christian Nationalism that were common among the Afrikaner elite of the time (Soudien, 2005, p. 42). Where this commission seemed to stray from other bureaucratic investigations of education was in its subtle avoidance of blatant White supremacy (Soudien, 2005, p. 42). While much of the testimony was overtly racist, it also promulgated the "separate but equal" premise that preceded apartheid (Soudien, 2005, p. 42), perhaps betraying the fact that apartheid, as a working principle, was still young and searching for a footing. That lack of clarity led investigators and participants to rely on the conventional prejudices of their era and the scientific racism learned in previous decades (Soudien, 2005, p. 42), and tiptoe around the beliefs that were, as mentioned earlier, "anathema in the post-Holocaust and post-colonial world" (Beinart, 1994, p. 138). Investigators and witnesses before the commission insisted Black Africans were sufficiently different to warrant their separation from White society, but they were careful not to betray themselves as White supremacists (Soudien, 2005, p. 42).

At the same time, the Eiselen commission had a more balanced appearance than some of its predecessors. None of the commissioners had explicit ties to business or mining interests (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 252). Eiselen himself was a 10-year veteran of the education authority in the Transvaal, and at least one more of his fellow commissioners had equitable qualifications (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 252). Other panel members included professors of history and social work; three had doctoral degrees from German universities and another held a doctorate from America (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 252). Three were serving education bureaucrats but only one was an elected official (Fleisch, 1995b, pp. 252-253). Of the 500 witnesses who spoke before the panel between

1949 and 1951, none were representatives of mining, commercial, or industrial interests (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 253). And at least five members of the South African Communist Party testified, as did two members of the African National Congress (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 253).

In the end, Eiselen and his peers concluded that all aspects of education for Black Africans should be removed from provincial departments, and controlled by the national government (Seroto, 2013, p. 103). Education should be an integral part of a planned policy for separate development, both social and economic, for Black South Africans (Collins & Christie, 1982, p. 59), formally splicing racial separation into the administration and financing of Black African schools (Davis, 1984b, p. 133). They also suggested that communities should recover local control from religious bodies – implying the “inefficiency” of the missions – and that a new, separate education system should apply to Black African students (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 254; Seroto, 2013, pp. 103, 104). A new curriculum would divert Black Africans away from – to borrow Verwoerd’s description – “expectations in life which circumstances in South Africa do not allow to be fulfilled” (Christopher, 1994, p. 150). The remarkable segregation that existed before 1948, with the aim of preparing Black Africans for a role in White society, was rewritten to embrace apartheid’s core assumptions: The ideal Black African could not aspire to upper levels of society, and so education for those positions was no longer necessary (Christopher, 1994, pp. 150-151).

Bantu Education

The commission report, quick on the heels of the Nationalist Party victory and the concomitant publication of the Christian National Education *Beleid*, laid out the philosophical and organizational background for the “much reviled” Bantu Education Act of 1953 (Soudien, 2005, p. 42). Less flattering terms have been used to describe the act and its effects: “scarring and deeply felt” (Moore, 2016, p. 85); “racist, Euro-centered, sexist, authoritarian, prescriptive, un-

changing, context-blind, and discriminatory,” to repeat a few (Jansen, 1999, p. 4). For Black South Africans, Bantu Education was “reactionary,” “a complete racist and fascist system of ‘education,’” and the “negation of every single principle of education which has been accepted by democratic people of the world” (Nokwe, 1954, pp. 16, 18). Those who lived under the act held no illusions to its motive: “By expunging academic education and placing a premium on illiteracy and ignorance,” the nationalist government could “create an army of defenceless Black workers, maimed by ignorance, rent asunder by tribal antipathies and fit only to be dumb tools for the performance of menial tasks” (Tabata, 1974, pp. 78-79).

Administrative Policies. The main function of Bantu Education was to release control of education from provincial authorities, and elevate it to the Department of Native Affairs, with an eye toward creating a Department of Bantu Education – all of which occurred within a few years of *The Eiselen Commission Report* (Christopher, 1994, p. 151; Lavin, 1965, p. 432). With a mandate to manage Black African education specifically, the first minister of Bantu Education stated the aim of his department in plain terms: “It is the basic principle of Bantu Education in general ... to keep the Bantu child a Bantu child” (Lavin, 1965, p. 432).

Language. In step with that, a second premise of Bantu Education was the use of mother tongue instruction at the primary level (Bantu Education Act, 1953, p. 272), and the languages that offered passport to economic and social success – Afrikaans and English – were to be postponed until later years (Beinart, 2001, p. 153). The nationalist government painted this as a means of preserving Indigenous traditions and heritage, but critics sensed the ulterior goal of fragmenting the Black African majority and isolating their respective nations, with each history and culture insulated from its counterparts (Beinart, 2001, pp. 160-161; Christopher, 1994, p. 151; South African Congress of Democrats, 1955, p. 10). Mother-tongue instruction has demon-

strable benefits to modern education researchers, but apartheid-era Black Africans saw its adoption as part of the “White master-plan,” even if concessions were made in later years to allow the introduction of English or Afrikaans to young pupils (Rose, 1965, pp. 211, 212). Afrikaner nationalists reinforced that impression, by clutching to mother-tongue instruction as a keystone to their politics: “Mother-tongue education is the foundation of Nationalism. So long as there is mother-tongue education, so long there will be Nationalism” (Rose, 1965, p. 212). Critics sided with Indigenous parents, but often for a slightly different reason: Advanced education and academic success would require proficiency in additional languages.

With English at his command the African had access to the libraries of the world. This the Zulu language can not give him. Zulu is a beautiful language that adequately expresses a pastoral, pre-industrial people ... For modern life its vocabulary is too restrictive. One can talk about the weather and crops in Xhosa but not about electrical engineering. (Rose, 1965, p. 211)

Apartheid policy and practice dodged this argument. Verwoerd and his peers felt education must prepare Black Africans in accordance to their opportunities in the world where they lived (Dube, 1985, p. 95). Black African education would be rooted to “the Native areas, Native environment, and in the Native community,” and graduates would be redirected back toward their own populations (Dube, 1985, p. 95) – even promising “deliberate attempts will be made to keep the institutions for advanced education more and more away from the urban environment and to establish them as far as possible in the native reserves” (*Debates of the Senate*, 1954, col. 2618). In many ways, Bantu Education would reinforce the essence of the Bantu Authorities Act.

Curriculum. Soon it became nearly impossible for nongovernmental schools to continue. Missionary education, still stinging from the withering criticism of earlier decades, took the

brunt of Verwoerd's displeasure when he presented his Bantu Education Bill to the all-White House of Assembly in 1953 (Dube, 1985, p. 95). The future prime minister insisted the old mission schools were "inadequate" because they had failed to integrate into the community (Rose, 1965, p. 209), but his opponents knew the real reason: The existing institutions for Black African education fostered unwelcome ideas that apartheid could not tolerate – such as racial equality (Christopher, 1994, p. 151). For nationalists, education at mission schools offered academic training with an overemphasis on English and the admission of "dangerous liberal ideas" (Beinart, 1994, p. 153). Missionary educators, with their long-running relationships in large communities of Black African parents and students, held formidable influence (Moore, 2016, p. 47). What is more, successful mission schools had a reputation for producing a Black African elite that demanded a part in common society (Beinart, 1994, p. 153) – something apartheid could not conscience. Missionaries had run more than 5,000 schools at the onset of the act, but before the start of the 1960s, nearly all schools for Black Africans – apart from roughly 700 Catholic schools – were under the control of the Native Affairs Department (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 60). In 1954, more than 90% of funding for Black African education came from public sources, with Black Africans once again paying a national tax in support of education, and national subsidies to schools soon to end (Davis, 1984b, p. 130; Robertson & Robertson, 1977, p. 11; Troup, 1976, p. 24).

Teacher Qualifications. Teacher training shifted to government training colleges where the apartheid message could be instilled; schools were required to follow a government syllabus rooted in CNE and "imbued with the ideas of racial inferiority" (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 60). And as the Bantu Education Act gave the Department of Native Affairs blanket powers to approve or register schools (Bantu Education Act, 1953, pp. 272-273), any school that refused was

considered illegal (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 69). At the end of that decade it was clear that the government would not approve of any school that ran counter to the *Beleid* or *The Eiselen Commission Report* (Brookes & Macaulay, 1958, p. 115). Given the choice to continue without state funding or to surrender their schools to government control, leading missionary societies chose the latter (Chisholm, 2017, p. xix). Private or denominational schools that could survive on their own adopted an outwardly segregated stance, in order to retain state recognition but remain beyond direct government control (Christopher, 1994, p. 151). The 160-year run of missionary education had come to a close, with education for Black Africans expanding, but with Christian Nationalists tightening their grip upon curriculum, administration, and finance (Thompson, 2001, p. 196). In the eyes of Bantu Education adherents, schools had been cleansed of a corrupting European presence, in accordance with apartheid's larger design (Chisholm, 2017, p. 186).

Almost overnight, the classroom became an echo chamber for nationalist doctrine (Ross, 2008, p. 131). Government policy now limited Black Africans to the skills that profited the White-run economy, with an emphasis on the fundamentals learned within the first four years of school (Ross, 2008, p. 131). The net result was a totally inadequate system of education (Jarvis, 1985, p. 33), marked by high levels of illiteracy, low pass rates, ill-equipped schools, and badly trained teachers (Moore, 2016, pp. 85-86). Where school buildings existed, they were likely in poor condition (Jarvis, 1985, p. 33), although the state did allow "Bantu mothers," with the permission of farmers and in observance of local methods, to erect the walls of a school, "and the Department will provide the windows, doors, and roofs" (Nokwe, 1954, p. 17). Teachers were largely underqualified and in short supply; in 1961 only one in 10 Black African teachers were themselves graduates (Jarvis, 1985, p. 33; Villette, 2016, para. 5). In 1978, only 2.3% of Black African teachers had university degrees; more than 80% taught on a secondary-school equiva-

lency or less (Bantu Education: Socialization for dependency, 1979, p. 15). Women teachers were preferred over men, as they were less expensive (Nokwe, 1954, p. 17). Even if a Black African teacher had the same qualifications as a White counterpart, she could still only expect two-thirds of their salary (Bantu Education: Socialization for dependency, 1979, p. 15). The “European” teacher was paid more because “he is in the service of the European community and his salary must be fixed accordingly” (Nokwe, 1954, p. 17). Even a “European” teacher working in the service of Black Africans would receive a higher salary, as he or she was “on loan to the African” (Nokwe, 1954, p. 17). Curiously, that principle was not reversed to benefit Black Africans working in the service of White Africans (Nokwe, 1954, p. 17).

Pupil Retention. Under Bantu Education, two sub-standards of pre-primary school were followed by six standards, then five “forms” of secondary school (Murphy, 1973, p. 20). Standard 2 was the limit of “fundamental” education, after which students were selected to continue onward for “higher-primary education” (Nokwe, 1954, p. 16). Most pupils left school after the first four years, curiously echoing a failure *The Eiselen Commission Report* leveled against missionary education (Beinart, 1994, p. 154; Beinart, 2001, p. 161; Fleisch, 1995b, p. 254). In 1945, three-quarters of Black African pupils were still in early primary standards, and only 3.4% were in secondary forms (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 63). During the first two years of Bantu Education, half of all Black African pupils were in sub-standards, and only 0.05% of pupils who had started school 12 years earlier would graduate, or “matriculate,” that year (Pells, 1954, p. 147). Out of every 100 students who began Standard 1 in 1969, only four matriculated (Abdi, 1999, p. 155).

Student-to-Teacher Ratios. Classroom crowding reached astronomical levels at the opening of the 1960s, when the student-teacher ratio was reported at 57 to one (Christie & Collins,

1982, p. 72). However, that number was undoubtedly low: The government not only aggregated ratios across all grade levels (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 72), but in some years admitted it had included “all pupils and teachers in training, secondary, and vocational schools” as part of its calculations (Rose, 1965, p. 210), thereby obscuring the worst conditions. Urban schools suffered most; Rose (1965, p. 210) credits one “excellently administrated” school for the education of 1,050 students across two shifts each day, including a sports regimen, and with a staff of only 14 teachers and a principal. By the 1970s, the student-teacher ratio had reportedly fallen, but still hovered at 41 students to one teacher (Abdi, 1999, p. 155); in the same time frame, the student-teacher ratio in White African schools rested at just under 20 to one (Bantu Education: Socialization for dependency, 1979, p. 15).

Finance. Funding further illustrated the imbalances of Bantu Education. In 1949, government expenditure for education for “Europeans” was over £18 million, equating to just over £50 per student; for Black Africans, the total spent was nearly £4.9 million, or a little more than £7 per student (Horrell, 1952, p. 50). Two years later, state funding for Black Africans had crept up to £5.7 million, and in two more years it would crest £7.8 million (Horrell, 1952, p. 52). Opponents to Bantu Education frequently attacked it on financial grounds, often highlighting discrepancies in the way funding statistics were reported.

[Verwoerd] does not point out that while £7 per year is spent on every African child in school, only £2.66 is spent on every African child of school going age. Or that £43.88 per year is spent on every white child in school, or that this means every white child of school going age. (South African Congress of Democrats, 1955, p. 8)

Where critics could find, or the government could report, a weak improvement in school funding, it was still at a level of disparity that would have been comical, if it was not so desperate. In

1958, five years after the adoption of Bantu Education but still three years before the Union of South Africa would become an apartheid republic, the government was spending 10 times as much on a White student as a Black student – levels comparable to the pre-apartheid union (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 62). In 1970, for every South African rand spent on the education of a Black African child between 5 and 19 years old, R31.60 was spent on a White African child in the same age group (Troup, 1976, p. 31). In 1976, the apartheid state spent R644 per White student, but only R42 per Black African pupil (Villette, 2016, para. 3).

Viewed against the national budget, Bantu Education received little. In 1974, as South Africa's economy began to slide, education for Black Africans still only amounted to half of one percent of the gross national product – a proportion of the national income unchanged over 1960 spending (Ndlovu, 2006, pp. 322-323; Rose, 1965, p. 209). In that same year, the nationalist government was educating White African students with 3.5% of the national income (Rose, 1965, p. 209). The tax burden obligated for schooling was particularly dear to the poorest segments of the nation: A 1961 newspaper article estimated Black African parents paid three times as much in direct costs for education as "European" parents did (Rose, 1965, p. 210).

CNE and Bantu Education. Scholars believed many of these shortcomings to be the vestiges of Christian National Education, as it manifested in Bantu Education and its syllabi (Chisholm, 2017, p. xxiii). Despite the repeated disavowals that the *Beleid* was official Nationalist Party policy (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235), the fact could hardly be argued otherwise: Afrikaner Calvinism, which preached a God-ordained racial inequality with Afrikaners as guardians, logically demanded some sort of separate educational program for Black Africans (Jones, 1966, p. 93). By the 1960s, it was easy to see where CNE had become a vehicle for the ruling party to apply a strict code of racial segregation while enforcing a patriarchal control and authority

(Chisholm, 2017, p. 132). CNE had open support in the Orange Free State and in the Transvaal in the 1970s, and enjoyed considerable influence within the Cape Province as well, gaining strength with each Nationalist Party victory (Kaplan, 1971, p. 235). As apartheid matured, denials that CNE formed the basis of Bantu Education became thinner and thinner.

Where the apartheid government would not expressly equate CNE to Bantu Education, scholars have connected the dots. The consistent underfunding of Black African schools as compared to White African schools proved the *Beleid* had a concrete expression in policy, reflected in its insistence that “Native education should not be financed at the expense of white” (Jarvis, 1985, p. 43; The Education League, 1949, p. 38). The *Beleid* defined “Christian” to mean “according to the creeds of the three Afrikaner churches,” and that principle likewise appeared in Bantu Education (Lavin, 1965, pp. 432-433; The Education League, 1949, p. 32): For one, at the recommendation of the Dutch Reformed Churches, the government assumed control over all technical colleges in 1955, and for another, when the government released a new religious syllabus to public schools in 1959, only the DRC had been consulted (Lavin, 1965, pp. 432-433). The *Beleid*’s injunctions against “anti-Christian or non-Christian or anti-nationalist or non-nationalist propaganda,” forced out instructors shown to have contravened apartheid teachings, to include professors at the only university open to Black African students under the 1959 Extension of the University Act (Lavin, 1965, p. 432; The Education League, 1949, p. 31; Troup, 1976, pp. 55-56). And where the framers of CNE refused to mix languages, colors, or races, the bureaucracy contorted to create a Department of Coloured Affairs in 1964, which housed education for Coloured Africans; then again the following year for a corresponding department for Indian African affairs – both of which fell within the grasp of CNE (Lavin, 1965, pp. 432-433; The Education League, 1949, p. 32; Troup, 1976, p. 49).

Christian National Education was visibly entrenched in apartheid proper, but hard-line Afrikaner theorists had to make one small concession if the entire premise was to succeed. The basic assumption of the *Beleid*, that each segment of South Africa's society had a separate cultural identity, remained inviolable (Lavin, 1965, pp. 429, 433). But the Boer tradition of anti-British sentiment needed to be softened if White African education were to complement the nationalist image of a united White South Africa (Lavin, 1965, p. 429). This opened Afrikaners to the new fear of losing future generations to liberal thought, and the eventual slackening of the Afrikaner political and cultural dynamo (Rose, 1965, p. 208). And while CNE justified the incessant partitioning of education *reductio ad absurdum* – by the 1990s, South Africa had by some counts at least 15 departments of education (Naidoo, 1990, p. 124) – it had an unintended effect as well: The effort to preserve Afrikaner identity by injecting CNE into the national-level education program ensured that “education would lie at the heart of the struggle for power” (Jones, 1966, pp. 85-86; Lavin, 1965, p. 433).

Black African Student Successes. In spite of the underfunding, the overcrowding, the poor facilities, the underprepared teachers, and the bureaucracy and its curriculum of subjugation, Black African students gained ground during these years. At the outset of Bantu Education, school capacity for Black Africans hovered at 800,000 students; a decade later, a million more seats were filled (Beinart, 1994, p. 154). School attendance rates vary by year and author; Rose (1965, p. 209) reported two-thirds of all Black African children were in school by 1963; Ross (2008, p. 131) was more conservative, placing school attendance for Black African students at 50% in 1976, and likely at 85% by the early 1990s. Of course, the quantity of students entering the system did not correlate to the quality of their education (Moore, 2016, p. 71); the system was grossly mismanaged and student advancement beyond the earliest standards was rare

(Beinart, 1994, p. 154). But the proportion of schoolchildren persisting to secondary levels was “surprising,” and with the option for university for Black African scholars, large numbers went on to tertiary education as well (Ross, 2008, p. 131). By the mid-1980s and after four decades of nationalist rule, the number of Black African students attending university was 60 times the rate at the start of apartheid – 90 times the rate, if correspondence schooling was included (Ross, 2008, p. 131).

In Retrospect. It is clear that Bantu Education was a sickly improvement over previous policies – it was still neither free nor compulsory – but it is equally clear that while Black African families were openly dissatisfied with the system (Rose, 1965, p. 209), they were willing to make the most of it (Beinart, 1994, p. 154). Teachers, underqualified or not, likewise gamed the system, or sidestepped central authorities, if it benefited their students – for example, by not teaching in Afrikaans, as was required in later years (Beinart, 1994, p. 154). And in some cases, Bantu Education reaped benefits that its planners and opponents had not expected (Beinart, 1994, p. 154). Literacy rates among Black Africans in some parts of the nation had been high – around 80% was reported in the Cape Province before Bantu Education (Ross, 2008, p. 131) – but as the number of school participants increased, a greater proportion of Black Africans nationwide gained literacy and numeracy (Ross, 2008, p. 131). Unfortunately, many of those who attended Bantu Education schools may have lost those skills later in life; in 1995, 80% of Black African adults and 40% of White African adults failed tests of functional literacy and numeracy keyed to a secondary school level (Ross, 2008, p. 131).

Priorities and Objectives. Operationally, Bantu Education had three demonstrable priorities: First, prepare laborers to drive the country’s rapid economic growth; second, pacify the Black African populations that congregated on the fringes of urban areas; and third, reduce tru-

ancy among young people, who could radicalize elements of the working class (Abdi, 2003, p. 92). In parallel to those priorities, apartheid education pursued five major objectives: to create a semi-skilled Black African labor force at a minimal cost and without displacing White African competition; to instill apartheid as the normal state of society in the minds of Black African students; to craft a sense of superiority among White Africans; to promote racial separation as a natural order and the only solution for racial harmony; and to stifle the intellectual development of Black Africans through minimal allocation of resources (Nkomo, 1990, p. 2).

Wholesale Subordination. Even after recognizing these priorities and objectives, Bantu Education was still in no way a break from South Africa's long educational history: Segregationist school patterns that manifested racist ideologies existed in schools throughout the missionary education era, and the roots of the racially differentiated education system predated Bantu Education by centuries (Nwandula, 1988, p. 51; Moore, 2016, p. 52). Where the apartheid rendition of Black African education differed was in its reinforcement of the subordination of Black Africans *in toto*: It offered threadbare financial support, it stubbornly refused to make education compulsory (Shingler, 1974, p. 291), and its underlying curriculum policy blatantly subordinated the racial majority of its citizenry on the basis of skin color.

Social Motivations. Furthermore, Bantu Education was not introduced as a measure of advancing the development of Black African culture, or for that matter, ensuring the success of the Black African student (Nokwe, 1954, p. 12). Apologists framed Bantu Education as a compromise between two equally unattractive poles: The stark reality of South African society was such that a Black African educated on par with a White African still could not achieve a commensurate social status (Leonie, 1965, pp. 105-106). At the same time, a Black African with that level of education would become a pariah within his own society (Leonie, 1965, p. 106). Verwo-

erd, ever explicit in his beliefs, reiterated this in his recommendation that

[The Black African must] learn not to feel above his community so that he wants to become integrated into the life of the European community and becomes frustrated and rebellious when this does not happen, and he tries to make his community dissatisfied because of such misdirected and alien ambitions. (*Debates of the Senate*, 1954, col. 2607)

For Pretoria, blindly producing pupils trained under a European model created a vain hope among Black Africans that they would eventually occupy posts within the European community (Rose, 1965, p. 209). Therefore, it fell to the White African to guide and direct the “pre-literate Bantu peoples” toward self-realization and higher levels of culture (Leonie, 1965, p. 117).

Paternalistic sentimentality aside, it is extremely unlikely that the South African government, fueled by racism and a religious craving for superiority, would have created and funded Bantu Education in a way that truly supported Black Africans seeking to advance their own development (Murphy, 1978, p. 31). As the Bantu Authorities Act split apart the geography and population of South Africa, the mechanics of the Bantu Education Act were, as far as possible, to take place in the homelands (Beinart, 1994, p. 152). The nationalist government would see no benefit in building the self-confidence of Black Africans, nor did it seek to instill a sense of pride in one’s self and one’s nation, or to develop qualities of entrepreneurship, self-reliance, initiative, or self-confidence – to borrow some terms from *The Eiselen Commission Report* (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 252; Murphy, 1978, p. 31). Those qualities would have run counter to the entire endeavor.

Economic Motivations. But education policy in South Africa was not just a product of its social order; economic forces must likewise bear responsibility (Davis, 1984b, p. 135). Black Africans who succeeded in the overcrowded, remote, unproductive Bantustans would not have

been content to confine their knowledge, skills, or values there (Murphy, 1978, p. 31), nor would they have proven “docile and effective” as servile temporary laborers in factories, mines, offices, or shops in the White economy (Collins, 1983, p. 366; Murphy, 1978, p. 31). The abuse of education as a tool in the oppression of non-European citizens not only gratified the racist segment of White South Africans, it satisfied a need for cheap, noncompetitive labor (Christie & Collins, 1982, p. 61). This interpretation is not out of step with the published views of the apartheid government; the prevailing commentary on Bantu Education through much of the 1970s and 1980s aligned with – but did not subscribe to – the economic stance of the Nationalist Party and the expressed labor needs of its government (Moore, 2016, p. 132). Bantu Education coincided with the transformation of the South African economy away from mining and agriculture and toward a reliance on manufacturing (Davis, 1984b, p. 134), and was imposed during a shortage of cheap labor on farms and mines (Nokwe, 1954, p. 14). This may be the only clue necessary to deduce that Bantu Education was, in a large part, a device intended to solve the problem of cheap labor for the country (Nokwe, 1954, p. 12). Clearly, the policy and the practice sought to domesticate students, rather than liberate them.

Politicization of Pupils

Schools are institutions of socialization, and for that reason, when there is conflict over politics, class, or gender, or where values within a society are incongruent, schools become contested ground (Keto, 1990, p. 26). When educational policies and practices are driven by economic and political needs, schools reflect the power relations between a nation’s social groups (Keto, 1990, p. 26). Someone – possibly an individual, but more likely a group or a class – settles on the “best” educational system, then imposes that system over others, enshrines the system in policy, builds a curriculum to support the system, and trains teachers to administer it, all in

hopes of instilling a preferred set of values, skills, and knowledge in the most impressionable members of society (Keto, 1990, p. 26). Ideally, schools complement what children learn at home, but when this does not happen – as is the case in colonialism – a crisis is inevitable (Keto, 1990, p. 26). Policies that benefit only the ruling group cannot be imposed without consequence: “Education resistance follows” (Keto, 1990, p. 26).

Education Resistance. In August 1946, one of South Africa’s premiere missionary education institutions was the site of an extraordinary outburst of student anger (Hyslop, 1986, p. 1). As many as 200 male students stoned the houses of school staff, then set fire to small buildings and equipment (Hyslop, 1986, p. 1). School officials who intervened were likewise pelted, and when police arrived, they were met with a hail of stones as well (Hyslop, 1986, p. 1). Officers fired warning shots and the crowd dispersed into the surrounding hills, eventually surrendering the next morning to face criminal charges (Hyslop, 1986, p. 1).

Three days later, in defiance of mission authorities, another 80 male students marched to the nearby jail to visit their fellows (Hyslop, 1986, p. 1). At their return march, the female students, who had been mostly quiet until that time, turned rowdy (Hyslop, 1986, p. 1). On the following day, a Sunday, the females threw stones and rang the church bell while male students refused to attend church services (Hyslop, 1986, p. 1). In a letter to the principal, students announced the boycott would continue until the school could guarantee that the arrested students would not face an additional punishment from school authorities (Hyslop, 1986, p. 1). The next day, only 30 students – none of them female – reported for class; the principal suspended lessons and sent everyone home (Hyslop, 1986, p. 1). Within the week, the arrested pupils were on trial in a magistrate’s court, with 152 found guilty and fined, and nearly a third facing a lesser punishment on account of their age (Hyslop, 1986, p. 1).

The root of this rebellion was, perhaps surprisingly, student discontent over sugar rationing (Hyslop, 1986, p. 1), although it deserves note that the school, despite its reputation as a top-notch educational institution, was £30,000 in debt and struggling to collect fees (Hyslop, 1986, p. 6). Before the magistrate had handed down sentences, a similar outbreak had begun at another mission, again over food rationing (Hyslop, 1986, p. 1). In that case, students attempted to stage a riot and boycott, set fire to one building, and cut telephone lines (Hyslop, 1986, p. 2), leading to student expulsions and criminal investigations (Hyslop, 1986, p. 2).

A “Repertoire” of Protest. As early as the 1870s, but increasing through the 1920s and the advent of apartheid, students of every color built a “repertoire” of protest, primarily with the features seen in the previous two incidents: physical damage to school property, arson, class boycotts, and occasional attacks on teachers (Chisholm, 2017, p. 26; Hyslop, 1986, p. 3). Student-driven action began an upward surge through the late days of missionary education and into the 1950s, including the 1953 destruction of an entire school, pump house, and the homes of a headmaster and two teachers at one training institute – only a month before the Bantu Education Bill appeared in parliament (Chisholm, 2017, pp. 22-23). Invariably, protests stemmed from food or discipline issues, although fees, discrimination, and student labor were possible points of contention as well (Chisholm, 2017, pp. 23, 27; Hyslop, 1986, pp. 3, 5). As missionary education succumbed to its inability to meet the demand for and cost of Black African education, more and more student-led incidents appeared in official records and in yearbooks of race relations (Horrell, 1953, p. 31; Horrell, 1957, p. 88; Hyslop, 1986, pp. 5-6).

However, by the 1960s and in stride with the emergence of the Republic of South Africa, student protest took on different tone: National politics became a focus for action (Hyslop, 1986, p. 3). Churches, universities, and writers formed the core of Black African ideology throughout

the apartheid era, but students were at the leading edge of opposition (Beinart, 1994, p. 219). Students were not immune, nor were they indifferent, to the “antagonism” existing between themselves and the politics of separation (Rebusoajoang, 1979, p. 237), and by the 1970s, student activism had begun to coalesce around political opposition to the prevailing system of education (Hyslop, 1986, p. 4). However, even as it matured, it learned to rely on the same repertoire of arson, damage to structures, and boycotts that had legitimized the voices of previous decades (Hyslop, 1986, p. 4; Naidoo, 1990, pp. 131-132).

With time, student protest became an identifying feature of the struggle for equality in South Africa – both on national and international fronts, where it found welcome support in mainstream opposition to apartheid.

I am surprised that most whites can be so insensitive. Black children pass by your well appointed schools, well built, well watered, with close-shaven lawns, with splendidly laid out sports fields, etc., and then they must go to their overcrowded, thoroughly deprived schools, and you are surprised that they rebelled. Aren't you surprised that they took so long to do so? (Tutu, 1978, p. 128, as cited in Jarvis, 1985, p. 57)

Even well into the 21st century, boycotts and strikes remained preferred demonstrations of student dissatisfaction (Chisholm, 2017, p. 24; Ritchie, 2019, para. 1).

The Soweto Uprising. As a particularly disheartening example, June 16 is a national holiday in South Africa, commemorating students who protested against the national education system on that day in Soweto in 1976 (Ndlovu, 2006, pp. 345-347). At a time when the national government spent more than 15 times as much money on White African students as it did on Black African students, economic pressure drove the Bantu Education Department to slash a full year from the primary school curriculum as a cost-saving measure (Chisholm, 2012, p. 87;

Ndlovu, 2006, p. 323). Students who completed Standard 5 in 1975 went directly to secondary school, piling two graduating classes into one massive cohort (Ndlovu, 2006, p. 323). Nationally, more than 257,000 students enrolled in Form 1 at the start of 1976, when only 38,000 seats were available (Ndlovu, 2006, p. 323).

Only a few years earlier, the department had announced a shift in the medium of instruction, placing Afrikaans on an equal footing with English from secondary school onward (Ndlovu, 2006, p. 327). Pressure from internal forces in the apartheid government, as well as White interests in society, had for a decade deliberately positioned Afrikaans as a part of schooling for Black Africans (Ndlovu, 2006, pp. 324-325). Department of Bantu Education documents openly required Afrikaans in schools on behalf of the *Afrikaner Broederbond*, on the basis of a perceived necessity for the language for life within South African society (Ndlovu, 2006, pp. 324-326).

But before 1975, the medium of instruction in Soweto schools had been the mother tongue, with a shift to English in Form 1 (Ndlovu, 2006, p. 327). When the Department of Bantu Education mandated Afrikaans in selected schools in 1976, students who had begun their secondary education in English were now expected to learn in Afrikaans as well – possibly as a fourth or even fifth language, depending on their upbringing (Ndlovu, 2006, p. 327). With no previous instruction in Afrikaans, many secondary school-age students could only adapt to the language and acquire the content through rote learning (Ndlovu, 2006, p. 327). Teachers, themselves anxious about using a language they struggled with, were likewise frustrated and in some cases fell back upon code-switching, in order to balance the demands of the bureaucracy against the reality of students' abilities (Ndlovu, 2006, pp. 330, 333).

The department had no interest in debating the changes; Punt Janson, deputy minister of Bantu education and himself a prominent member of the *Afrikaner Broederbond*, was asked if he

had consulted parents before the switch (Ndlovu, 2006, pp. 326, 331). He replied,

Why should we now start quarrelling about the medium of instruction among the Black people as well? ... No, I have not consulted them and I am not going to consult them. I have consulted the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. (Ndlovu, 2006, p. 332)

In response to this blatant indifference, and to other flaws in their education, Soweto students planned a protest march through the township to their school grounds, capped with speeches by student leaders, then a return home (Beinart, 1994, p. 220; Ndlovu, 2006, p. 341). One student leader later recalled, "Our original plan was just to get to [the secondary school], pledge our solidarity, sing our song and then we thought that is it, we have made our point and we go home" (Ndlovu, 2006, p. 341).

Instead, they were met by a small contingent of police. Officers were unable to contend with thousands of marchers, and as a result, they resorted to police dogs, tear gas, and finally live ammunition (Ndlovu, 2006, pp. 345-347). Among the first killed were 15-year-old Hastings Ndlovu and 13-year-old Hector Pieterse (Ndlovu, 2006, pp. 330, 344). News of police brutality against students incited Soweto residents and criminal elements to riot, and as a result, looting and arson continued throughout parts of the city for the remainder of the day (Ndlovu, 2006, pp. 346-347). Months later, the official report would tally 575 deaths, nearly 500 of which were Black Africans, with smaller numbers in other official demographics (Ndlovu, 2006, p. 350). The same report also exonerated the police who fired the first shots (Ndlovu, 2006, p. 342).

The Soweto uprising, as it came to be known, spread to other parts of the country, with students in other townships and schools around South Africa protesting in solidarity with the original marchers (Guelke, 2004, pp. 127-128; Ndlovu, 2006, p. 350). Official reports connected unrest in parts of Cape Town, the southern city of Port Elizabeth, and nine other towns to the

Soweto incident (Ndlovu, 2006, p. 350). Perhaps more importantly, the event threw doubt upon conditions for Black Africans (Beinart, 1994, p. 227), and the viability of the apartheid system as a whole (Moore, 2016, p. 66). The Soweto uprising painfully illustrated that students have an influence over the course of both their education and their nation, albeit in a different way than teachers or administrators.

The De Lange Report. At the start of the 1980s, and after that particularly harrowing decade of civil discontent, Pretoria attempted to engage the reality of Black African education with the Education and Training Act of 1979, but its efforts were largely superficial, and were met with skepticism (Moore, 2016, p. 84). The 1979 act retained a discriminating tone, arguing that Black African pupils held a different world view and cultural framework than White peers (Moore, 2016, pp. 84-85), and often communities rejected the new regulations for that reason (Moore, 2016, p. 84).

Meanwhile, the remnants of Bantu Education were dissected at bureaucratic levels. The *De Lange Report* of 1981 opened with a “startling” tone, asserting that “equal opportunities for education, including equal standards in education, for every inhabitant, irrespective of race, colour, creed or sex, should be the purposeful endeavour of the State” (Collins & Gillespie, 1984, pp. 625-626). While the report conceded differences in “aptitude, ability, interest, and occupational orientation” exist, differentiation by race or skin color did not justify “inequality of treatment” (Collins & Gillespie, 1984, p. 630). This progressive tone echoed the report’s recommendation that a “single Ministry of Education which would be responsible for broad, overall education policy should be set up,” with regional departments managing education within defined areas (Hartshorne, 1985, p. 148).

The report also envisioned three phases of education – pre-basic, to encompass creches

and nursery schools that allow children to acclimatize to school environments; basic, with six years of literacy and numeracy as the focus; and six years of post-basic education “canalized” into three pathways – academic, technical, or apprenticeship (Collins & Gillespie, 1984, p. 629). In essence, education would be more open and flexible, with parents, teachers, and communities given a stronger voice in education decisions (Hartshorne, 1985, p. 148). Schools would not only attend to the development needs of South Africa, but also consider the plight of disadvantaged members of society (Hartshorne, 1985, p. 148).

From the vantage of that era, the *De Lange Report* opened specific debates on education quality and teacher preparedness (Hartshorne, 1985, p. 149). It also reintroduced a focus on “equal but separate” – a grammatical twist that blatantly echoed liberal education philosophy – as it applied to accessibility and financing (Hartshorne, 1985, p. 149). It also led toward an eventual concession for multiracial private schooling (Worden, 1994, p. 124), and prompted larger education expenditures (Beinart, 1994, p. 228). Unfortunately though, the *De Lange Report* yielded no major educational compromises, mired as it was in the desperate politics of late-era apartheid (Collins & Gillespie, 1984, pp. 632-633). Current events were likewise to blame: From 1985 onward, international pressure and widespread domestic resistance edged South Africa into a near-continual state of emergency, even as the demise of apartheid grew ever more evident (Ross, 2008, p. 191; Moore, 2016, p. 96). Scholars of this period, aware that Black African schooling did not exist in a political vacuum, wrote with the uncertain perspective of a society on the verge of transition, knowing that apartheid could not last much longer (Moore, 2016, p. 96). They were, however, as yet unaware that South Africa’s peaceful transition to a multiracial democracy in the early 1990s would be a “miraculous escape” from the catastrophes predicted for decades beforehand (Guelke, 2004, p. 209).

Historical Discussion

As mentioned at the start of this review, history does not consist, and has never consisted, solely of a recitation of facts about the past (Guelke, 2004, p. 208). Even with the historical details of education in South Africa, it requires a patient understanding of two major cultures to make sense of how learning evolved at the southern tip of the continent (Abdi, 2003, p. 90). Dutch settlers drew upon a political, economic, and social arrangement that was more competitive than the culture of their new neighbors (Abdi, 2003, p. 90). In addition to that, the new arrivals were forced to cope with environmental pressures, the intricacies of colonial hierarchies, and an uncertain future – requiring that they adapt if they were to succeed, or even survive (Abdi, 2003, p. 90).

This was not the situation for Indigenous residents, which leads comparisons to conclude that the Europeans were more prone to adopt an aggressive, predatory, or confrontational stance as they staked out living spaces and claimed resources (Abdi, 2003, p. 90). Isolated conditions in Southern Africa reinforced traits of rigidity, intolerance, and a narrow outlook in the newcomers (Tabata, 1959, p. 30). Without access to enlightened streams of European thought and with no more literature than a bible, the descendants of the original settlers barricaded themselves intellectually (Tabata, 1959, p. 30), obeying a religious mandate to be “ruthless, vindictive, separate, and exclusive” (Tabata, 1959, p. 32). When circumstances brought White South Africans into contact with the “generally peaceful and accommodating [Black] African worldview,” the Europeans sought to take the upper hand, imposing a foreign understanding of politics, economics, and society – to include education – upon their fellow Africans (Abdi, 2003, p. 90).

At this point, the manipulation of education deviated, with state schools perpetuating the desired submissive attitude that supported European-controlled agencies, while schools under the

influence of subjugated Indigenous cultures became centers of opposition (Keto, 1990, p. 26).

Over the centuries that followed, South African educational arrangements regularly exhibited – or combated – the traits and philosophies of domination, learned from the European invasion and developed at the expense of Indigenous African populations (Abdi, 2003, p. 90).

Themes and Patterns

With this overall description, and with a stronger context for the history of education in South Africa, a number of themes and patterns come to the forefront. The most obvious was the constant return to the medium of instruction, and the role it plays in larger issues of policy and social structure. Whether it was the need for language as a gateway to church services, as in the early days of the DRC and the DEIC settlers; or language as tool of cultural imperialism, as English was for British colonial authorities; or language as an instrument of racial oppression, as Afrikaans was for the Department of Bantu Education – the medium for instruction had a recurring role in South African history. Indeed, perhaps more than any other issue save skin color, the language the teacher used to deliver the lesson was at the center of South Africa's school struggles (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 227). Not surprisingly, language over time became tied to the aforementioned cultural domination and economic oppression (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 227), with struggles over the language of the lesson dating back to the first days of European colonization and conquest (Fleisch, 1995b, p. 227).

Four Themes. The prolonged conflict over medium of instruction also echoed four themes Collins (1983, p. 364) recognized in South African schooling. First, schools were religious in character, which was clear not only in the earliest educational efforts in the 1600s as a requirement for church services, but also in the heavy-handed presence of the DRC and the injection of CNE into educational policy for Black Africans in the 1950s and beyond.

Second, early schools focused on rudimentary academics rather than industry and vocation; over time, this evolved in some missionary education programs to include skills training, but very little higher education. The apartheid government's Bantu Education, with the particularly distasteful and arbitrary split of "fundamental" education and selective "higher-primary" education, reversed that trend and effectively implied that a full education was available only for some. In this sense, the original theme that Collins (1983, p. 364) put forth might be edited to admit a larger theme of curtailed or privileged education, where certain topics or levels of education were withheld as inappropriate or unattainable for Black African students.

The third theme that Collins (1983, p. 364) recognized was a steady trend toward segregation by race, and this remained a consistent feature of education from the late 17th century through to the end of the apartheid regime in the 1990s. As mentioned, race separation may be the only characteristic that surpassed the medium of instruction as the dominant challenge to students, teachers, and administrators in South Africa; those two traits alone could efficiently summarize much of the nation's difficulty with centuries of education policy.

The last theme Collins (1983, p. 364) offered was the slowest to evolve, and was mired in the politics and bureaucracy of any given era: Education began within the demesne of religion, but over time became a concern of central government authorities. Government was the late-comer in execution of educational policy, and the failures of successive governments to adroitly manage education for all of South Africa's children was both noteworthy and noted.

Chronological Interpretations. Collins' (1983, p. 364) four themes for education for Indigenous peoples implied a chronological progression, and in some cases might need slight revision to better capture the overall succession of school policies and systems that served South Africa over nearly 350 years. Other scholars have mapped South Africa's educational history in

different fashions; both Keto (1990, pp. 25-26) and Jansen (1990, pp. 1-2) proposed corresponding systems aligned to different time frames. Keto (1990, pp. 25-26) established three phases for educational policy and practice limited to the arrival of the Dutch settlers in 1652 and ending with the British educational authorities in 1880. The first phase based educational policy and practice on the regulations and support of the DEIC, with critics among private community members (Keto, 1990, pp. 25-26). The second phase corresponded to early missionary education, with a measure of local control mixed with state aid (Keto, 1990, pp. 25-26). The last stage saw centralization under departments of education and superintendentcies (Keto, 1990, pp. 25-26). In some cases, these phases adopted school administration and leadership features that had been established under historical developments elsewhere in the Western world; in that sense they represented a mix of regulations and policies observed from afar, but adopted locally in hopes of solving persistent dilemmas over funding and control (Keto, 1990, pp. 25-26).

Jansen (1990, pp. 1-2) suggested a system that had a greater range and more phases than Keto (1990, pp. 25-26) observed. Jansen (1990, pp. 1-2) offered five major periods for Black African education, beginning with a “traditional” phase, as mentioned earlier: education by community elders and parents in an oral fashion, focused primarily on life experience and cultural transmission. The Europeans brought the first formalized educational efforts, with “slave education” as simplified Christian religious instruction, and intended for admission to the church (Jansen, 1990, pp. 1-2). The arrival of missionaries *en masse* in the early 1800s introduced the longest and most influential period, “missionary education,” which further transformed schooling to follow a form of European education driven by religious outreach (Jansen, 1990, pp. 1-2). This period overlapped to a small degree with “Native Education” in the 1920s, which saw government assert itself over education with the introduction of a state-mandated, segregated cur-

riculum (Jansen, 1990, pp. 1-2). The final stage, “Bantu Education,” was an explicitly racist corruption of education to enforce the government policy of apartheid, beginning in 1953 (Jansen, 1990, pp. 1-2). Over the next 40-plus years, Bantu Education contorted under social and economic pressures, taking on different names but remaining the core educational policy of the Nationalist Party government, until its extinction in the 1994 election (Jansen, 1990, pp. 1-2).

While all of these theoretical interpretations have merit, this study preferred an emphasis on key events and trends as they evolved over 350 years of cross-cultural interactions, which provided greater substance to the experience of apartheid-era education. That, in turn, formed the context and background for this study’s investigation.

Freirean Educational Theory

Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, first published in English in 1970 with a 30th anniversary reprint in 2000, was the primary text for this study’s interpretation of education under apartheid. Considered a seminal text in critical pedagogy both within South Africa and without (Nekhwevha, 2002, p. 134; Thomas, 2009, p. 254), Freire (2000) established a framework for discussions of oppressive social structures, and a fundamental understanding of how education plays a role in democracy and liberation.

Foundations

Freire’s theories grew out of his observations of colonial and neo-colonial exploitation around the world (Thomas, 2009, p. 254). For Freire (2000), education was a tool that allowed oppression to perpetuate, which meant that it was equally useful in a society’s transformation toward freedom and democracy (Thomas, 2009, p. 254). Traditional delivery of education – which Freire called “banking” education (Freire, 2000, p. 72) – expected the teacher, as the possessor of knowledge, to deposit information into the minds of students, who would then repeat it back as a

form of evaluation (Youngman, 1986, p. 156). Modern educational theory has since labeled this the “teacher-centered” classroom (Chall, 2000).

In this arrangement, education becomes a gift that is bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable, upon those they consider not (Freire, 2000, p. 72). For Freire, a classroom where people were expected to ingest information, then regurgitate it without thinking critically on its meaning or implication, was inherently oppressive and an essential feature of exploitation (Thomas, 2009, p. 254). Students were reduced to passive receptacles, and encouraged to adapt rather than to question (Youngman, 1986, p. 156), creating a classroom that domesticated and dominated, rather than liberated. As students accepted information without thinking, they likewise grew accustomed to accepting the oppressive reality around them, becoming blind to the opportunity to transform their world (Thomas, 2009, p. 254). Ultimately, that form of education “attempts to control thinking and action, leads women and men to adjust to the world, and inhibits their creative power” (Freire, 2000, p. 77).

In contrast to “banking” education, Freire recommended “problem-posing” education – a cyclical method heavily reliant upon dialogue and communication, which “problematized” the world around the teacher and student, and explored the relationships within it (Thomas, 2009, p. 255). Rather than simply showering students with facts, teachers posed questions and problems for learners to engage and analyze (Thomas, 2009, p. 255). This promoted an open and unstructured dialogue that has since been adopted as the “student-centered” method in modern educational theory (Chall, 2000).

“Problem-posing” education had an immediate effect on the classroom dynamic. The traditional vertical relationship between teachers and students was scrapped for a balanced arrangement that allowed teacher and student to take on both roles equally and simultaneously (Freire,

2000, pp. 79-80). The resulting dialogue allowed both “teacher-students” and “student-teachers” to participate in the process of knowing, and investigate the problems of the world together (Youngman, 1986, p. 156). As Freire (2000, p. 80) explained: “The teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach.”

Freire (2000) could not completely sever educators from their conventional, classroom-level responsibilities, instead describing a situation where teachers and students were “together, but not equal” (Alexander, 2013, p. 58). But because this approach eliminated authoritarian learning, ended intellectualism, and encouraged critical thinking about society, Freire’s version of education became a pathway toward liberation (Youngman, 1986, p. 156). Put into practice, traditionally “passive” schools gave way to “culture circles,” with the formal role of the teacher transformed into a coordinator, and lectures becoming dialogues between equal participants (Freire, 1976, p. 42). Properly conducted, “problem-posing” education allowed people to develop a critical eye for “*the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves*”, eventually seeing the world “not as a static reality, but as a reality in process, in transformation” (Freire, 2000, p. 83).

Praxis and Conscientization

The recurring goal of this educational cycle was praxis – a combination of reflection and action that brought about the transformation of reality (Freire, 2000, pp. 79, 87, 126). A balance of both reflection and action were necessary to achieve praxis; reflection alone was simply verbalism, and action without reflection was mere activism (Freire, 2000, pp. 87-88). When education brought students to praxis, it had raised the consciousness of the population, and allowed them to see the causes of oppression in their daily lives – and move to change them (Thomas,

2009, p. 255).

With praxis, people could recognize and understand the nature of oppression, and in that way education revealed strategies to confront and transform those conditions (Thomas, 2009, p. 255). Once learners had developed an ability to critique society and fulfill their role in changing it, people had an opportunity to liberate themselves and create a new society – a process Freire dubbed *conscientização*, or “conscientization” (Thomas, 2009, p. 255). At each achievement of praxis, Freire (2000, p. 159) explained, *conscientização* accelerated, allowing people to “free themselves more rapidly of these specters.”

Freire (2000) set conditions for his theories. First, oppression of any sort was a dehumanization of both the oppressor and the oppressed, and for that reason, implied an act of violence (Freire, 2000, p. 44). The act of dehumanizing others dehumanized the oppressor, and for that reason, the oppressor could not lead a struggle for freedom (Freire, 2000, p. 44). Furthermore, as the oppressor lacked the will or power to liberate themselves or the oppressed, liberation could only occur at the hands of the oppressed (Freire, 2000, p. 44).

With similar logic, liberation could never be achieved through the “banking” approach; education must be dialogical from the outset (Freire, 2000, p. 86). This meant that a problem-posing education that taught the oppressed to think critically was never in the interest of the oppressor: “No oppressive order could permit the oppressed to begin to question: Why?” (Freire, 2000, p. 86).

Freire (2000) also placed some responsibility at the feet of the oppressed, accusing them of suffering from an “adhesion” to their oppressors. As they were submerged in the reality of oppression, their perception of themselves suffered, and an initial desire to become the oppressor was masked (Freire, 2000, p. 45; Youngman, 1986, pp. 173, 175). In seeming contradiction,

Freire (2000) explained that the oppressed fear freedom: Having adopted the oppressor's guidelines and internalized his image, "freedom would require them to eject this image and replace it with autonomy and responsibility" (Freire, 2000, p. 47). Because the oppressed were so deeply adapted to domination, they were resigned to it – effectively powerless to struggle toward freedom because they feared the risks it involved (Freire, 2000, p. 47). This inability to challenge domination was illustrated perfectly in Freire's 1998 article "Cultural Action for Freedom," in which peasants described how they were immersed in their oppression:

Before the agrarian reform ... I didn't even think. Neither did my friends. ... It wasn't possible. We lived under orders. We only had to carry out orders. We had nothing to say. ... There was no reason to read or write. We weren't responsible for anything. The boss gave orders and we obeyed. Why read and write? (Freire, 1998, p. 454)

With education and conscientization, they became aware of their situation, and framed the transformation of their lives against the newfound ability to read and write (Freire, 1998, p. 454).

Freire's works required teachers and students to directly engage with concepts of freedom, democracy, liberation, and even revolution (Thomas, 2009, p. 256), making him one of few writers to espouse a concrete philosophy as a foundation for educational practices (Youngman, 1986, p. 159). By tying education to a class-based approach to liberation, he implied a definition of revolution that was a radical and abrupt break from colonialism (Thomas, 2009, p. 256).

Freire regularly cited Hegel, Marx, Lenin, and Guevara (Freire, 2000, pp. 49-50, 125, 169). But contrary to some of those philosophers, Freire consistently identified democracy as the end goal, with oppressed populations asserting control over their own lives and destinies (Thomas, 2009, p. 256). For Freire, liberation was impossible without the involvement of the masses, hinting at a decentralized form of participatory government, but with each individual re-

sponsible for the liberation of all (Thomas, 2009, p. 256). Freire (2000, p. 68) himself stated this quite clearly: “It is essential for the oppressed to realize that when they accept the struggle for humanization they also accept, from that moment, their total responsibility for the struggle.”

Leadership

Freire almost always discussed leadership against the backdrop of education, and usually added a qualifier to the word, referring to “revolutionary leadership” (2000, p. 69) and its focus on change. “Revolution undeniably has an educational nature,” Freire (2000, pp. 68, 136) wrote, and for that reason, revolutionary leaders throughout history have acknowledged the role of education both in oppression and liberation. This meant that revolutionary leadership must first be “co-intentional,” meaning leaders and followers – or, teachers and students – must both be engaged in unveiling reality, critically engaging it, and re-creating it (Freire, 2000, p. 69). This shared reflection between leaders and followers allowed them to jointly attain reality, and discover themselves as its permanent re-creators (Freire, 2000, p. 69).

Leadership alone was incapable of bestowing liberation; that could only be accomplished through *conscientização* (Freire, 2000, p. 66). Similarly, leaders could not implant the idea of freedom in the minds of the oppressed, nor could it be instilled into slogans, catchwords, or “libertarian propaganda” (Freire, 2000, p. 67). Those tools were the “arms of domination,” and could not assist in re-humanization (Freire, 2000, p. 68). “The only effective instrument is a humanizing pedagogy in which the revolutionary leadership establishes a permanent relationship of dialogue with the oppressed” (Freire, 2000, p. 68). All the same, some leaders succumbed to the temptation to use educational methods employed by the oppressor (Freire, 2000, pp. 68, 94).

Freirean philosophy placed a heavy emphasis on equal interaction between leaders and followers: “Revolutionary leaders cannot think *without* the people, nor *for* the people, but only

with the people” (Freire, 2000, pp. 131-132). Leaders who did not, or could not, think “with” the people were devitalized (Freire, 2000, p. 132). Neither role held any superiority over the other: “The revolution is made neither by the leaders for the people, nor by the people for the leaders, but by both acting together in unshakable solidarity” (Freire, 2000, p. 129). At the same time, both the leader and the followers must be jointly convinced that their struggle is necessary, Freire (2000, p. 67) warned. If either lost their conviction, then the transformation devolved from “with” the oppressed to “for” the oppressed – which Freire (2000, p. 67) frowned upon. In the same way, Freire saw no merit in change accomplished “by” the people “for” the leaders, and denied it was liberation (Freire, 2000, p. 129). Freire (2000, p. 95) also took exception to the phrase “win the people over”; leaders had no need to “win over” the people, because it was the leader’s role to be liberated alongside them.

A constant state of clear and level communication became a key element in Freirean leadership: “Leaders can flourish only in communion with the people” (Freire, 2000, p. 133). “Revolutionary leaders do not go to the people in order to bring them a message of ‘salvation,’” Freire (2000, p. 95) insisted, but rather come to know them through dialogue, learning their situation, and probing their awareness of it. From there, leaders could guide the followers’ empirical understanding of reality toward an insight into its causes (Freire, 2000, p. 134), with a goal of achieving praxis.

Leaders who could not, or would not, maintain a dialogue with followers were “totally misguided in their conception of their role,” and worse, took on the traits of the oppressor (Freire, 2000, p. 127). This meant that leaders were not “thinkers” and followers “doers” – that arrangement removed the people’s right to reflect on their situation, which in turn demoted them to activists and nullified liberation (Freire, 2000, p. 126). As was the case with teachers, Freire

conceded that leaders must direct or coordinate at times, but “leaders who deny praxis to the oppressed thereby invalidate their own praxis” (2000, p. 126). Without the same praxis they hoped for their followers, leaders held no authenticity with the people (Freire, 2000, p. 130).

Freire (2000, p. 91) felt the relationship between leader and followers required levels of love, humility, integrity, and faith, as well as mutual trust (Freire, 2000, p. 91). Critical pedagogy described trust as an ability to see another person as truly human, with an appreciation of diverse systems of thought and understanding, and a capacity to lead toward liberation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 422). The followers’ trust in a leader is a reflection of the confidence a leader has in the followers (Freire, 2000, p. 169), implying trust is an observable condition that the leader can affect to a degree.

However, trust could only be established when the leader provided evidence of true, concrete intentions (Freire, 2000, p. 91). If the leader’s words did not correspond to actions, trust could not exist (Freire, 2000, p. 91). “The road to revolution involves openness to the people, not imperviousness to them; it involves communion with the people, not mistrust” (Freire, 2000, p. 138).

Application to South Africa

For this study, much of the value in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and Freire’s related works was in their unflinching depictions of the oppressor and the oppressed, and the process or mechanism of oppression. These descriptions served as an interpretive framework for the historical portion of this review, and reappeared in Chapter Four as the interpretation of the data analysis.

Freire’s understanding of domination required only a dominant party and a dominated party arranged in opposition (Freire, 2000, p. 132), which clearly fits much of South African his-

tory: Africans of European heritage commonly held the dominant pole, and Indigenous Africans became the dominated. The Freirean definition of oppression relied on this binary arrangement, giving rise to the concepts of oppressor and oppressed (Freire, 2000, p. 133). In order to dominate, the oppressor needed to deny the oppressed an avenue to praxis, which would prevent people from thinking their own thoughts (Freire, 2000, p. 126). Here again, the South African case, with the historical White African minority exerting control over racial majority populations, comes to mind.

At this point, South African educational history could be rationalized by identifying behavior patterns that occur regardless of culture or society. Observations of racial majority-minority interactions within the past century have led social scientists to believe that dominant groups interpret gains among outsider groups as a threat to the social arrangement (Blumer, 1958, p. 7). In societies that depend on social position for the status quo – which matched the apartheid social structure – the threat or challenge to the social arrangement is ingrained to a greater degree (Blumer, 1958, p. 7). Furthermore, if the fears of the dominant population escalate to a belief that the social arrangement could be upended, prejudice and hostility erupt (King & Wheelock, 2007, p. 1257). In fact, the greater the threat perceived by the dominant group, the more openly vocal they became in their bigotry and animosity (Quillian, 1995, p. 588).

However, more precise and detailed connections can be drawn between Freirean philosophy and the South African case. Freire's publications emerged as apartheid reached its heyday (Dubow, 2014, p. 162; Nekhwevha, 2002, p. 137), and for that reason it should not be surprising that *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* – and other Freire titles – were banned by the apartheid administration within years of their appearance in the subcontinent (Alexander, 2013, p. 59). In spite of that, the text was quickly adopted into anti-apartheid efforts. Members of the Black Conscious-

ness Movement circulated hundreds of copies (Alexander, 2013, p. 59; Dubow, 2014, p. 162), finding links between Freire's theories and their own experiences under Bantu Education – and possible means of escaping it (Alexander, 2013, p. 59). Inspired educators and activists held informal courses on Freirean methods at liberal English-speaking universities, and students began to apply his techniques in education projects in townships and urban areas (Alexander, 2013, pp. 59-60).

Connections. There are several reasons why Freire was so readily accepted within the South African experience. First, Freirean social theory paralleled the liberation movement already underway in South Africa in the late 1970s. Educators and education theorists had concluded, for some time, that Bantu Education was intended for economic and racial stratification (Alexander, 2013, p. 60), and Freire (2000) underscored that. Second, Freire's (2000) depictions of oppressor and oppressed bore a striking resemblance to the educational experience in South Africa, particularly in townships and the Bantustans (Alexander, 2013, p. 60).

Third, Freire's pedagogical methods – which mixed education, culture, and an awareness of class interactions – fell into step with liberation and consciousness movements in South Africa at the time (Alexander, 2013, p. 60). Fourth, the liberation movement's grassroots, community-level organization in the 1970s and 1980s was receptive of democratic principles, and where Freire's writings corresponded, it became an integral part of "alternative education" (Alexander, 2013, p. 60). Ultimately, this meant that transplanting Freire's ideas into South Africa in the 1970s – particularly after the Soweto uprising – further radicalized and politicized education (Alexander, 2013, p. 61).

While mainstream anti-apartheid efforts readily adopted Freire (Alexander, 2013, p. 58; Nekhwevha, 2002, p. 137), concepts and terms that appeared in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* be-

gan to surface in the vernacular of student opposition groups. Rather than confronting the apartheid state directly, Black empowerment in the 1970s and 1980s stressed challenging the apartheid mindset through “conscientization” – Freire’s exact term (Dubow, 2014, pp. 160, 321). A student pamphlet that urged education reform in the late 1970s and early 1980s paraphrased Freirean philosophy even as it demanded change (Molteno, 1983, pp. 329-330). In those and other examples, Freire’s principles had found a home among apartheid-era students, suggesting they not only identified with his definitions, but likely subscribed to his philosophy.

From a vantage point well after 1994, the gradual emergence of the apartheid state likewise embodied Freire’s depictions of oppression. A basic element of the oppressor-oppressed relationship was prescription – the imposition of one individual’s choice upon another, forcing the oppressed’s consciousness to conform to the oppressor (Freire, 2000, pp. 46-47). Over time, the oppressed unwittingly accepted the guidelines that the oppressor established (Freire, 2000, p. 47). In the South African case, colonial-era efforts to “de-pattern” the lives of Indigenous Africans allowed marginalization to become so entrenched that it was the norm (Abdi, 2003, p. 90). Those efforts persisted into other venues, with missionary-era acculturation, South Africa’s pass laws, the creation of the Bantustans, and the insinuation of Christian National Education into the national syllabus as prime examples.

As people became critically aware of the nature and causes of their oppression, Freire believed they would begin to recognize avenues for their liberation (Thomas, 2009, p. 255). In the case of South Africa, this occurred when Black African populations appropriated the right to define their own surroundings and their relationships with the environment and society (Abdi, 2003, p. 90). Freire (2000, p. 56) was adamant that only the oppressed could achieve this; the oppressors could free no one. That statement brings to mind the long, slow failure of the nationalist

government in its declining years, saddled with inefficiency and maintaining order only through sheer force.

Anti-Dialogical Actions. The more insidious tactics of the apartheid regime also found their analogues in Freire's playbook for domination. Freire (2000, pp. 138-167) presented four "anti-dialogical actions" that served the ends of the oppressor – conquest, divide-and-rule, manipulation, and cultural invasion. While distinct in their practice, they converged in their goal of preventing the oppressed from standing united against the oppressor – hence, "anti-dialogical." Freire's (2000) tactics find clear examples in South African history. For one, cultural invasion occurred when the oppressor penetrated the cultural context of an oppressed group in order to impose their own world view, inhibit creativity, and stifle expression (Freire, 2000, p. 152). As seen previously, scholars have accused the apartheid government – as well as earlier governments and concurrent missionary efforts – of attempting to erase the culture of Indigenous Africans through the systematic imposition of foreign values and norms, which curbed traditional forms of creativity and self-expression (Soudien, Kallaway, & Breier, 1999, p. 495).

Freire also predicted the oppressor would "attempt to destroy in the oppressed their quality as 'considerers' of the world" (2000, p. 139), as a means of conquest. In order to achieve this, the oppressors would need to "mythicize" reality, painting it as a "world of deceit," which would evoke alienation and passivity in the oppressed (Freire, 2000, p. 139). South African governments and society employed this anti-dialogical action for centuries, depicting Indigenous Africans as incapable, unfocused, fierce, and barbaric. And with the advent of eugenics at the start of the 20th century, the dominant minority "mythicized" racial inferiority and undeveloped civilization in their rationale for White African superiority and governance.

Freire's (2000) definition for divide-and-rule could have been penned by the nationalist

government itself, if not the *Afrikaner Broederbond*: “As the oppressor minority subordinates and dominates the majority, it must divide it and keep it divided in order to remain in power” (Freire, 2000, p. 141). A long list of events in South African history illustrated that anti-dialogical action: policies that subdivided Black Africans into fragmented groups, the checkerboard definition of traditional homelands, the relegation of education to sub-departments and provincial fiefdoms, forcible separation of families based on skin color, repartitioning of urban areas on racial grounds, and many more. Any or all of these could stand as examples of Freirean theory, in tangible form, and some centuries before his books were published.

Indeed, in short order the pairing of Freirean anti-dialogical actions and tactics to South African history becomes an exercise in the unsubtle. Freire (2000, p. 147) described “manipulation” as a tactic to sculpt the masses to the objectives of the elite; South Africans suffered the political connivances and legislative onslaught of the Nationalist Party during the earliest days of apartheid. When Freire (2000, p. 156) put slurs in the mouths of oppressors – “the members of the invaded group are ‘inferior’ because they are ‘ingrates,’ ‘shiftless,’ ‘diseased,’ or of ‘mixed blood’” – it echoed the racism leveled against Africans of color, from van Riebeeck’s undignified company reports to the supremacist rhetoric of Verwoerd. Where Freire (2000, pp. 139-140) described “the myth of the heroism of the oppressor classes as defenders of ‘Western Christian civilization’ against ‘materialist barbarism,’” it connected to the *Beleid* of Christian National Education as it portrayed the divine calling of Afrikaners as guardians of Indigenous Africans. Even less subtle, where Freire (2000, p. 138) described conquest as the first anti-dialogical action toward oppression, South Africans experienced the very real and very painful conquest by colonial powers – and the violent proclivity of the late-apartheid police state. Clearly, centuries of oppression inflicted by successive governments in South Africa meshed perfectly with Freire’s (2000)

theories.

People's Education. The South African experience also generated its own corollaries to Freirean educational theory. A core principle of Freire (2000) is that the oppressor cannot install a liberating education; Freire (2000, p. 136) even insisted that was a “naive” notion. The oppressor needed to divert the oppressed from any critical inspection of their reality, which would not be in his interest (Freire, 2000, p. 52). “What is to his interest is for the people to continue in a state of submersion, impotent in the face of oppressive reality” (Freire, 2000, p. 52). A humanizing education, supported by dialogue between revolutionary leaders and the oppressed, was the only effective form of schooling (Freire, 2000, pp. 68-69). Such an education was no longer a means for teachers to manipulate students, but instead allowed an exploration of their consciousness (Freire, 2000, pp. 68-69).

This principle led to the belief that the curriculum could become an instrument of social change, and a proliferation of English-based education projects and cooperatives in the late 1970s and early 1980s demonstrated Freirean principles at the ground level in South Africa (Nekhwevha, 2002, p. 138). Likewise, liberation movements in South Africa moved to leverage curriculum as a counterpoint to Native Education and Bantu Education (Coetzee, 1995, p. 45).

Those efforts materialized in People's Education, a 1980s-era effort to redraw the national curriculum with a foundation in equality and development (Morphet, 1987, p. 4). At a time when “alternative” education in school was punished with a hefty fine or jail time (Morphet, 1987, p. 3), People's Education explored “education for liberation” (Alexander, 2013, p. 165) and espoused a number of Freirean ideals; scholars have summarized People's Education by insisting that it

- Enables the oppressed to understand the evils of the apartheid system and prepares

- them for participation in a non-racial, democratic system;
- Eliminates capitalist norms of competition, individualism, and stunted intellectual development and one that encourages collective input and active participation by all, as well as stimulating critical thinking and analysis;
 - Eliminates illiteracy, ignorance, and exploitation of any person by another;
 - Equips and trains all sectors of our people to participate actively and creatively in the struggle to attain people's power in order to establish a non-racial democratic South Africa;
 - Allows students, parents, teachers and workers to be mobilised into appropriate organisational structures which enable them to enhance the struggle for people's power and to participate actively in the initiation and management of People's Education in all its forms;
 - Enables workers to resist exploitation and oppression at the work place. (Naidoo, 1990, p. 140)

While there is more than a passing resemblance between Freire (2000) and these descriptions of People's Education, other researchers have found more specific correspondences between the two. Coetzee (1995) drew from Roodt (1993) to align the specific aims of People's Education to paraphrases of Freirean education (Roodt, 1993, pp. 124-126, as cited in Coetzee, 1995, pp. 131-132). Coetzee (1995, pp. 131-132) felt that in many cases there was a one-to-one relationship between People's Education and Freire (2000), but in other instances, the two paralleled along larger beliefs – such as the role of teachers, or curriculum. Regardless of the specifics, People's Education is a clear example of Freire (2000) in practice, under the apartheid regime.

Examinations of Freire's influence. Freire's works, and *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* in

particular, have seen repeated applications to the South African context. The testimonials of Alexander (2013) make frequent mention of Freire (2000), supplying a firsthand report of Freirean philosophy in action. Other scholarly works examine Freire's effect on South African consciousness and society; three of those, from chronologically different viewpoints, are examined below. First, Naidoo's (1990) present-tense article examined Freire alongside student resistance groups, at a time when apartheid was still in full swing. Next, Nekhwevha (2002) reviewed some of the same ground – but carried a distinct retrospective quality – in an article entitled “The influence of Paulo Freire's ‘Pedagogy of Knowing’ on the South African education struggle in the 1970s and 1980s.” Last, Thomas (2009) encouraged a return to Freirean philosophy more than a decade after the close of apartheid, as a means of reassessing the performance of the new South African government. Taken in concert, these three articles demonstrate how Freire's theories took hold on South African consciousness – and in some ways, continued to do so.

Freire and Student Movements. Naidoo (1990, p. 124) discussed the evolution of student opposition groups through roughly two decades, beginning with the late 1960s. Where Freire offered insight on resistance efforts, Naidoo (1990, p. 123) recast terms and passages from *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* to fit the local context, or to serve as advice to student movements. For example, Naidoo (1990, p. 122) recommended student leaders “develop effective means of communication, consultation and involvement,” equating that combination to a Freirean “dialogical encounter” (Freire, 2000, p. 159; Shaull, 2000, p. 32). In other cases, the article employed Freire's vocabulary directly, in an insistence that

There is still a need, however, to address the issue of student efforts which do not transcend the realm of activism or verbalism. The extent of these weaknesses in student resistance is sometimes exaggerated by certain critics who charge reckless militant volun-

tarism and too much “activism” without reflection. (Naidoo, 1990, p. 123)

Having employed Freire’s groundwork, Naidoo (1990, pp. 124-128) discussed the growth and spread of student resistance movements, as well as the role of teachers in the success of anti-apartheid efforts (Naidoo, 1990, pp. 128-130), and the interaction between student opposition groups across color lines and through different phases of the educational system (Naidoo, 1990, pp. 136-140).

Through most of this discussion though, Freire was used as a counterpoint or as a bracket for what South African students and student leaders experienced. Naidoo (1990) returned to Freire when his philosophy proved useful for the explanation; as an example, when Naidoo (1990, p. 135) reached a discussion of People’s Education, the author suggested that “the whole campaign was to facilitate the taking-over of the schools by the popular forces.” As one part rationale, one part defense, Naidoo (1990, p. 135) invoked Freire and labeled the South African education system “an instrument of dehumanization.” Even with that support though, Naidoo (1990, p. 135) did not seem optimistic at the chances of Freirean education alone freeing South Africa from apartheid’s yoke: “Given that the state education bureaucracy has effectively regained control, and that resistance in the schools has subsided, the chances of engaging in a ‘pedagogy of the oppressed’ within the confines of the classroom have become remote.”

However, the article reinforced several connections between Freire’s theories and the reality of apartheid South Africa. “South Africa provides a classic setting for ‘banking education,’” Naidoo (1990, p. 129) declared. The author also felt “praxis, verbalism and activism all persist in South Africa,” and in spite of difficulties, “a developing revolutionary and progressive praxis definitely exists amongst the politically active students” (Naidoo, 1990, pp. 122-123). When students aligned themselves with trade unions and joined in a stay-away in November 1984, Naidoo

(1990, p. 132) felt the government's retaliatory remarks against students were "predictable" – and reminded the reader that it was in fact Freire who made that prediction:

It is indispensable for the oppressors to keep the peasants isolated from the urban workers, just as it is indispensable to keep both groups isolated from the students. ... It is thus necessary to convince the lower classes that students are irresponsible and disorderly.

(Freire, 2000, p. 145)

Naidoo (1990, pp. 140-141) again invoked Freire in passages that discussed a "long, slow march towards an emancipatory pedagogy," and in a plea for an organized progressive pedagogy that could be implemented under repressive conditions. In the article's conclusion, the author again borrowed from Freire in a prediction that "authentic rebellion will continue" even if "it is difficult to predict with certainty the exact form it will take" (Naidoo, 1990, p. 142). Naidoo took a cue from Freire, and suggested that form might be violent:

If children reared in an atmosphere of lovelessness and oppression ... do not manage during their youth to take the path of authentic rebellion, they will either drift into total indifference ... or they may engage in forms of destructive action. (Freire, 2000, p. 155)

Despite this warning, within a half-decade of Naidoo's (1994) discussion, South Africa had made a peaceful transition out of apartheid and into democracy.

Freire and Black Consciousness. With the benefit of hindsight that Naidoo (1990) did not have, Nekhwevha (2002) found other analogues between Freirean education and counter-apartheid efforts. The 1980s in particular showed a pattern of similarity between the language of education and Freire's work: Demands for "people's education," for democratic school governance, for inclusive syllabi, and for democratic educational institutions were "mostly framed in the language of critical pedagogy" (Nekhwevha, 2002, p. 138). That language was adopted into

the Black Consciousness Movement, and found a strong supporter in Steve Biko (Nekhwevha, 2002, p. 137).

As with the previous article, Nekhwevha (2002, p. 136) found explicit use of Freirean principles in both the Black Consciousness and People's Education efforts. Beyond that, Freire's influence was found in career research centers in Cape Town, in radical elements of several South African church councils, as well as among trade unions, women's organizations, and community action groups (Nekhwevha, 2002, p. 141). Nekhwevha (2002, p. 141) likewise sensed "Freirean-type social practices" in action research and school improvement projects at the post-graduate level at two universities.

Nekhwevha (2002, p. 142) closed with a tone of disappointment, blaming post-apartheid curriculum overhauls for a "lack of interest in understanding the roots of our education." For the author, this was evident in the absence of Freirean insights in the interim curriculum published circa 1997, which prescribed specific exit outcomes rather than "reasoning, reflection, and action" (Nekhwevha, 2002, p. 142). This generated a measure of skepticism on the part of "education activists and intellectual leftists," who expected "some form" of People's Education would shape school policy, and "post-apartheid education in South Africa should be anti-capitalist" (Nekhwevha, 2002, p. 142). The same segment sought a pedagogical approach that combined education and culture with "'conscientization' and politicization for a sustainable democratic future" (Nekhwevha, 2002, p. 142). However, Nekhwevha (2002, p. 142) felt the post-apartheid education policymakers "either overlooked or ignored" those recommendations, and expected a review of Freire's work would likely remedy those "omissions and deficiencies."

Freire and the Post-Apartheid Experience. In a way, Thomas (2009, p. 254) took up that challenge, and advocated for a return to Freire as part of an analysis of not only the post-

apartheid government, but top-down development throughout the continent. Penned 15 years after the close of the apartheid regime, the article acknowledged that the end of institutionalized racism was “an enormous victory for the forces of democracy and freedom,” but insisted that “South Africa remains plagued by numerous socio-economic problems” (Thomas, 2009, p. 257).

The new government took the blame at that point, as Thomas (2009, p. 258) imposed Freire’s lens back upon South Africa’s state of affairs in the new century, in hopes of providing “a compelling framework for understanding the lack of progress toward a more free and egalitarian South African society in the post-apartheid period.” Where the democratic government showed a trend toward centralization of power, Thomas (2009, p. 258) sensed the “exclusion of the masses from the process of liberation,” and provided a relevant warning from Freire. With the acknowledgment that the “liberation movement was essentially demobilised after 1994,” Thomas (2009, p. 258) again cited Freire’s admonition against attempts to “deliver” liberation to the people, then accused contemporary governments of abandoning their democratic base in favor of “the interests of domestic and international capital.” And where the author sensed a lack of dialogue with the people, Thomas (2009, p. 264) accused the new government of elitism, and applied Freire’s disapproval by proxy.

Thomas (2009) expanded upon those allegations with a series of case studies, most of which touched upon education only tangentially. Before closing though, Thomas (2009, p. 264) made the case for re-applying Freirean analysis to the post-apartheid administration, as well as to other post-colonial African nations.

Freire’s dialogical method can serve both as a means of critiquing the practices of elites across the continent (both African and “Western”), and also of organising mass-based resistance to the top-down “development” strategies currently being pursued in most

African countries. (Thomas, 2009, p. 264)

What is more, the author felt society – and education – in the new South African era had a welcome tool in Freire’s techniques, as they were already well established in South African history and culture.

Freirean pedagogy highlights the importance of participatory forms of dialogue and resistance, and provides critical insights into the nature and potential for more democratically organised movements and organisations. ... The new social movements reflect many aspects of the Freirean model. ... They tend to focus on mobilising and empowering people on the ground to act as creative agents of change, rather than treating them as “objects” to be acted upon by state policies. (Thomas, 2009, p. 264)

In that sense, the author expected much could be learned about new social movements in South Africa from Freire’s perspective (Thomas, 2009, p. 264).

After examining all three articles, it appeared that Nekhwevha (2002, pp. 141-142) touched upon an idea that was less obvious, but still present, in the other two articles. Each researcher attempted to frame portions or aspects of South African history and education against the principles and theories of Freire; each seemed to overlook the larger realization that Freire’s ideas and concepts have become a large part of South African culture and consciousness. When “‘people-driven’ social movements” aimed at education, or housing, land, electricity, or water (Thomas, 2009, p. 264), or women’s organizations (Nekhwevha, 2002, p. 141), or the evolution of student resistance movements (Naidoo, 1990, p. 128) stand as examples Freirean social movements, the question should not be how well Freire’s model fits the South African experience, but how deeply Freire’s philosophy is ingrained in South African social consciousness.

Criticism

Freirean theory has its detractors. Some critics drew the line at Freire's educational recipe for revolution, chiding him for promoting a false hope of somehow arriving at a place outside oppression and power struggles, and offering as rebuttal the historical failure of "revolutions" to create more free and democratic societies (Thomas, 2009, p. 256). Some of Freire's early projects attempted to incorporate gender or race, but earned criticism for gender-biased language and the omission of some oppressed social groups (Thomas, 2009, p. 265).

Others discounted *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* as idealistic, primarily because it attempted to establish an oversimplified subjective-objective theme throughout the text and throughout human experience (Youngman, 1986, p. 163). Some caught a sense of elitism in Freire's work: The polar arrangement of oppressor and oppressed could only be remedied through the intercessions of an enlightened few (Freire, 2000, p. 132). Admittedly, Freire (2000) hinted at this third actor: Oppression could only be resolved with the appearance of a "man in the process of liberation," or the emergence of a leadership group during liberation (Freire, 2000, pp. 56, 132).

Other theorists have attempted to divorce Freire from social transformation, or from the dichotomous framework of oppressor-versus-oppressed and teacher-versus-student, resulting in interpretations that label Freirean thought as "classism" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, pp. 422-423). For still others, the utility in Freire's educational philosophy was found only at the classroom level, where participation and engagement in decision-making confronted the relationships between power and oppression in society (Thomas, 2009, pp. 256, 264-265). South Africans specifically spoke to examples where Freire's principles were subverted to work precisely opposite to his original goals of liberation and democracy – emphasizing that educational techniques are

neutral, and like any other tool, can be used for good or evil, however it is defined (Alexander, 2013, pp. 59, 148).

For some critics, another weakness of Freire (2000) was its inherently oppositional nature: Critical pedagogy itself was powerless to directly mend social structures, and would require an agent to enact meaningful change (Skinner, 1999, p. 118). In other words, no measure of critical pedagogy would have been able to concretely divert apartheid policy, until a member of the government structure moved to alter it. Scholars were willing to admit that Freire's theories proved themselves when implemented (Skinner, 1999, p. 127); after all, Freire himself had employed critical pedagogy in adult and community education projects in Latin America and western Africa (Youngman, 1986, p. 151). But even in the immediate wake of apartheid, some expressed doubt that Freirean concepts – and the political agenda they implied – could have provided a direct means of transforming South African society (Skinner, 1999, p. 127).

Some of that doubt may be related to the fact that the South African experience was primarily grounded in race, while Freire's theories transcended race and directed attention on classes. Within Freirean thought, race or gender oppression reinforced the class disparities that already existed as oppressor and oppressed (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 423). Echoing that, Freire's later works insisted oppression worked across factors of race, gender, culture, language, or ethnicity (Macedo, 2000, p. 15); *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* made no references to race or gender aside from conventions in narration.

This was not to say that Freire excluded discussions of race or gender or ethnicity (Thomas, 2009, p. 254). Rather, Freire and other critical pedagogists conflated anti-racist or anti-sexist struggles, as well as others, with class conflicts (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 424). When race, or gender, or ethnicity, or other forms of oppression took center stage, the dominant classes

were overlooked, and the underlying oppression was ignored (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 423). For Freire and others, a genuine end to racial oppression, to use the apartheid example, would come about with an insightful analysis of class, the concept of race, and the workings of racism (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 424). By combining efforts to combat racism, sexism, and other forms of oppression with the awareness of class conflicts, the result would be a more powerful transformation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 424).

Discussion

Freirean theory demanded reflection and action as necessary steps toward praxis, which occurred within a constantly refocusing cycle of development (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 422). With praxis, and amid a dialogue founded in respect and trust, conscientization could occur, with a goal of social transformation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 422). Conscientization raised the individual's awareness of power, and reframed education as an agent of change and a tool of democracy (Skinner, 1999, p. 118).

At the classroom level, critical pedagogy required a balanced role for student and teacher, a measure of prior learning that allowed reflection, and a "problematizing" of knowledge as a step toward political and social insight (Skinner, 1999, p. 118). As could be seen in the case of South Africa, the potential for transformation that existed in Freire's theories came from the empowerment of marginalized peoples, a push to transcend the restrictions of apartheid society, and the role the oppressed played in their own progress toward social justice (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 422; Skinner, 1999, p. 118).

On one hand, it is impressive that Freire could be at once so specific in the sequence of oppression, and at the same time so general in his observations that they fit completely distinct cultures suffering under an unrelated government on the opposite side of the globe. On the other

hand, it is disappointing that Freire's framework for oppression readily matches South Africa's social and educational history. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and its companion works arrived through a different culture, different environment, different history, and different geography, meaning the suffering and injustice seen under apartheid were not exclusive to the South African experience. They were – and still are – a common feature of the human experience.

However, this does feed the central premise of this study: The experiences and recommendations of school leaders under the South African nationalist regime have an application beyond that time and location, and serve to inform present and future schools laboring under similarly oppressive conditions. Where other school leaders can also draw parallels between their situation, and the situation described by Freire, or the situation experienced by South African educators and students, their ordeals and advice may prove transferable.

The Apartheid Archive Project

At the closure of the apartheid government in 1994, the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act formed a commission to investigate and document human rights violations that had occurred as aspects of the South African government between 1960 and 1994 – the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 1998, vol. 1, p. 24). The release of TRC report in 1998 represented as complete a picture as possible of events and violations, in an effort to fairly and fully represent the motives and perspectives of both perpetrators and victims (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 1998, vol. 1, p. 24). The underlying belief of the commission, and the view of the incoming government, was that history needed to be engaged if South Africans were to understand its ongoing effects in the future (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 12). At the same time, the TRC represented a chance to restore or augment the official record, which had been “systematically sanitised and deliberately destroyed ... in an

attempt to conceal the machinations of the apartheid State” (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 12).

While the TRC hearings and report attempted to rebuild the official record, the commission focused only on the most extreme abuses and violations, ignoring the “countless horrors that people ... faced in their daily struggle to survive” (McEwan, 2003, p. 746). That tendency to concentrate on the most salient narratives of the apartheid regime meant there was little opportunity to openly explore common, but no less significant, everyday details suffered under a racist government (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 12).

Aims and Principles

For that reason, the Apartheid Archives Project (AAP) was initiated in 2008, with an intent to “insert the experiences of ordinary South Africans in the written history of South Africa” (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, pp. 12, 18). The AAP began at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, South Africa, with facilities and funding continuing to be provided by that institution (Stevens, Duncan, & Hook, 2013, p. 7). The original goal was to gather roughly 5,000 stories within a five-year period (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 14); the accumulated material is open to the public through the university’s website (Stevens, Duncan, & Hook, 2013, p. 7).

The project shares at least one assumption with the TRC – that past experiences will continue to inscribe themselves on the present if they are not acknowledged and dealt with (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 14). Because “apartheid may return, and come to haunt our future lest we attend to its past, and understand it properly” (Laubscher, 2013, p. 47), the project embodied a belief that comprehending and engaging the past allowed an understanding of the present and an imagining of the future (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 14).

Additional Aims and Goals. A second aim was that the archive represented a chance for ordinary South Africans to tell their stories (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 14). “The project aims to examine the nature of the experiences of racism ... of South Africans under the old apartheid order, and their continuing effects on individual and group functioning in contemporary South Africa” (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 14). While it is altogether possible that other-than-“ordinary” South Africans could have contributed to the archive, the aim of the AAP was to collect stories of racism and victimization from both Black and White Africans, without regard to their social successes (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, pp. 14-15). The archive accepted stories from any portion of South African society, but it was particularly focused on economically, politically, and socially marginalized groups, whose stories are “rarely incorporated into dominant historical accounts,” and who seldom get the opportunity to publicly share their personal stories (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 15). With that wide and open approach to contributors, the AAP generated an “unusual richness” (Stevens, Duncan, & Hook, 2013, p. 9).

The project had two secondary goals: First, the project leaders hoped the AAP would provide a space to restate oppressive, dehumanizing, and painful past experiences in a non-persecuting and transformative way (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 15). Second, the project designers hoped the AAP would allow people to creatively, in the form of storytelling, engage with their subjective past without fear of judgment (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 15). This explained their choice of stories for archive content, as storytelling represents one of the “more accessible symbolic forms” for creatively expressing human experience (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 15).

Guiding Principles. The AAP designers believed the constraints of the archive should be challenged at all times, by pushing the boundaries of its creation, maintenance, and utilization

(Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 13). The project maintainers invited differing socio-political perspectives on archive content, which they believed would allow the testimonies to be extricated from their social and political underpinnings, improve understanding of the stories, and allow “re-thinking” the contents to benefit both current and future perspectives (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 13). “New possibilities for interdisciplinary collaboration will no doubt also emerge” (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 23). A variety of viewpoints was of benefit to the archive, in that “what is sometimes concealed in shadows becomes illuminated” (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 13).

A second guiding principle employed “liberation” in the same sense as Freire (2000): an active process of reflecting on the archive content, in order to wrench those social resources away from those who originally grasped it (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 13). Expanding the boundaries of the archive, both in terms of who could contribute to it and who could access it, implied qualities of democracy, inclusion, appropriation, and reclamation of the archive and its content for the project designers (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, pp. 13-14). The final principle was grounded in a need to encourage “reflexive liberatory praxis” in academic work with the archive, in order to avoid eclipsing the voices of others (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 14). Underneath these three guidelines was an understanding that theoretical and ethical engagement with the AAP implied a politically progressive viewpoint, as seen in the decolonization and anti-oppression contexts of post-apartheid South Africa (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 14).

Summary

As this study attempted to collect the advice of school leaders, teachers, and students on their experiences within the educational system of an oppressive government, it was necessary to frame apartheid-era education against a historical overview of the subcontinent. Schooling for

Black Africans moved through distinct phases in stride with South African history, existing for generations as community-based education passed between elders and parents in Indigenous communities, then to formalized European-style education as a means of discipline and religious gatekeeping. Later, a centuries-long missionary education began, seeking to perpetuate the values of colonial governments and reinforce social and racial striations. It was not until the beginning of the 20th century that central governments took serious notice of education for Black Africans, becoming first Native Education of the 1920s, and later Bantu Education under apartheid.

Understanding the evolution of South African education allowed a theoretical perspective on the consistent and deliberate mismanagement of education for Black Africans, stretching back hundreds of years into history. In many cases, the actions and policies of the apartheid government that began in 1948 and expired in 1994 closely followed the patterns and theories described in Freire's (2000) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Knowing that theories of education and oppression that evolved in another part of the world fit the South African context perfectly meant the testimonials of school leaders, teachers, and students under apartheid could be of benefit to educators laboring under similarly oppressive systems, elsewhere in the world and in the future.

Chapter Three of this study describes the methodology that was used to examine the stories available in the Apartheid Archive project. The chapter begins with the central question and the sub-questions that informed it, followed by the methods and procedures that were used in data collection. The chapter will close with the document protocol, the use of Freire (2000) as an interpretive framework, and the role of the researcher in the study.

Chapter Three: Methodology

This qualitative study employed a phenomenological approach to explain how teachers, school leaders, and students rationalize a seeming contradiction between the inherent goal of education when their institution is bounded by a system that openly strives against that goal. Phenomenological research searches for a common meaning reported among several individuals in their lived experiences of a concept or phenomenon (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 121) – in this case, education under apartheid. Phenomenology was chosen over the narrative approach, on the grounds that Creswell and Poth (2018, p. 110) described narrative research as “studying one or two individuals, gathering data through the collection of their stories, reporting individual experiences, and chronologically ordering the meaning of those experiences.” As phenomenological research reduces a variety of personal experiences into a description of the universal essence (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 121), it was deemed a better fit to the purpose of this study.

Ideally, phenomenological research would rely on focused face-to-face interviews to collect data from people who experienced the phenomenon, which in turn would contribute toward a composite description of what they experienced, and how they experienced it (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 121). This research instead relied on the testimonials and interviews published by the Apartheid Archive Project to understand the lived experiences under apartheid-era education of a variety of individuals. Where common points of experience reappeared across participants’ stories, this research attempted to distill the essence of education under the apartheid government through a phenomenological approach. From there, the study relied on the principles of Freirean education as an interpretive framework, ultimately referring to contemporary leadership theory to inform school leaders who believe they face a similar situation.

Central Question

The central question of this study was, “How do personal experiences of an oppressive school system, as interpreted through the framework of Freirean education, inform school leaders?” The wording and structure of this question belied a number of points that were important to this study. First, this question sought to focus on school leadership, which implied a moral component that may or not be necessary in leadership roles beyond education. Whereas other leadership domains – social, organizational, business, or elsewhere – might gain insight from this study, this question acknowledges that they may do so without subscribing to the ethical component that is necessary to any investigation of education.

Second, this study sought to employ the lived experiences of apartheid-era students and teachers in its interpretation of the school system through Freire’s educational framework – not to interpret the experiences themselves against Freire (2000). In other words, this study employed Freire (2000) as an interpretive framework for the resulting depiction of the apartheid education system, not as a tool to critique the submissions of participants. The grammatical structure of the central question was intended to eliminate ambiguity over the use of Freire (2000) as the study’s interpretive framework.

Third, the results of this study should be of interest to school leaders of any category, whether educators, administrators, or related roles – such as school boards or student leaders. In that way, the central question recognized that the significance of its results will likely be of greater importance at the level of the school than to national- or even local-level policymakers and stakeholders. While external entities may have some interest in the findings of this study, the central phenomenon being discussed – education under apartheid – presumes that some, if not all, of those policies and institutions are arrayed in a contradictory stance to the goals of school

leaders, teachers, and students. In other words, the central question described a situation where the school stands as an ideological unit opposed to the institutions, policies, and entities that surround it.

Several sub-questions guided the central question. The sub-questions were intentionally aligned with the textural and structural descriptions recommended by Moustakas (1994, p. 96); textural descriptions portray how a phenomenon was experienced, while structural descriptions provide a context or situation for what was experienced. Two sub-questions spoke to the textural description:

- 1 What was the personal experience in an oppressive educational system?
- 2 What was the educational experience in an oppressive educational system?

These two questions were selected to allow the stories to speak to educational events specifically, but also to permit data to include personal or ancillary details that framed or supported the participants' school experiences. The first tied directly to the personal effects of national policies of oppression, while the second focused on how education was affected by those policies. Historical discussions of apartheid education mince no words in describing its detrimental effects on students (Jansen, 1999, p. 4; Moore, 2016, p. 85); if those are to be believed, then the candid experiences of everyday South Africans should describe personal and educational effects that were similarly unfavorable. Together, these two sub-questions permitted the writers to describe their experience of education under apartheid in terms of personal and school experiences.

The structural descriptions recommended by Moustakas (1994, p. 87) were guided by three sub-questions:

- 3 How was learning affected by an oppressive educational system?
- 4 How did participants react to an oppressive educational system?

5 How did leadership influence the experience of an oppressive educational system?

These three sub-questions sought a context for the impact of apartheid on the educational interaction, participants' reaction to that effect, and how leadership reacted – or failed to react – to that intrusion into the educational sphere.

The third sub-question asked specifically how apartheid affected individual school experiences, and should permit similar experiences to overlap or reinforce one another. Dube (1985, pp. 88, 93) was explicit in describing how education embodied racism up to and through the apartheid era, eventually becoming a “road to nowhere.” Kallaway (1984, p. 9) likewise described how early 20th century education in South Africa contributed to the slow erosion of traditional cultural identities, over time completely negating them. If these authors and others were correct, the testimonies in the archive would portray an education system that reached the level of the learning experience to impose its racist agenda.

The fourth question sought the response of the author to the apartheid educational experience, as well as their reflection on what happened, or what they felt should have happened. South African history described numerous incidents of protest under the banner of education, not the least of which was the Soweto uprising of 1976 (Ndlovu, 2006, pp. 345-347). With a strong legacy of opposition that reached back decades before the Nationalist Party came to power (Chisholm, 2017, p. 26; Hyslop, 1986, p. 3), it could be expected that the submissions to the archive would portray the writers' responses – both emotional and physical – to the experience of education under an oppressive government.

The last question tied the educational experience under apartheid to leadership specifically, wherever the author sensed it. For school leaders under the apartheid school system, this sub-question permitted their personal experiences. For others who did not hold the position of

school leader, it invited their conceptions and impressions of leadership, as they observed it in practice. In the years since 1994, educational leadership in South Africa has evolved to include contemporary organizational leadership theories, but leadership in the apartheid era was recalled as a function of the headmaster's or principal's post (Grant, 2006, p. 512). This suggested submissions might equate leadership to legitimate power (French & Raven, 1959, p. 264), but modern discussions of leadership as it was exercised in the past could also show how the idea has evolved. In that sense, the final question may offer insight on how influence-based leadership concepts appeared, or did not appear, or took hold in apartheid-era schools. That, in turn, would provide a perspective on the central question.

Participants

The data available in the AAP represented the personal memories of participants who volunteered to submit stories (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 16). It is unlikely that minors provided any contributions; the span of years between the close of apartheid in 1994 and the call for submissions in 2008 would likely preclude any meaningful contribution by an individual under 18 years old. The invitation to participate asked specifically for responses in a written format, requesting "stories of their earliest and/or most significant experiences of race and racism in apartheid South Africa" (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 16).

Initially, the core research team for the project employed a snowballing strategy, employing their own network of contacts to recruit possible contributors to the archive, while an Internet page allowed any member of the public to submit a story directly to project researchers (Stevens, Duncan, & Hook, 2013, p. 10). Contributors were asked to retell their earliest significant experience with racism, providing as much reference to the location of the event as they were comfortable revealing, and some measure of the effect the event had on their lives (Stevens, Duncan, &

Hook, 2013, p. 10). That guiding prompt provided a central theme and allowed analysis between stories, but also opened the responses to deeply personal accounts (Stevens, Duncan, & Hook, 2013, p. 10). Over time, the project evolved to supplement stories with interviews, and where individual participants could offer more specialized responses, interviewers asked focused questions – for example, former members of the South African military may have received questions directed at their service (Stevens, Duncan, & Hook, 2013, p. 10). Aside from those procedural guidelines, the content of the narratives was largely unmediated (Ratele & Laubscher, 2013, p. 111).

Arrangement of the Submissions. As of 2020, a total of 113 submissions were available publicly as portable document format files, downloadable from the University of the Witwatersrand’s Historical Papers Research Archive. Other material was collected by the project, but was held under an embargo with no predicted date for release, owing primarily to health concerns worldwide (G. Stevens, personal communication, September 2, 2020).

Stories were assembled into files in groups of 10; interviews are collected in groups of five or six for a single file. The file names of the documents derived from their collection number within the university archives – AG3275 – as well as a one-word indicator of its contents – either “text,” for stories and transcripts, or “jpeg,” to indicate images. For example, the first collection of stories is AG3275-B-1-1-10-text.pdf. A total of 13 files were available in late summer 2020; each file contained as many as 10 submissions, with 97 stories and 16 interviews in total.

Each submission received an item number that incremented between submissions and continued in sequence across consecutive files – for example, N14 or SN7. The prefix N indicated a story contributed from the public, SN indicated a university student-submitted story, and the prefix SI indicated a student-led interview (The Apartheid Archives Project, 2011, para. 5-7).

Some files seemed to confuse that numbering system; for example, the file entitled AG3275-C-1-11-16-text.pdf is clearly a collection of interview transcripts, but the item numbers begin with SN. For those reasons, and to assist future researchers in locating the source material, this study refers to each individual submission by the distinctive elements of the file name, followed by the sequence number, to create a unique label. For example, the first story in the first electronic document is referred to as B-1-1-10-N1, indicating file AG3275-B-1-1-10-text.pdf, item N1.

Unless the participant elected to include it, stories and interviews contained no personally identifiable information. Some submissions, but not all, included a pseudonym or demographic labels for the participant; some writers incorporated some or all of that information into the body of the testimonial. For example, the author of story B-1-11-20-N11 preceded her submission with key words indicating she is female, white, was in her forties at the time of submission, and from an academic background. She also provided her origin as the Transvaal. On the other hand, story B-2-1-10-SN14 gave no demographic labels, but opened with the line, "I am J.S, an Indian female. Born 1961 at King Edward Hospital in Durban. I have brown skin and jet black hair." In some cases, the interviewer included a name for the participant, or elicited a name as part of the conversation. For example, C-1-11-16-SN1 is labeled with the name "Mavis," and C-1-11-16-SN5 opens by referring to the participant as "Jane," with demographic data surfacing later in the discussion. In rare cases, almost no demographic information is available at all; as an example, B-1-21-30-N24 manages to deftly discuss the fallout from a relationship that crossed racial boundaries, even though the story itself offers no outright assertion of any demographic identity, except to suggest that the writer is possibly female.

Appendix A of this study separated individually numbered submissions to show the source file, the format of the submission, and any demographic information supplied – but not

inferred through the body text. The appendix also provided very general topics for the submission, such as education, youth, activism, relationships, family, or other terms. These were offered as loose clues to the content of a submission; in most cases, the content varied widely with the author and their memories, and for that reason, it might be difficult to definitively label any submission with one topic or another. On the other hand, interviews followed a common series of topics, including youth, education, and family, and while they provided less focus than some stories, they played a strong part in the analysis.

Data Collection Procedures

The first step of data collection was to determine which submissions could make a meaningful contribution to this study's focus on educational leadership. Once relevant material was selected, the methods and procedures described by Clark Moustakas in *Phenomenological Research Methods* (1994) were followed. Afterward, Freirean educational philosophy was overlaid onto the results, to serve as an interpretive framework for the apartheid-era educational experience. As a closing note to these data collection procedures, the researcher's own connections to the content material were briefly discussed.

Data Analysis. Not every submission to the archive was focused on educational leadership, let alone education. In fact, none of the submissions offered the direct and specific advice of a school leader that the central question sought. It was expected that a majority of the submissions touched upon education, but even so, the usefulness of the content could not be established until each complete submission was read and compared to its peers. Some stories went to great lengths to discuss student activism and the role of education – Story B-2-21-32-SN36 is a good example of a submission that provided strong content tied to both education and school leadership – but others touch only briefly on school attendance, then move away. This was the case

with Story B1-31-40-N38, which mentions “some of my pre-school and primary-school years were spent on a farm,” but aside from that line, and a later mention of cycling to school, the story moved to topics beyond the orbit of education. While that submission and others like it were still strong and valid testimonials to the apartheid experience, there was little that particular story could offer this study. The time it would take to examine it in detail would have been better spent working with submissions that shared the focus of this research.

Therefore, as a preliminary means of screening stories for their relevance to this study, features of the NVivo software suite were used to determine whether the content of an individual story or interview included a considerable discussion of education. Published by QSR International, NVivo is a software program that assists with qualitative research through the analysis of text, audio, image, and video data. NVivo’s ancillary tools allowed the researcher an unbiased and impartial filter for key words used in the discussion of education, and thereby contributed to the expectation that a submission would prove relevant to the study. As a preliminary list, the stories and interviews available in the AAP were examined according to the frequency of the appearance of the following words: *school*, *teach*, *student*, *leader*, *educate*, and *learn*. NVivo allowed the inclusion of words and their derivations in the search – such as *teaching*, *teacher*, and *teachers*, alongside *teach* – and words that carried the same connotation – such as *instruct*, as it conveys *teach*. The volume of output generated did not require this list to be amended or refined during the data collection stage. From those results, an expedient and impartial examination of submissions was performed, on the basis of relevance to the study.

A general overview of the archive content suggested more than 50 of the participants, from a variety of backgrounds, provided a substantive discussion of education. Creswell and Poth (2018, p. 124) recommended a heterogenous group of between three and 15 individuals

who experienced the phenomenon would satisfy a phenomenological approach.

Method and Procedure. Moustakas (1994, pp. 138-140) provided both processes and a methodology for the pursuit of phenomenological research, with many of those suggestions condensed into a step-by-step procedure proposed by Creswell and Poth (2018, pp. 128-129). While the bulk of these procedures were pertinent to this study, the nature of archive research – as opposed to interview-driven phenomenological research – required a few modifications to the steps described by Moustakas (1994, pp. 138-140) and other authors (Creswell & Poth, 2018, pp. 128-129).

Establish the Question. The initial steps recommended a researcher focus on “discovering a topic and question rooted in autobiographical meanings and values, as well as involving social meanings and significance” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 87). This should spark the researcher’s curiosity and inspire the search, and the personal history of the researcher will bring the core of the problem into focus (Moustakas, 1994, pp. 87-88). Creswell and Poth (2018, p. 128) rephrased this as, “identify a phenomenon of interest to study,” adding that the researcher should fully describe it. Previous sections have defined the phenomenon of interest, the central question, and the sub-questions that informed it. A later section will discuss the researcher’s connections to education in South Africa, and the challenges that presented to this study’s analysis.

Bracketing. Through these initial stages, the researcher must “distinguish and specify the broad philosophical assumptions of phenomenology,” with the recommendation that, in order to faithfully describe how participants view the phenomenon, “researchers must bracket out, as much as possible, their own experiences” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 128). Moustakas (1994, p. 81) expanded on the principle of “bracketing” by insisting that “the focus of the research is placed in brackets, everything else is set aside so that the entire research process is rooted solely

on the topic and question.” Done properly, bracketing allows the researcher to arrive at “*epoche*,” where we “set aside our prejudgments, biases, and preconceived ideas about things” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 73).

To satisfy these requirements, each story was approached from a neutral viewpoint, and allowed the narrator or participant to describe their experience without an expectation or preceding value judgment. Moustakas (1994, p. 74) warned that bracketing can be difficult, as it “requires that we allow a phenomenon or experience to be just what it is and to come to know it as it presents itself.” Particularly when examining stories describing prejudice and racial discrimination, it was challenging to accept the central message of a story without interference from preconceptions and personal experiences.

Collect Experiences. The data collection step varied in this study, owing to the use of the Apartheid Archive Project as the data source, rather than focused interviews. Researchers should “collect data from the individuals who have experienced the phenomenon” through a series of in-depth interviews (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 128). Such interviews might begin with a conversation intended to create a relaxed and trusting atmosphere, followed by a few moments for the participant to focus on the experience before describing it fully (Moustakas, 1994, p. 94). However, because this research examined material submitted into an archive, there was no opportunity for interviews or follow-on sessions with participants. In order to ensure the source material of the study was focused on the central phenomenon, the relevance of each submission was evaluated using the method described previously. From those, a series of experiences were collected that approached the topic of the study.

Generate Themes. Moustakas (1994, p. 81) explained that when every statement was given an equal value, those which were irrelevant to the topic and question, or those that were

“repetitive or overlapping,” could be deleted, leaving the researcher with a “horizon” – a textual meaning and unvarying essence of the phenomenon. From there, horizons could be clustered into themes, providing a “coherent textual description of the phenomenon” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 81). In other words, significant statements and passages would provide the empirical foundation for recurring notions that “provide an understanding of how the participants experienced the phenomenon” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 129). For the purposes of this study, relevant submissions were read in their entirety, in hopes of detecting themes that offered insight into the sub-questions provided earlier in this chapter. Both the explicit descriptions of the original submissions, and the recurring concepts that are shared between authors generated the themes that ultimately guided an understanding of the central question.

Generate Descriptions. At this point Moustakas’ (1994, p. 96) distinction between “textural” and “structural” became important: Textural implied an empirical interpretation of an individual’s experience, while structural encompassed the environment or situation that contributed to it. From the themes generated in the previous step, the researcher should be able to describe what the participants experienced individually, as well as the context or setting that contributed to their experience (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 129) – the textural as well as the structural (Moustakas, 1994, p. 87). The goal of those two descriptions was “an integration of the textures and structures into the meanings and essences of the phenomenon” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 96). While some interpreted this to include the experiences and situations of the researchers, it was also suggested that personal statements of this sort could be placed at the beginning of the phenomenology, or as part of the validation strategies discussing the role of the researcher (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 129).

Moustakas suggested here, and in other parts of his plan for phenomenological research,

that researchers represent what they, as a group, experienced (1994, p. 112). As this study was an individual effort, this representation, as with others, was adjusted accordingly, and may be interpreted as the researcher's singular contribution.

Report the Essence. From both the structural and textural descriptions, the researcher should compose a composite description reflecting the “essence” of the phenomenon, called an “essential invariant structure” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 129). This “synthesis of textural and structural meanings and essences” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 101) focuses on the common experiences of the participants (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 129). As part of the analysis portion of the study, a composite description of the essence of the experience was provided, as an effort to encapsulate what the participants described.

Portray the Essence. The final step is a narrative report of the essence of the experience, beginning with an introduction that restates the phenomenon and the personal experiences of the researcher (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 129). The narrative should also reiterate the rationale for the use of phenomenology, data collection and analysis assumptions, and a report of how the phenomenon was experienced, justified by significant statements from source material (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 129). The narrative report closes with a composite description and essence of the phenomenon (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 129). The data analysis closed with a complete narrative report that reintroduces, summarizes, and distills the essence of the experience, grounded in the text of archive submissions. That report served to inform or answer the sub-questions asked earlier, before finally converging these answers into a response to the central question.

Interpretation Through Freire. Stories that validate or substantiate the educational philosophy of Freire (2000) received additional attention. With much of the discussion of South African education and history framed in Freirean education, it stood to reason that the individual

experiences of ordinary South Africans would likewise reflect Freire's (2000, p. 132) descriptions of oppressor and oppressed. For that reason, testimonials that suited Freire (2000) as an interpretive framework were noted. The opposite of this was also true though: Stories or interviews that contradicted Freirean interpretations of South African education deserved highlighting. In those cases, the experiences of the individual did not substantiate Freire's (2000) theories, but instead invited other perspectives on the experience of education under apartheid.

Document Protocol. A document protocol guided the analysis of each relevant submission, which aided in the data collection procedure. The protocol sheet and the points of examination are shown in Appendix B. The document protocol identified each submission by its item number, summarized the content, applied categories and themes, then identified details of textual and structural descriptions, and highlighted portions that validated the educational philosophy described in Freire (2000).

Role of the Researcher. Between 1996 and 1998, in the earliest years of the democratic South African government, the researcher lived as an educator and development worker at a small rural school in southeastern Lesotho in the district of Qacha's Nek. Between 2003 and 2005, the researcher lived in a small village in the North West province of South Africa, providing professional development for teachers at three rural schools, within the administrative range of the Mothibistad offices for the present-day Department of Basic Education. The researcher has also worked in school administration in east Asia, and has conducted research and university outreach projects in public education and reading instruction at the elementary level in southeast Asia.

In many cases, the researcher's peers in the education systems of both Lesotho and South Africa studied, or were employed as educators, under the apartheid regime. In other instances,

the researcher's peers were not just teachers or school leaders, but were active participants in anti-apartheid efforts. The perspectives and stories of those co-workers and friends painted a picture of a life that the researcher could sense was less than ideal – and in some cases, painful for them to share. In many of the testimonials of the Apartheid Archive Project, the researcher heard strikingly familiar tales – not just of prejudice or racial hatred, but of a need to resist apartheid at a personal level. For an American, learning about life under apartheid is particularly distasteful, and its retelling becomes both a point of empathy and a cautionary tale. It was at once disappointing and discouraging for the researcher to hear of fellow teachers, school leaders, students, neighbors, and friends suffering the disgraces and injustices of apartheid, in ways that were similar to those presented in the archive.

These became the pre-existing experiences and notions that the researcher actively attempted to bracket in discussions of archive content. As Moustakas (1994, p. 74) warned, bracketing requires a phenomenon or experience to be only what it is, and the researcher must “come to know it as it presents itself.” For the researcher, this presented an added challenge, given the experiences and relationships that preceded this study.

Transferability. Qualitative research requires a conscious efforts to address the concept of transferability, as it relates to generalizability. Eisner (2017, p. 198) regarded generalization to be “going beyond the information given,” but also transferring what was learned in one situation to another. Transferability, in that sense, became a function of the similarity, measurable by degree, between two contexts (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 124). Where two situations or tasks were identical, there was no need for generalization, because what was learned in the first situation could be moved directly to the second – “like moving a truckload of furniture from one place to another” (Eisner, 2017, p. 198). However, in the case of skills, images, or ideas that must be ap-

plied to situations, this was not the case: Some features of the situations always differed, and for that reason, transfer was a process that exhibited features of generalization (Eisner, 2017, p. 198). A person engaged in the transfer of skills, images, or ideas must recognize similarity, but not exact identity, between one situation and another, and then make an appropriate judgment (Eisner, 2017, p. 198). If the two situations or contexts were “sufficiently” congruent, a working hypothesis from one context could be applicable in the other (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 124).

This judgment suggested a high level of thinking, because in many ways, transfer was a necessary component to learning (Eisner, 2017, p. 198). A teacher would not likely agree that a student had learned something if the person could not demonstrate the application of skills, images, or ideas derived from one situation to another (Eisner, 2017, p. 198). Unfortunately, Eisner admitted “there are no operationally defined truth tests to apply qualitative research” (2017, p. 53), which meant the value of any qualitative research effort was determined by its usefulness and relevance to the audience: “In the end, it is the practitioners, the users of ideas, who must determine whether the ideas available are appropriate to their situation” (2017, p. 180).

Ultimately, transferability hinged on the trustworthiness of the study – a quality that Lincoln and Guba framed as a question: “How can an inquirer persuade his or her audiences . . . that the research findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to?” (1985, p. 290). For a qualitative study, trustworthiness is determined by accuracy and validation; accuracy speaks to the reader’s satisfaction with the method used to record or transform the data, and validation is a combination of efforts by the researcher, participant, and reader, to prepare the study for the reader’s critique (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 338).

In some ways, the accuracy of this study was precipitated through the protocols established by the original project. As mentioned above, the project coordinators openly solicited vol-

untary testimonials through an Internet portal, but also through their own professional and personal networks (Stevens, Duncan, & Hook, 2013, p. 10). The results were either a self-composed and self-edited story or the transcription of an interview, reformatted and accessible as electronic documents (The Apartheid Archives Project, 2011). While the content is largely “unmediated,” the materials and passages employed in this study can be easily corroborated against the documents available through the University of the Witwatersrand website (Ratele & Laubscher, 2013, p. 111; Stevens, Duncan, & Hook, 2013, p. 7), suggesting the accuracy of the data in this study can be directly verified against the university holdings. In that sense, the content material was recorded in digital form, was directly accessible, and was offered in a transcribed or written form that can be compared against the source materials quoted in this study.

Validation was achieved through a variety of strategies, some of which were within the researcher’s scope, while others fell to the participant or even the reader to achieve (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 340). This study employed four primary strategies: The first was “clarifying researcher bias or engaging in reflexivity,” which required the researcher to disclose biases, values, or experiences that affect the position the researcher takes in the inquiry (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 341). A previous section described the role of the researcher in this study; it is altogether possible that those experiences created a situation where the researcher and the published stories shared inclinations or biases, and that brings the results into question. It fell to the researcher to ensure “bracketing” was practiced, which should have reduced researcher bias.

The second strategy for validation was “enabling external audits” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 342), wherein an external, unconnected auditor examines the process and product to determine accuracy. In this study, “external audits” was accomplished through the oversight of the dissertation committee.

The third strategy was “generating a rich, thick description,” where the detail offered in the study allowed readers to decide on transferability (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 343). Descriptions that interconnected details, used strong action verbs, and provided direct quotes satisfied this validation of transferability. This study employed as many details as were available in the primary source materials in its representation of the essence of the central phenomenon, and in its portrayal of the life experiences of participants under the apartheid-era education system.

A final strategy is offered in a “negative case analysis,” which “provides a realistic assessment of the phenomenon under study” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 341). Included in Chapter Four are two authors whose descriptions and experiences with apartheid ran counter to many of the submissions that formed the core analysis. While those negative cases were detached from education specifically, their perspective on the wider apartheid experience offers insight into an individual interpretation that other South Africans may have shared. In that way, and when combined with the previous strategies, validation should be achieved for readers of this study.

Regarding Truthfulness. From the perspective of researchers, the Apartheid Archive Project leaders were clear that they did not expect the content of the archive to reflect a neutral, objective, or unbiased reflection of “absolute truth,” or “accurate or objective accounts of the past” (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, pp. 13, 18). In the sense that “truth” means “exact correspondence to reality,” research on narratives cannot attempt to be “true” (Webster & Mertova, 2007, p. 90). Stories are never faithful recollections of actions or events, instead representing the personal investment of the speaker, listener, or observer who was party to the story, converging to construct a version of the event (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 17). But in cases such as South Africa, where the official record was erased or modified, personal memories offer a means of reinforcing or redirecting what remained (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 16). Facts may

at once be indisputable and ephemeral, but individuals generate their experiences of those facts.

There certainly was a national Group Areas Act, and a set of apartheid laws that held for everyone, but every one's experience of those laws were wholly particular, and singular.

... It is by witness and testimony that every singular story must question the universal process, threaten it and unsettle it. (Laubscher, 2013, p. 57)

The power in a personal retelling is its ability to allow the protagonist to tell the story in their own words – a particularly important consideration when reflecting on racism (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 18).

Stories also reinforce the fact that humans are storytellers by nature – we develop knowledge by listening and telling stories with one another (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 18). van Manen (1990, p. 62) echoed this point, insisting that “we gather other people's experiences because they allow us to become more experienced ourselves.” We are interested in the experiences of others because they inform us, allow us to be shaped or enriched, and provide a pathway toward the full significance of the experience (van Manen, 1990, p. 62). The value of a personal memory is less in its truth than its insight into the experiences, values, and interpretations of the narrators, which offers a portal to the past and perhaps a better understanding of the present (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 18). And like oral histories, those personal accounts challenge accepted or authoritative or official records, and the over-arching narratives that sometimes drive them (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 16). In a similar way, culturally or politically marginalized populations can preserve knowledge suppressed by dominant ideas or groups through storytelling (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 19). Particularly in cases where the established record is damaged, deleted, or disguised, the role of personal memories in expansion and inclusivity must be emphasized as alternative understandings of the accepted sequence of

history (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 16).

Furthermore, and perhaps more so than other archives, the AAP was inherently tied to power relationships, in personal, social, psychological, and political ways (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 13). This was in addition to the social and political processes that always surround any archive, and as a result, the inherently oblique, partial, and singular perspective of an archive forces the observer to adopt a political or social position in relation to it (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 13). Expecting the stories within the AAP to necessarily conform to an official or accepted “truth” therefore became unreasonable.

Summary

This chapter described the methodology for this study, first establishing the phenomenological approach and its application to the process of this study. This provided a justification for both the use of the Apartheid Archives Project as a data source for the study, and as an insight into the experiences of everyday South Africans who endured apartheid. From there, this chapter discussed the central question and the sub-questions that guided the investigation.

This led to a fuller discussion of the “participants” of this study, as well as the nature and format of the AAP and how it collected its material. The final section spoke to the data collection for this study and the anticipated analysis for both story and interview content, their evaluation, and their merger for the final synthesis and report. The chapter included a brief discussion of the role of the researcher, as well as personal experiences that could have been influential in this study. Lastly, the issues of generalization, transferability, and truthfulness were discussed, along with a brief summary of the strategies for accuracy and validation for this study.

Chapter Four: Data Analysis

This chapter presents the findings of the data analysis through each step of the methodology described in the previous chapter. The methods and procedures suggested by Moustakas (1994, pp. 138-140) included some preliminary steps which have, prior to the analysis step of the study, been completed. First, the researcher established a topic and question that had both personal and social meanings and significance (Moustakas, 1994, pp. 87-88), as described in the previous chapter. Second, throughout the examination of archive content, a conscious effort was made to “bracket” out personal experiences (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 128), in hopes of setting aside preconceptions or biases, and containing the research process to the topic and question of the study (Moustakas, 1994, pp. 73, 81).

The next step was to collect experiences; while Moustakas (1994, p. 94) and other authors (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 128) expected this would be accomplished through focused interviews, this study examined submissions to the Apartheid Archive Project. Moustakas explained that, if bracketing had been successful, each statement of a submission could be given equal value (1994, p. 81). This allowed irrelevant or repeated statements to be omitted, leaving only a textual meaning and core essence of the phenomenon – a “horizon” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 81). Horizons could be clustered into themes, which provided a “coherent textual description of the phenomenon” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 81), as well as “an understanding of how the participants experienced the phenomenon” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 129).

From those themes it was possible to generate both textural and structural descriptions, providing both an empirical interpretation of individual experiences, and a contextual setting that contributed to them (Moustakas, 1994, p. 96). The penultimate step was to combine the textural and structural descriptions into a synthesis representing the “essence” of the phenomenon

(Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 129). The analysis closed with a narrative report that fulfills the last step of Moustakas' (1994, p. 140) methodology, including a reintroduction, a summary, and distillation of the essence of the experience, grounded in references to archive submissions.

Description of the Analysis

The first step was to determine the usefulness of each available submission to research into education. As explained in Chapter Three, the NVivo software suite was used to filter submissions based on the appearance of the following words, as they relate to education: *school*, *teach*, *student*, *leader*, *educate*, and *learn*. The software also flagged terms that derived from those words – such as *teaching* or *teacher* as derivatives of *teach* – and words with a similar connotation – such as *instruct* as it implies *teach*. The results were reviewed for suitability, then compiled into Table 1 below, which lists the submissions considered in this analysis and pseudonyms attached to those submissions.

In total, 53 submissions were considered: Eight were interviews, and the remainder were stories. Of the submissions that provided demographic data, nine described themselves as “Black” or “African;” 17 identified as “White;” four provided “Coloured” as an identifier; and three used “Indian” as a demographic label. Eleven submissions were labeled “male,” and 19 included “female” or “woman” as an identifier. In some cases, more demographic information could be inferred from the text of the story; this was avoided as many of the submissions clearly showed a creative quality. For that reason, the above figures do not reflect interpretations of submission content.

Table 1*Submissions Considered for this Analysis, and Attached Pseudonyms*

Submission	Pseudonym	Submission	Pseudonym	Submission	Pseudonym
B-1-1-10-N2	Amahle	B-1-41-50-N42	Hope	B-2-11-20-SN18	Olerato
B-1-1-10-N3	Angel	B-1-41-50-N44	Iminathi	B-2-11-20-SN19	Philasande
B-1-1-10-N5	Asemahle	B-1-41-50-N46	Innocent	B-2-11-20-SN21	Precious
B-1-1-10-N9	Bandile	B-1-41-50-N49	Jade	B-2-11-20-SN22	Prudence
B-1-11-20-N12	Banele	B-1-51-60-N52	Jayden	B-2-11-20-SN25	Rose
B-1-11-20-N15	Bayanda	B-1-51-60-N53	Joy	B-2-11-20-SN26	Samkelo
B-1-11-20-N17	Blessing	B-1-51-60-N54	Khayone	B-2-21-32-SN32	Siyabonga
B-1-11-20-N18	Bonolo	B-1-51-60-N58	Kungawo	B-2-21-32-SN36	Tee
B-1-11-20-N19	Bright	B-1-51-60-N60	Leigh	B-2-21-32-SN38	Warona
B-1-11-20-N20	Brilliant	B-1-61-66-N61	Lerato	C-1-1-5-SI4	Pumi
B-1-21-30-N22	Emihle	B-1-61-66-N63	Lesedi	C-1-6-10-SI6	Mpho
B-1-21-30-N24	Emmanuel	B-1-61-66-N64	Lethabo	C-1-6-10-SI8	Tshepo
B-1-21-30-N25	Enzokuhle	B-1-61-66-N66	Lubanzi	C-1-6-10-SI9	Vusi
B-1-21-30-N27	Esihle	B-2-1-10-SN8	Lunje	C-1-6-10-SI10	Thenjiwe
B-1-31-40-N34	Faith	B-2-1-10-SN9	Luthando	C-1-11-16-SN1	Mavis
B-1-31-40-N35	Gift	B-2-1-10-SN11	Melokuhle	C-1-11-16-SN2	Tebogo
B-1-31-40-N40	Grace	B-2-1-10-SN14	Minenhle	C-1-11-16-SN5	Jane
B-1-41-50-N41	Happiness	B-2-1-10-SN16	Okuhle		

Pseudonyms. As shown in Table 1, original interview transcripts that provided a pseudonym for the participant have been attached to the considered submission. For materials that did not provide a pseudonym, one has been assigned in alphabetical order. The rationale for the use of pseudonyms was threefold: First, it provided a small measure of privacy to the narrator, by assigning a name that does not immediately reveal any demographic information, or allow an immediate assumption of the writer's opinions. Second, it allows the analysis to refer to authors as persons; by contrast, identifying stories by a code number detracts from the personality of the story. Finally, the readability of the analysis is improved where individual submissions can be referred to by a name, rather than a citation built from a number sequence, which can be difficult to

follow.

Despite those benefits, the assignment of pseudonyms presented a distinct challenge. The possible names were gleaned from lists of first and second names provided by South African national statistics services, from live birth occurrences and registrations for 2017 (Statistics South Africa, 2017, pp. 51-53). The most popular of those names were expressions of “pride, joy, and thankfulness” (Statistics South Africa, 2017, p. 28).

However, the pseudonyms were assigned without consideration of any available demographic data, or to any identifiers that were suggested in the body of the submission. This presented the possibility that in some cases, the pseudonyms did not correctly imply the ethnic background, origin, or gender, if it was provided by the author, or if it was suggested through the body of the submission. It would have been preferable to use names that corresponded to the culture, gender, and ethnicity of the writer, but that would require a closer investigation of the content than was practical in many submissions. This was a problem with no graceful solution; in no way should the reader infer or assume any disrespect toward individual ethnicity, gender, or heritage by the use of a particular pseudonym. As explained above, the benefits of using pseudonyms were the primary motives for their attachment.

Collect Experiences

Moustakas (1994, p. 94) and later authors (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 128) implied that this step of phenomenological research would require focused interviews, but this study relied on archival submissions. This adjustment proved to be mixed blessing: On the one hand, the material was prepared and ready for examination, with no need for transcription or translation. On the other hand, there was no opportunity to revisit participants, or ask follow-up questions, which was sometimes disappointing. If the source material diverged from education, or gave only an

abbreviated account, a guided interview might have provided better detail or more focus. Ultimately this meant that the free-form and unguided nature of the submissions sometimes failed to explore areas that might have proven informative to this study.

Each of the submissions shown in Table 1 was read in its entirety, then revisited in an effort to sense the “horizons” Moustakas (1994, p. 81) described. With the document protocol shown in Appendix B as a guide, submissions were indexed against item numbers, briefly summarized, and described in both textural and structural terms, with particular attention to how the story informed the sub-questions that were established in Chapter Three. Where a particular submission lent itself to interpretation through Freire (2000), that was noted, as well as significant passages or quotes that would provide the “rich, thick description” that would support transferability (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 343).

Generate Themes

The analysis revealed two themes, with the second appearing frequently in submissions as a response to the first.

Apartheid Intruded Upon Education. The first theme was the undeniable sense that apartheid intruded upon education. Whether the story described a student attending school, a teacher delivering lessons, or a school leader within an institution, the consistent thread was that government and policy interrupted, interfered, or rerouted education to undesired ends. Those intrusions took many forms; some were benign, and were described as little more than incongruencies or inconveniences. But others implied irreversible damage to the author’s educational experience – or worse, their physical well-being.

Many authors were very matter-of-fact in their description of education in a society split by race, suggesting students accepted things just the way they were. Bright, the author of Story

B-2-11-20-SN19, explained that “as children we were taught about Apartheid in our school days. It was taught to us, that normal society had to be kept apart.” Even at a young age, children could sense that the community was divided, but did not reflect upon those divisions for years to come. Kungawo knew as early as Standard 2 that her school had two names, “an English one and another one in isiXhosa.” She also knew there were other schools nearby, but those were for children of different skin colors. The division was there, but she never questioned it: “There are several other black schools in the villages around the town,” she added, writing in the present tense, “but I barely ever think about these.” This sense of separation was not unique to Black African students; White writers also admitted they could sense the divide, but did not question it. Esihle explained that “in accordance with apartheid policy no coloureds or blacks were admitted to the school. What is particularly poignant about this is that I only questioned this year later [*sic*], at the time it was for the norm!”

Already the experiences submitted to the archive follow the Freirean blueprint. Apartheid relied on prescription to persist – a term Freire (2000, p. 46) explained as an imposition of one individual’s choice upon another, with the goal of forcing conformity and removing consciousness. Prescription cemented the oppressor-oppressed relationship, and transformed the consciousness of the oppressed into one that conformed with the oppressor (Freire, 2000, p. 46). As children grew up within apartheid society, they unwittingly adopted the behavior that apartheid demanded – never questioning why schools had more than one name, or why schools for children of different colors were elsewhere in town. This was not their fault though: They learned through the examples of their parents, teachers, and other adults, and conformed even as the prescription became the mechanism of their dehumanization.

Separation of Students. As students grew older though, the apartheid prescription began

to materialize. Many stories described arbitrary assignments to specific schools based on race, and in some cases it fell to the school administration to enforce that policy. Hope was raised in the 1970s as a child of a mixed-race couple: “My father, a very dark skinned, kinky haired man, classified as Malay was married by Moslem rights to my mother who was classified as white.” Like other writers, apartheid prevented Hope from attending a school “that was literally within a short walking distance from my home.” A late arrival was rewarded with corporal punishment, and so, “having been caned more than once for late coming, I was particularly indignant for not being allowed to attend the neighbourhood school.” When the opportunity arose for Hope to live with an adult sister and attend school in a predominantly Indian community, the rules of apartheid reappeared.

Compared to my sister, I differed in my dress code, was of fairer skin and my racial classification as Cape Malay offered a seemingly insurmountable challenge to the local school authorities who had to consider my application to the school. My application was denied. I was not Indian, a non-negotiable requirement according to the school principal. My late application was hurriedly sent to the nearest school for coloured children, which was at least a 30 kilometre train ride away. I spent the first six months after my arrival in Natal traveling to and from school, again bypassing the school within walking distance from my sister’s home.

The 30-kilometer daily commute ended when the nearby school principal retired, and a family member successfully appealed to the new school administration on Hope’s behalf.

Not every assignment was detrimental. In the early 1990s, apartheid policy relaxed, and students at segregated institutions were permitted to apply to “Model C” schools, which had previously been White-only (South African Institute of Race Relations, 2011, p. 1). This gave many

students – such as Bright, who attended a school for Coloured students until 1991 – the chance to finish school at an institution that had been reserved for White students. Enzokuhle had a similar experience: “My parents moved me from a previously non-white school (which was predominantly Indian) to a former Model C school.” Olerato summarized the school arrangement in the closing years of apartheid: “The schools I attended were specifically for the Indian community. Whites and blacks also attended schools that were built for their communities. Model ‘C’ schools were established where all students, irrespective of race were allowed to attend.”

Bright, Enzokuhle, and Olerato discussed racial stratification in schools obliquely; the change occurred as part of their educational careers, and they appreciated the opportunity to move to schools previously exclusive to White Africans. For writers of earlier generations, this was an impossibility. Okuhle began school in 1960, and blamed rigid school segregation up to and including university level, for “being allocated into an ‘Indian’ only school.” As Okuhle matured, the disruption caused by separated schooling grew worse.

The lack of choice of a school meant that I attended an Indian primary school two kilometres away, even though an “Indian” school was 300 metres close to our home. The department of Indian Affairs made an arbitrary allocation which school in the Indian neighbourhood you attended. High School was by train to a school 35 kilometres away. University was at a bush college located 600 kilometres away. (Story B-2-1-10-SN16)

Several writers explained how apartheid had a direct effect on their student endeavors, in differing degrees. Precious was among those who offered specific evidence how apartheid’s education policies impeded their success outside the classroom, as well as inside.

I was born in central Johannesburg in September 1953; due to the segregation of the schooling systems we had to attend so called “Indian schools”. This is in spite or despite

a school in the proximity of ones place of residence. Once the act of separate development and specified areas of residence was [passed] life became very difficult. Living in Forthsburg the “Johannesburg Indian High School” located in Forthsburg was closed and all high scholars were bussed to schools in Lenasia – the area declared so called Indian. The bus space was inadequate and due to the travelling, especially in the afternoons one could not participate in extra-mural activities, especially sports. I enjoyed sport in the form of athletics, cricket and soccer but these activities took place after school hours and there was no transport, public or otherwise to get home safely. Therefore it curtailed an important aspect of my life.

To an outside reader, an arbitrary assignment to a school, or a lengthy commute, or the inability to participate in sports might seem like “inconveniences” – and given the gravity of some apartheid experiences, that initial reaction might not be incorrect. But these experiences exemplified the common, everyday details of life under a racist government that the archive sought to preserve (Stevens, Duncan, & Sonn, 2010, p. 12). The indignity of a cross-country commute to attend school assigned by skin color might sound relatively minor, but as the intrusion of a racist government into a student’s life, it does fall well within the “countless horrors that people ... faced in their daily struggle to survive” (McEwan, 2003, p. 746).

White African Students. Compartmentalization did not stop at White South Africans; in their case, home language was the dividing factor. Lethabo explained that “my school was the normal Government School for home language English speakers with an Afrikaans speakers [*sic*] in a school around the corner.” Children were no more oblivious to White-White segregation than they were to other divisions in society: “We were very conscious of the difference between ourselves and the Afrikaans kids, didn’t like them and thought we were superior to them,”

Lethabo wrote. And, as with previous writers, Lethabo admitted that as children, they believed the apartheid divisions were natural, and the rules went unchallenged: “All these schools of course were for white children only but I don’t remember observing this or questioning it.”

When White South Africans did examine their own society, they often commented on how “obscure” it had become, to adopt a word Esihle used. She explained how her teachers prepared her and her classmates for a “terrorist” incident.

We were told to hide under desks and instructed on how to leopard crawl across the playground. At the same time this way was scary – why would people want to hurt us? Of course the terrorists were made out to be black men – as were all dangerous persons. In fact this was never doubted – it was a given.

For Esihle, hindsight revealed the lasting effects of that incident: “It only occurred to me much much later how warped this exercise had been. We were quite literally taught to fear blacks; they were painted as this enemy which as children I feel we believed.” In later years that fear would resurface, this time among parents. Esihle said about a year after the “terrorist” preparations,

the first black children were admitted to the school. There was a huge palaver surrounding this! I distinctly remember how many children were kept at home on the day (or even week) they first arrived. ... Parents were having kittens over what this would mean for their children’s education.

It would take her more time to fully grasp the significance of those events, but over the course of her life, they “reinforced how obscure apartheid” was, she wrote. That was not the only follow-on effect; those lessons not only “increased my empathy with persons marginalised by apartheid,” but also “engendered disrespect for Afrikanerism and apartheid,” she explained.

Esihle’s word “obscure” echoed those other White writers used to describe the apartheid

years. Some suggested their educational experience felt artificial because schools lacked students from other racial groups. Joy described the “oddity of the situation” at a secondary school, where the absence of Black African students contrasted the presence of Black South Africans on the school custodial staff. For Tee, a separated school was just one of many divided areas of South African life: People of different colors “didn’t live together or catch buses or go to school together.” However, Tee’s education did imply a social hierarchy: “It was taken for granted that black people had to learn English while we did not learn an African language” – a fact that Tee said “did not feel right.”

Tee described an incident when students could clearly see the inequalities of apartheid society, and questioned school leaders about it.

In high school, we began to become aware of the gross disparities in the amount of money spent on black and white education, largely through reading newspaper articles. We saw photos of black children standing in queues, waiting for a place in school. If the school was full, a child might simply not attend school that year. At that stage, education was not compulsory for black children. Our school fees were almost zero and we got the use of free textbooks for the year. Our class questioned our headmistress about the morality of this. She said, “We pay the taxes. Our taxes pay for our schools and those school books.” She did not mention the fact that the reason poor people did not pay taxes was because they were so terribly paid, nor the fact that company taxes – and profits – were high partly because of the availability of cheap labour.

While the headmistress’s response clearly did not satisfy Tee, it did appear to have sparked more questions in the minds of her pupils.

Private School Students. Students of any color who enrolled in private schools could

possibly deflect, if not avoid altogether, some of the harsher effects of apartheid. As a Coloured student, Khayone attended a religious school in the northwestern town of Bloemsmond, and while it primarily catered to Afrikaans-speaking students, “isiXhosa-, seTswana- and Afrikaans-speaking black African” children also attended.

Some parents enrolled their children in religious schools expressly to insulate them against apartheid. In the early 1980s, the parents of Gift went against their own counterculture lifestyle when they sent her – the author of Story B-1-31-40-N35 – to an Anglican school. The decision was deliberate, Gift explained: “The choice of an expensive main-stream private school was offset by the fact that I would receive a ‘very good education’ and that the school, being private and therefore protected from the apartheid government agenda, was ‘non-racial.’” In her case, expectations did not match reality: While the school had its reputation for a nonracial enrollment, the “hegemony of whiteness in the school” undermined those claims.

There were in effect very few black girls who attended the school. Apart from the handful of daughters of Anglican priests from Cape Town townships who received scholarships through the church, and a few ‘coloured’ and ‘indian’ girls from the city’s merchant and professional classes, most of the black school-girls were the daughters of diplomats from other African countries, or Bantustans.

Gift’s perspective on her education, her opinion of her parents’ choice of lifestyles, and the evolution of her experiences under apartheid formed much of the content of her submission.

Black African Students. For Black South Africans in rural or underserved locations, apartheid’s greatest failure was perhaps not what it forced upon their education, but what it omitted from it. Thenjiwe attended rural primary schools in the 1980s, explaining that up to Standard 7, “it was just a normal school, no computers or anything like that, just a school. You wake up in

the morning, go to school, and ... reading, and come back.” Her school was understaffed for learners at her level. For Thenjiwe and her peers,

we didn’t have some of the teachers for Standard 7. ... So I didn’t pass very well but I was top 10 in my class, regardless of the fact that we didn’t have our maths and science teachers, because of the situation in rural areas.

Thenjiwe said her father saw through her top-10 ranking. As a strong believer in education, “he would basically force you to go to school, and if you don’t want to go to school, if you rebel, he will force you and make it a point that you go to school.” This explained why he was not pleased with her results:

My father then decided that this is no school. ... He was very much interested that I do maths, because most of us at home don’t have maths. So he said no, I would not like you to proceed and go to high school. ... So I want you to go ... so I moved to the suburbs and stayed with my aunt for a year, where I was repeating Standard 7 so that I can improve my maths.

The experience appeared to have influenced Thenjiwe’s opinions of education. Later in her interview, she praised the school where she sent her own children, with one caveat: “I guess it depends on the teacher. My son’s class I’m not so happy with; they always don’t have homework. But then my girl’s teacher, she is excellent. But it’s a good school, it’s well resourced.”

Other Black South Africans looked back on their apartheid-era education with an even stronger sense of disappointment. Tshepo explained that “out of all the boys I grew up with, I was the first to go to university and be a graduate.” Born in 1979, after graduation he “went to what was supposed to be a teachers college,” then studied pharmacy, and found employment in pharmaceutical research.

In spite of that success, Tshepo felt his schooling held him back: If not for “the level of education that we received as small children, I mean, I could have been becoming a genius or something.” He explained that, in his time at primary and secondary school, “we were not taught things that we were meant to learn.” He illustrated his point with a story about a math problem in university.

I went there and we were given a maths assignment and there was one sum I couldn't do. So I went to my former school to ask my teacher if he could solve it, and he couldn't. So he referred me to another teacher who couldn't do it, and they referred me to a teacher at a primary school. She couldn't do it and they finally referred me to another teacher at another school and that guy solved that problem. And to me, it told me something. ... I started to ask myself, how come this person couldn't work it out?

Prompted for his feelings on the experience, Tshepo said, “You feel bad. You feel like this was just a total waste of time for you. ... If you had had a better school, things could be different.”

Tshepo linked those emotions to his understanding of apartheid.

I mean, you can't blame anyone. It was apartheid. I mean, during those days, people, I mean us, me, even myself, people expected that when you [graduated] you would go to a certain college. I think that that's where this problem came, there were too many teachers. The way the system was designed was that black people would not have access to other career paths, except teaching or being a policeman.

Tshepo's resentment of apartheid, and his understanding of how it failed him, had its basis in education policy under the nationalist government.

Tshepo was not the only Black South African to realize too late how the apartheid system contorted society. Iminathi described himself as a 50-year-old male born in a rural area of the Or-

ange Free State, and a native Sesotho speaker. As the child of a teacher and an employee of the Department of Health, “I enjoyed a kind of a middle class status,” he wrote. At the age of 12, apartheid complicated his admission into high school not only on the basis of skin color, but also on the basis of home language:

I had to go to QwaQwa for my high school education as there was no high school for the so-called non-whites in our home [village], although there was one for white kids, just four kilometres away. What is interesting is that there was another high school about 30 kilometres from our home and I could not be admitted to that school either as that one admitted only Setswana speaking children. QwaQwa, where I finally got my high school education, was about 300 kilometres away from my home. Back then it took a full 24 hours travelling to get to QwaQwa.

Iminathi provided details of the arduous journey from home to school, and back again – inconvenient travel arrangements, unsafe waiting areas, a lack of sleeping facilities, and even abuse at the hands of railway employees that left physical scars. And yet, “the discomfort of this experience did not really get to me then, may be because of my tender age.” Like previous authors, it would be years before Iminathi would question his apartheid-era experiences.

This blatant discrimination did not matter then, or shall I say that it was so rife that it looked normal and natural to be handled that way. ... Nobody ever asked as to why we did not have high schools nearby while our white counterparts could literally walk to their high schools. Nobody ever asked as to why was it that the majority of the Black kids we started sub-standard A with, never went beyond standard six education. In fact nobody asked why was it that none of my standard six classmates ever went to any high school at all, to further their education.

As other writers admitted, Iminathi accepted the reality of apartheid society without stopping to confront it.

The dissolution of the nationalist government was not a golden ticket to educational equality. In the immediate wake of apartheid, the experience of being a Black African student in an otherwise all-White school was already “random,” but suddenly became emphasized when more Black African students arrived. Lunje explained:

In my school in Standard 1 there were not a lot of black kids and in Standard 2 there was like an influx – an influx I mean like 20 black kids in one year and that was huge. And they were older than me and they were all from township schools and so their perceptions were totally different from mine.

In this case, once apartheid policy had been reversed, Lunje felt the presence of the new Black African students “moulded my perceptions,” and that “the experience definitely had an impact on my views about myself.”

These passages portrayed life under several Freirean anti-dialogical tactics, which the apartheid government deliberately employed as a means of continuing their oppressive state. The clearest is the divided social system and the schools that mirrored it; Freire’s analysis succinctly explained the rationale for the apartheid system: “As the oppressor minority subordinates and dominates the majority, it must divide it and keep it divided in order to remain in power” (Freire, 2000, p. 141). A unified majority presented a threat to the survival of an oppressive minority (Freire, 2000, p. 141), and the apartheid regime was a perfect illustration. “Divide and rule,” as Freire labeled it (2000, p. 141), became the hallmark of the nationalist government through to the end of the 20th century.

Second to that tactic though, are the subtle efforts to realign the cultural and social goals

of students to the desires of apartheid ideology. A common origin point of the previous stories – whether from Black African students, White African students, or students from other categorizations – is the cultural invasion of apartheid into the education experience. Students who grew up with the apartheid prescription had taken on the values, standards, and goals of the oppressive government, and came to see their world through the outlook of the oppressor’s culture, instead of their own.

Direct Interference. In one case, apartheid interfered in a student’s education in a far more dangerous way. Rose was the daughter of a prominent newspaper editor. When a television personality complained that her father, along with Bishop Desmond Tutu and Nelson Mandela, had encouraged a school boycott in Soweto over Bantu Education, but sent their children to private schools, she said “there was a big uproar in the township, and they threatened to come and get us, and burn the schools.”

Rose said other parents feared for the safety of their own children, and called the school, threatening to keep their children at home if she and her sister were not removed. Efforts to contact the narrator’s father or mother failed; Rose explained that “my father was actually in Cape Town, meeting with the Minister of Education, trying to sort this Bantu education.” As she recounted, the headmaster said “he had no choice,” and “my sister and I were kicked out of school.” The driver of the school transportation was “too scared to drive into Soweto,” she said, and for that reason, “left us in town,” where the students had to make their own way home on public transportation.

Needless to say, the experience of being ejected from school and abandoned in an urban area was traumatic. “At this stage we did not even [know] what to expect, as they were also threatening to burn my house,” Rose wrote. Luckily, the situation ended without incident: “We

got home safely, thank God, my helper was terrified cause my phone has been ringing non stop and people coming to my house. It was tense times.” Her parents returned later that evening, she concluded.

While the experience was alarming, Rose recalled she could see how the incident strained her father:

For the first time I could see how father felt at that moment, a sense of helplessness, for the first he did not know where he belonged, scorned by his own people for trying to give his kids a better education, and being failed by the system, at [school name omitted] kicking his children out.

In perhaps one of the most heartfelt passages of the archive, Rose explained how the experience infiltrated her own sense of cultural identity, beyond just the administrative failures of one particular school.

The only thing negative about this is lack of trust, even when people mean well. ...

Apartheid has messed us up as black people, how we conduct ourselves on day to day basis, even how we relate to each other in relationships. It was poisonous and so wrong and its important that we talk about it so that history is not repeated.

Beyond policy and beyond social administration, apartheid had, in this case, managed to corrupt and contort fundamental human relationships, and force at least one personal re-evaluation.

In another sense, her father’s experience illustrated the “horizontal violence” that Freire described, where the oppressed struggle with an inner image of order that benefits only the oppressor (Freire, 2000, p. 62). Caught in an internal conflict between the desire for humanization and the reality of oppression, the oppressed react by “striking out at their own comrades for the pettiest reasons” (Freire, 2000, p. 62). With no avenue to struggle against the oppressor, and

knowing that their peers have also internalized the oppressor's image of order, they attack their friends and neighbors, as an indirect means of attacking their oppressor (Freire, 2000, p. 62).

When community members lashed out against the author's father, and subsequently targeted her school, they were making an effort to combat the injustices they recognized within their own lives, and sensed in the lives of their peers.

Effects on Teachers. Where educators sensed the intrusion of apartheid, to whatever degree, they also re-evaluated their role, and students could sense their dilemma. Angel explained how her mother, a teacher, complied with policy and delivered lessons in Afrikaans, and taught the language as a subject. "Due to her limited knowledge of the language and the fact this was not one of the languages she regularly spoke," Angel wrote, her mother's pronunciation was sometimes a source of amusement to students. While the episode was embarrassing to Angel, her mother "did not want to part with the few Afrikaans words she had managed to acquire" and as a result, "she regularly used them with pride in conversations."

Students also recalled when teachers and school leaders included social or political commentary in class – or failed to do so. Khayone, who attended a private school, insisted teachers spoke freely with students on political issues. What is more,

I remember Mr Beukes ... taking down the Republic's flag on Republic day in 1976, denouncing the apartheid government and promptly stopping the whole ceremonies of Republic day from that year on. So I actually have only my first school year memory of standing around the flagpole and singing [the national anthem]!

Flagrant defiance of the apartheid monolith was unusual among the submissions; in more cases, stories ran in contrast to that episode, describing instances when teachers shied away from social commentary. As Tee explained,

at school we were actively discouraged from discussing “politics”, i.e. the government policies, in class. I think teachers feared that they could get into trouble or lose their jobs if they were seen to be encouraging or permitting dissent at school.

While it is a secondhand account, this passage is an indication that teachers who disagreed with apartheid policy may have avoided the topic in the classroom, out of fear of repercussions.

Other authors corroborated this, suggesting that the government manipulated teacher-student interactions even at the level of the classroom. Asemahle described the experience of a Coloured learner in the 1970s, when “in one of my early years of primary school, the two white teachers at our school had to leave, they couldn’t teach at our school – because they were white, I assumed.” In later years, while driving with his father past a White-only school, Asemahle asked “why those kids were at school and we were not. It must have been June, because we were commemorating the Soweto uprising, now Youth Day.”

Some writers accused their teachers of knowing more than they told. Samkelo realized in later years that teachers and school leaders knew the protests that led to the the Soweto uprising of June 1976 would occur. “They were not taken aback at all,” Samkelo wrote, adding that “the elders used to talk amongst themselves but everybody was afraid” and for that reason, kept much of what they knew to themselves. Students could sense when teachers were confronted with the reality of apartheid society, and were forced to re-examine their role and responsibilities as educator.

Effects on Schooling. More than one story connected apartheid as a policy to the opportunities available at their institution, indicating that both teachers and students were aware how policy neglected school facilities. Siyabonga explained that “the distribution of facilities was vastly inferior for ‘non white’ citizens compared to white citizens.” Innocent, the author of Story

B-1-41-50-N46, was a teacher who taught in a primary school for Black African students in Johannesburg – in reality “a large falling-down church which became unsafe for us to use as the year went on.”

Even when a community banded together to improve school facilities, the results were somehow less than ideal. Prudence described how a school, built by an Indian African community, was completed with only “limited funds” from the government.

There were limited class rooms and with 40 or more learners in a class. The limited space was further hampered as the platoon system had to be used. To maximise this system meant that we had to go to school and the “non-Black Board” subjects were [taught] outside under trees regardless of any inclement weather.

Prudence admitted to learning later “that the Blacks were worse off than the Indians.”

As apartheid faded, the stark divisions between racial groups were still visible in the remnants of the school system. Bonolo attended school in the sunset of apartheid, and the effects of underfunded schools were obvious even in the early post-apartheid education system.

The primary schools that I attended before 1990 were very under resourced and the quality of the education very poor. The townships where I lived were just as poorly resourced, with very poor infrastructure. While I was too young to have been involved in the struggle I was old enough to have endured what some may say were the necessary disruptions to education during the consumer boycotts and “stayaways” of the middle to late 1980s. In the ever repressive and brutal measures that the then government resorted to in response to the resistance against apartheid during the 1980s many children in the townships even my age were severely disadvantaged. Quality and consistent schooling was, by far, immeasurably compromised.

Fortunately, Bonolo benefited from the relaxed educational policies of the early 1990s in the same way some other authors did: He was later accepted at a “Model C” school in the west of Johannesburg.

Race and Higher Education. Moving from secondary to tertiary education was no guarantee that the realities of apartheid could be forgotten; in fact, many of the same indignities that appeared in descriptions of public school education were imposed at the college level as well. Blessing became a student at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg in 1978, to study speech and hearing therapy. As one of only four non-European South Africans in her class, Blessing was not permitted to live on campus, and was instructed to apply to a residence facility located at a hospital in outlying Soweto – an arrangement she remembered as welcoming, even if it was inconvenient.

Compliance with race segregation laws tainted other memories of university. “Because of the Group areas act and the necessity to attend schools,” Siyabonga wrote, “I have spent a large portion of my life commuting.” At first, Siyabonga believed the 40-kilometer commute required during secondary school would be lessened with admission to a nearby university, but “we were evicted from our home in 1976 and forced to move to Lenasia. I now had to travel daily to [the University of the Witwatersrand] from Lenasia.”

Many authors explained that university attendance hinged on “special ministerial consent to study at a ‘white’ institution,” as Siyabonga described it. Precious explained “if you were Indian” and sought a degree not offered at a segregated university in the southeastern coastal city of Durban, you could attend the next nearest university – again, the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg. But as Precious recalled, “we required special permission from the minister of Home Affairs [*sic*] to study, which had to be applied for every year of study.”

This “special permission” could complicate a student’s college plans. As a South African of Indian heritage, Minenhle was expected to attend the Durban university. When she applied to an education degree program – also at the University of the Witwatersrand – the university’s decision provoked a range of emotions:

When I received that first white envelope with my name on it – I was nervous to open it. Upon opening I was angered once again by the fact that my application was pending, not because of my grades obtained in Standard 9 but because I did not make an application for ministerial consent to attend a ‘White’ institution where only a certain number of brown skinned persons were accepted.

Her story had a positive ending: Weather conditions in Durban would aggravate her asthma, and for that reason, her application to the Johannesburg university was ultimately approved – after the requisite visits to a number of medical professionals, Minenhle explained.

Racial boundaries permeated every discipline – even professional programs, including medicine. The professor of a second-year medical course allowed students to form mixed groups and dissect a corpse “regardless of race or color,” Precious recalled. But in the third year, while studying forensics and pathology, “we were not allowed to see White bodies,” except after “all the organs were removed and demonstrated separately to the class,” Precious wrote. Practical medical experiences also tap-danced around racial stratification. “The drill was simple – if the body was one of a black or colored person – we all traipsed in – if the body was white – then the approx [*sic*] ten Asian, black, and colored students would be turned away,” Lubanzi wrote.

Those artificial boundaries won more than one critic; Precious insisted that the arrangement created “a total mockery of our medical education,” where “despite being in the same university and class,” students from non-European backgrounds were “receiving different expo-

sure.” The indignity was repeated during internship and specialist training, “where there was no rotation to the so-called White hospital,” Precious added. Clinical blocks for Asian, Black, or Coloured students were restricted to half of the medical facilities available to White classmates, and heads of departments were located at a Johannesburg hospital, where, Precious explained, students of other ethnic backgrounds could not train. Happiness – the author of Story B-1-41-50-N41 – said even for trainee clinicians, “white students had to be asked if they minded to be seen by a black intern.”

For Lubanzi, apartheid surfaced in the anatomy room, when “black students were assigned black corpses – white bodies were dissected by white students.” But in that case, Lubanzi said “no one was excluded, sent off – we were assigned bodies.” This memory was both a passive admission that racial segregation occurred, Lubanzi explained, but also a missed opportunity to confront inequality.

We didn’t have to choose or decide. We could live with a belief that we were different, not prejudiced, hearts in the right places and so on. This was inescapable – the fact of the betrayal – repeated every day for a year – and that it wasn’t experienced as a betrayal – it didn’t register.

Even at the tertiary level, some South Africans simply accepted discrimination in education, without challenging it.

University Faculty. For those who were not able to attend top-tier urban universities, education was tarnished by other racial distinctions. Okuhle explained that his university education took place at a rural college 600 kilometers from home. There, he experienced his “first across-the-colour-line interaction” with “white surly lecturers,” as he described them. “These lecturers were those who were not good enough for white universities,” Okuhle explained. The belief that

sub-par White lecturers had been relegated to remote or rural universities to teach students from other ethnic backgrounds “ensured a racial hate-hate relation with the cream of the Indian youth of the country,” he wrote.

That hatred may or may not have been warranted. University dynamics during the apartheid era were, as discussed in previous chapters, subject to the vicissitudes of politics and social pressure. Emihle’s submission suggested not all professors found outside top-tier academia were necessarily inferior. In the 1980s, Emihle taught in the mathematics department of the University of South Africa (Unisa) at the same time a Dutch national was employed in the university library. The government sought to arrest and deport the librarian for involvement in protests against forced removals and migrant housing, and as he described it, the university faculty members reacted strongly.

Certain lecturers at Unisa (myself included) were furious at the lack of support for her by the Unisa management and the meek unprotesting way in which they appeared to be accepting the government action in spite of the fact that this was a employee of many years who had committed no crimes whatsoever other than following the dictates of her conscience.

Staff members agitated for a protest, but he said “it appeared to be going nowhere.” At that point, Emihle drew on support from other departments, and launched a campaign to “organize a public protest at the lack of action on the part of the University.”

Emihle distributed pamphlets to university faculty and staff, protesting the imminent deportation, and scheduling a public meeting in a university hall “to voice our protest and allow staff some public outlet for their feelings.” This drew a certain measure of risk, he said: “These were dangerous times. So one had to be quite careful about what one did.” For that reason, the

organization was done covertly, “without the Unisa authorities (and possibly even the security branch) being able to locate the source of the organization and so stamp it out,” Emihle wrote.

Turnout was strong: “We got to the point where we had set up the meeting and people had arrived in the hall. There was quite a large attendance,” Emihle said. Unfortunately, at the outset of the meeting, a member of the philosophy department “grabbed the microphone and convinced the meeting not to go ahead because of the personal risk to all the individuals present,” he wrote. For Emihle, this sudden collapse was a disappointment in more than one way: “Pathetic really, but more pathetic was my own personal inaction in not presenting a counter argument and going ahead anyway.”

The coda to the story might reassure Okuhle and other students of the era that their professors were not necessarily substandard, just because of their place of employment. Emihle explained that

Shortly after this, I resigned from Unisa and joined Khanya College, a [South African Committee for Higher Education] project, teaching first year maths to talented black students who would otherwise not have qualified to go to Wits. And the Dutch lady was deported back to Holland a week after her arrest.

In at least one case, apartheid had inadvertently generated a teacher intent on working for the communities that policies had marginalized.

The submissions described previously portray an education system weighed down under the apartheid prescription – one that children accepted unconsciously, but adults could likewise internalize and normalize as they pursued their educational goals. Older students – and in parallel situations, educators and school leaders – did this with an awareness that accepting the apartheid order not only acknowledged their part in oppression, but diminished their claim to freedom.

Even as the apartheid government actively split apart the racial majority of its citizenry, it coerced its people into subscribing to the apartheid prescription, and ultimately convinced them of their inferiority. These were the tactics that served within apartheid education, and when students, teachers, or school leaders accepted this prescription without challenge, the relationship between the oppressor and the oppressed was finalized. These tactics ran aground when education became the common experience of the oppressed majority, and the starting point for their liberation and humanization.

Activism Had Roots in Education. This second theme appeared as a counteraction to the first: Activism had its roots in education. This theme received varying degrees of attention; for some authors, it was sufficient to merely acknowledge that students participated in counter-apartheid efforts. But for others, their individual struggle against apartheid stemmed directly from education. And within that latter group, a smaller population who participated in student protests found leadership roles within those movements, and could therefore trace their leadership experiences directly to the educational domain.

At times, the connection between the apartheid struggle and education was tenuous, insincere, or even superficial. For example, Banele grew up in Cape Town in the 1960s and 1970s, and described an insulated childhood focused on books about children in America and England. “Only later in high school do I begin to understand the meaning and injustice of Apartheid,” she explained, using the present tense. “Ironically my political consciousness grows mostly through debates and discussions at [religious youth] seminars and camps, another sealed off world in its own way, yet one that opened up my mind to new ideas,” Banele wrote.

Another story from that time frame lent less gravity to early counter-apartheid movements. Lethabo, who identified herself as a White female, was born during World War II and en-

tered university in the early 1960s. She described her “liberal reactions” to apartheid as “amateurish,” but added that they did elicit responses from her parents: One was “to threaten to take me out of university,” and another was an implicit refusal to “come and help me should I get arrested in one of the protest marches,” she wrote. She added that students joined those marches “almost as a game,” and that some events were more defiance of parental authority than “genuine liberal efforts.”

To borrow Lethabo’s word, Freire predicted “amateurish” attempts at solidarity with the oppressed, but also doubted them: Discovering one’s self to be an oppressor causes significant anguish, but it does not lead to true solidarity with the oppressed (Freire, 2000, p. 49). That sense of solidarity can only emerge when the oppressor

stops regarding the oppressed as an abstract category and sees them as persons who have been unjustly dealt with, deprived of their voice, cheated in the sale of their labor. ... To affirm that men and women are persons and as persons should be free, and yet to do nothing tangible to make this affirmation a reality, is a farce. (Freire, 2000, pp. 49-50)

True solidarity would require a “radical posture,” and cooperation with the oppressed to transform the reality that made them (Freire, 2000, p. 50).

Police Intimidation. But lurking in many of the later stories – particularly passages describing the 1970s and 1980s – was the assertion that opposing apartheid presented a serious risk. Lesedi described her embarrassment, in hindsight, at a “lack of any real or meaningful engagement” across color lines. At the same time, she felt her family was guilty of “private sympathy and public compliance” to apartheid society. Behind closed doors, her family identified with anti-apartheid efforts, Lesedi said, and demonstrated a vicarious pride “in the courage of apartheid activists” of Asian descent, such as Ahmed Timol or Fatima Meer.

But for Lesedi, that pride was “difficult to reconcile” with “our lack of active involvement in the anti-apartheid struggle.” In her opinion, the root of that difficulty was in one specific incident from the 1970s, when her family unexpectedly won the attention of the security police.

This occurred soon after Mozambique freed itself from colonial control and achieved independence. In response to this event ... my younger sister sent a letter to the editor of the regional newspaper lauding [Mozambican revolutionary leader] Samora Machel. To our parents’ great consternation and considerable anxiety, a senior teacher in the community with whom we did not have any other contact, came by to speak to my family. He conveyed a ‘friendly warning’ which he said he had been asked to communicate by his friends in the dreaded security branch, that my sister was placing herself and the family in great danger by her misguided actions. ... The anxiety this sinister visit engendered was not insignificant. And so our lives fraught with the contradictions of private sympathy and public compliance continued for a while longer.

At a time when outspoken anti-apartheid figures, such as Timol and Biko, were murdered in police custody, the arrival of a teacher with a warning from the security forces was clearly the reason for the family’s differing inward and outward stances toward apartheid.

Others could also attest to the cruelty of apartheid police, but in a secondhand fashion. Siyabonga described how three university-age brothers in a neighboring family “were detained without trial for a period of approximately two weeks” for what “amounted to attending protest meetings at the university.”

When they were released, they relayed horrifying accounts of torture at the hands of the security branch officials. The entire family was traumatized after this event and soon thereafter they emigrated to Canada. I have not seen them since, and often think of how a

simple act of attending a protest meeting, can lead to such life altering repercussions. Siyabonga's reaction to this event differed from other authors, who may have recalled their experience as a springboard into apartheid opposition: "From a very young age, my parents inculcated in me an understanding that despite the system being grossly unfair, it was not sensible to protest as the repercussions were harsh."

Implicit in this theme is the understanding that students who worked against the racist government placed themselves in peril. Samkelo described that danger in concrete terms: Even though politics and racial separation were legitimate topics for family discussion as a youth, "we were warned, to keep it to ourselves." Samkelo said the reason was

the brutality of the police – you never know who would tell and should the police know that you talk about it then you'd be in big trouble. Fear of victimisation perhaps? Fear of the unknown – disappearing from your family and friends forever. In short fear was inflicted in us – you can never survive the brutality of the police.

With that fear came an awareness that in one sense, the apartheid government harassed its citizens impartially. Jayden, a White author, explained:

When I attended [the University of the Witwatersrand] during the 1960s, the students of Women's Residence participated in protests. ... The police took photos of all of us. I saw white students returning to the university after having been detained in solitary confinement for 90 to 120 days. ... The white governments hounded ordinary people of all skin colours, and meted out terrible punishment and seemed to be all powerful.

Other authors corroborated this fear with experiences of their own. Olerato recalled that "all the students at our school marched in support of the Soweto uprising;" police later came to the school, and "in an attempt to bring things back to normal they took away the leaders of the

march.”

Police intimidation became a key feature of education under apartheid, with many authors recalling their school years against the shadow of the police or the threat of violence. Conquest was the first tactic of oppression in Freirean philosophy, and was accompanied by some of the strongest imagery. Conquest is a “necessity,” and is pursued “increasingly and by every means, from the toughest to the most refined” (Freire, 2000, p. 138). Physical violence became an instinctive means for the dominant elite to prevent people from thinking (Freire, 2000, p. 149).

Activism Inherited. Family became a recurring element in stories of student opposition to apartheid. Hope became “painfully aware of the politics of difference and its manifestation beyond the categories of black and white” as a young teen. By the late 1970s, her parents were “terribly upset” when they learned of her “involvement in politics.” Hope’s father, at the time a police reservist, felt she should be grateful for the education she was receiving, considering that his own education had been limited. Despite their disagreement, Hope finished her education in Cape Town, “at a school at the forefront of political activism amongst Cape schools.”

In other cases, the birthright of opposition was easier to trace. Blessing explained that her father, in his youth, had been a member of a communist movement and of Gandhi’s passive resistance efforts in South Africa. Many years later, when Blessing was 10 years old, she discovered her older brother was involved in anti-apartheid efforts. Within a year or two, he was suspended from his teacher’s college for political activity, and in spite of her father’s history of political activism, Blessing said her parents worried that their son would not be allowed to finish his degree. She explained: “He was allowed to complete and I do recall him being harassed by the security branch of the police, which we felt impacted on his career.” However, her parents

did not openly discuss the issue with the other children, she said: “I guess my parents wanted to keep a low profile and try and manage the situation without causing too much upheaval.”

The family’s difficulties with the security branch were not over. Blessing blamed security officials for harassing her brother where he taught, and for a feeling among local parents “that he was politising [*sic*] their children and were not always supportive of him.” Eventually Blessing’s brother departed South Africa for the United Kingdom. In 1980, her younger brother went missing at a time when the security branch was searching for him, she said. Security officers began harassing the family, and Blessing said they ransacked their home, interrogated her father, and detained her mother.

In spite of this, Blessing took part in university protests, but “I kept a low profile because of my family involvement in the political struggle.” She became part of the Black Students’ Society, and “worked on conscientising students.” All the while, she was aware she “studied on bursaries and had to finish,” and that “being overtly involved in the protests may jeopardize my position.” Judging by her description though, these emotions did not prevent her success, so much as fuel it:

This struggle for recognition of human dignity only made me more determined to be all I can be and more. It added value to my character and I also wanted to work with and build confidence in others irrespective of race, colour or creed. These incidents were stepping stones in an inward journey. Even though I wrestle with the emotion that arises when I look back, the traits I chose to define who I am in developing my self-worth was within my call.

These experiences as a student, protesting against apartheid at time when members of her own family were suffering its persecution, clearly contributed to the identity Blessing held later in

life.

In contrast, Jade claimed to enjoy a childhood free of direct discrimination, but was also thankful for parents who taught him an awareness of apartheid.

I knew that black South Africans were treated differently to white South Africans, I knew it was wrong, and I knew that there were a lot of people, black and white, all over the world who were fighting to change the system.

Jade's parents were among those fighting for change: "My father had been detained for about a month before I was born and my mother spent a day in jail because she refused to apply for a 'pass' for our domestic worker."

In his case though, his parents' activism permeated his school experiences, becoming a defining theme in his later life. Jade remembered "wearing a yellow ribbon on my school blazer because the wife of one of my father's friends had been detained." At awards ceremonies at school, his parents stayed seated when the national anthem played, he said. "I remember being embarrassed and wishing that they would stand up," Jade wrote. "Now I just wish I had stayed seated myself."

By the 1990s, "when I finally went to university, I was envious that my parents had a definite cause to fight for," he said. With the release of Nelson Mandela and the slow dwindling of the apartheid government, "it felt like the battle had been won," Jade wrote, even if "there were definitely still important issues that had to be addressed." When a group of students was arrested and he was not one of them, Jade realized his "parents' political activity had seemed quite romantic to me." For at least one writer, the divorce of student activism from the political domain had left an anticlimactic aftertaste.

In some cases, the activism inherited between parent and child was less pronounced. As a

child, Khayone was disappointed by his father's obsequiousness when dealing with White Africans. Much later in life, he learned that his father "had a fighting spirit that saw him embarking on apartheid-buckling entrepreneurial activities," and "was involved in underground [South West Africa People's Organisation] politics in Namibia and more than once narrowly escaped arrest." Bonolo admitted that as a student in the 1980s, "I was too young to have been involved in the struggle." But as his own father was in exile during much of that time, his understanding of apartheid was still very personal: "I was always very keenly aware of the situation in South Africa and the reasons that forced many young people of his generation to get involved in the struggle," Bonolo wrote.

Education as a Gateway. Among authors who did not credit parents or family for their interest in student opposition, education was still a driving force. Warona, the author of Story B-2-21-32-SN38, was perhaps the most straightforward in that regard: First on a list of life events that "transformed my thinking into an understanding that South Africans can all learn from each other and that [we] can enrich each other's lives" is the writer's "involvement in student politics, especially through [the National Union of South African Students]."

Similarly, Bandile listed her profession as "anti-racism activist," and many of her school-age experiences seemed destined for that occupation.

My father and sister were politically involved and so supper times in our family were spent talking about injustice, equality, fairness, responsibility, courage, oppression and exploitation. We were taught that while we were impacted by apartheid there were others that were even worse off than us. We were taught that we had a responsibility to act and speak out against injustice, apartheid and racism.

Her family's heightened sense of social justice meant that "by the time I was 13, I saw myself

not as a teenager but as a political activist.” In 1976, against the backdrop of the Soweto uprising, “I remember how surprised my teachers and fellow students were that I as a 9 year old was so ‘political.’” There was one downside to an upbringing steeped in social justice and activism: An early exposure to the realities of racism “robbed me of an innocent childhood and teenage years. I spent my youth (weekday afternoons and weekends) working ... in community, civic and youth organisations,” she wrote.

But with a note of honesty, Bandile admitted that “early in my life my experiences were defined not by what was directly happening to me but by what was happening to people around me.” Apartheid became less of a dinner-table discussion and more of a personal reality when tragedy struck her teacher’s family:

Then a horrible thing happened – my needlework teacher’s son was shot and killed by police at their home’s gate while watching others protesting in the street. I still remember the sadness in her eyes, how her lips quivered and how she often broke down crying while teaching. Through this experience, my father’s teaching about the impact of Apartheid, racism and injustice on people’s lives became real for me.

Her teacher’s misfortune strengthened her own commitment to her father’s instructions. “I responded to his challenge that I prove that I am as good as if not better than any so-called white person,” Bandile wrote. More than that, she promised that she would “not be a-political [*sic*] but take a stand and speaking out on behalf of not only myself but others as well.” And yet Bandile expressed a sense of guilt that “people have died and suffered far worse fates in this country while I have lived a relatively privileged middle class life.”

Other writers reported a similar journey toward anti-apartheid involvement. During the 1960s, Brilliant spent time in her school-age years with a church-based youth club in Cape Town

that was “developed to respond to local neighbourhood needs.” Club activities took her to some of the poorest areas of the Cape, and brought the realization that “so many people (all of whom were black) lived in terrible poverty” – at the same time, “becoming painfully conscious of all the ‘whites-only’ signs – everywhere!”

Through friendships with Black African students, Brilliant became “aware of their feelings of pain and anger at being treated as ‘less than human.’” She responded to her own feelings of pain, shame, and guilt by “trying to ‘make it better,’ and by ‘fighting injustices.’ I immediately looked for ways that I could ‘help.’ ... My beliefs and values spurred me to get involved in fighting apartheid.” This led to involvement in community projects, local youth work, and social justice campaigns, which in turn drew her attention to the civil rights movement in the United States – particularly the teachings of Martin Luther King Jr. “His dream made it possible for me to dream in South Africa,” Brilliant explained (Story B-1-11-20-N20). “I was shattered when he was killed.”

For Happiness, her youth and education were “filled with many stories of humiliation, insults, and exclusion because of the colour of my skin.” With no little sense of pride, she added that “some of these stories are interspersed with brave struggle, standing up and speaking out against ill-treatment – on my own behalf as well as on behalf of others.” As one example, in high school, “I was the only one expelled in September 1971 when I was doing Std 9 (grade 11) [*sic*] after leading a strike and refused to name others,” Happiness wrote. By the mid- to late-1970s, when she entered her university career, “I was right in the centre of student activism, and the academic pursuits of 1976 and 1977 were ‘interrupted’ by events that unfolded violently in the country.” In her case again, opposition to the apartheid government drew upon education for its basis.

Specific interactions with teachers also snowballed into participation in youth opposition

groups. Minenhle admitted that until she was 17 years old, she “saw life in two colours – brown and occasionally black. I lived in an Indian neighbourhood, went to an Indian school and had Indian friends.” In her pursuit of an education degree, she struggled with a White professor whose racial expectations ran counter to the narrator’s ability and performance – even to the point of doubting her top-mark test scores.

With time, Minenhle won over her teacher’s opinion, and their interactions ended on a positive note: “I finally believed ... that I can and will change the ‘superior minds’ opinion of my race,” eventually making them “realise that we are and can be the same.” This proved to be a watershed moment for Minenhle, as “my experience hardened my resolve. I wanted to be instrumental in changing attitudes in South Africa and joined in the youth group on campus. There I was enlightened even further and fought for my human rights and racial inequality.” In that way, her success in working with a White professor emboldened Minenhle to further engage apartheid attitudes and myths.

The pattern of racial challenge followed by student activism reappeared in several other stories, in some cases accompanied by a newfound sense of community. Racist confrontations built into a feeling of solidarity for Philasande:

We as Indians made a stand against this injustice during the most important years of our lives. We boycotted schools during our standard four year. In standard ten we were arrested on several occasions and were showed no mercy by the police. Tear gas and rubber bullets were used against us during protests. This form of harassment caused us to hate White people in general. It was at this time we realised the importance of fighting this unjust system together with the Blacks and Coloureds.

In some stories, the sense of personal indignation at a striated society led to both personal and so-

cial victories. Khayone also felt racial inequality propelled him into student activism, beginning in secondary school: “My standard eight year was a blur of protest action, paranoia about police surveillance and heated arguments with my father.”

At university, Khayone joined the Black Students’ Organisation of Stellenbosch (BSOS) “within weeks” of his arrival on campus in the late 1980s. In later years, he held an executive seat as the organization became part of a national activist group, the South African Students Congress. Their efforts met with success: By Khayone’s second year of schooling, the university dropped its policy separating residences by color. He credited the student group for the accomplishment.

BSOS provided me with the analytical tools to understand my blackness in a white world and, most importantly, how to negotiate the obstacles of threatening infringements on my political freedom. I could not but be part of BSOS’ planning and execution of protest actions against the segregationist policies and practices at [the University of] Stellenbosch. Khayone directly connected experiences in student activism to his understanding of racial issues of the day, and his development as a leader.

Students who suffered under the apartheid regime saw others suffering as well, and this shared sense of dehumanization became the common thread of their humanization. If division was indispensable for oppression, unity was an essential tactic for liberation. Once these authors recognized themselves as “persons prevented from being,” they recoiled from the idea of being a “‘thing’ possessed by others,” and moved toward the consciousness of an oppressed class – rather than an oppressed individual (Freire, 2000, p. 174). As Philasande described it, they “realised the importance of fighting this unjust system together.”

Witnesses to the Struggle. Some writers did not offer direct experiences with student ac-

tivism, but could nonetheless speak to its effects – and not all were positive. Samkelo described how June 16, 1976, began like a usual day, but at 10 a.m. and without warning, “high school students came to our school – forcibly removing us out of the classrooms and telling us that we’re at war with the government.” The education department of the day “had opened a can of worms,” Samkelo explained, and the Soweto uprising had begun.

That was not the only day school was interrupted; by Samkelo’s account, classes continued through the rest of the year, but “the high school pupils wanted answers from the government so they would now and then disrupt classes.” For much of 1976, Samkelo said students “stayed at home – no school and no play – just stayed indoors.” The fallout from the uprising spilled into later years as well; by 1977, disillusioned teachers and students had begun to look elsewhere for effective instruction. “Some moved across the border, the teachers left to work for the private sector – I mean even though the standard of education was inferior – we had the most dedicated teachers that time. It was never the same again,” Samkelo wrote.

Examples to the Contrary. In contrast to the testimonials discussed thus far, there were rare exceptions where authors offered a differing impression of the apartheid experience, or in one case, could not attest to its effects at a personal level. Perhaps most interestingly, both submissions suggested the changes of 1994 were not all for the better.

Lines of Development. Story B-1-31-40-N38 was not originally included in the submissions considered for the study, and a close reading indicates that there is very little in the text that connects to education. However, the story offered a starkly different perspective on apartheid, from an author who supplied demographic data indicating a white male from the Johannesburg region. He began with a unique illustration of apartheid’s arrangement and goals.

[Apartheid] policy was presented to the public and the outside world as a type of parallel-

ism, where whites and blacks should each follow a separate course or line along which its development will run, separate from the others' but with similar opportunities; and never the twain shall meet. The problem with this concept, as some people felt and experienced, was that in practice these parallel lines did not run vertically, but horizontally, and that the top line was for the whites and the bottom line for the blacks. (Story B-1-31-40-N38)

The idea of “parallelism” and the image of parallel lines remind the reader of the concept of “parallel institutions” endorsed by liberal South Africans in the early part of the 20th century (Cross, 1986, p. 188; Davis, 1984a, p. 108). But the use of lines to suggest development, and the horizontal arrangement suggesting ordination, appeared to be an innovation.

For the author, the reality of apartheid was in its mechanics, and the democratic election of 1994 had done little to change the nuts and bolts of bureaucracy. “To me, on a personal level,” the author wrote (Story B-1-31-40-N38), “whether we have Apartheid or no Apartheid makes little difference.” An explanation followed:

There was a plethora of laws, bylaws, rules and regulations that prescribed conduct under Apartheid, and following the end of Apartheid there is again a seemingly endless stream of prescriptive discriminatory legislation which is supposed to redress discrepancies.

There are always excesses. There are always zealots on both sides. (Story B-1-31-40-N38)

The author felt the state of affairs for the average South African had changed little since the expiration of apartheid. “The majority are still poor and there are more jobless persons,” the writer explained (Story B-1-31-40-N38). “Health care has deteriorated, schooling is in disarray, standards have dropped and any idea of excellence, good management and efficiency has become strangers to our shores.”

The author went on to argue that, had the apartheid regime not suffered international sanctions or needed to spend money on weapons and defense, “many more houses and facilities would have been provided for the ‘disadvantaged’” than had been arranged under the new government (Story B-1-31-40-N38). The author was not in favor of the “discriminatory restrictions” that “degraded blacks,” but felt they were a “small price the blacks had to pay for all the other benefits they have enjoyed through the presence of whites and what whites have brought to this country” (Story B-1-31-40-N38). From there, the writer continued:

The whites were their gateway to the achievements of civilization. Those achievements were not handed on a platter to the Europeans, but cost them dearly over a long period in their faltering and often flawed struggles. ... The price paid by the blacks to benefit from these achievements was infinitesimally small compared to what it had cost the Europeans over centuries. ... Through social change and acculturation blacks have come to share the European legacy and contribute to it. Their acknowledgment of the debt they owe whites in this regard is still outstanding. (Story B-1-31-40-N38)

While the writer did not touch directly on education anywhere in the submission, this viewpoint stands contrary to the experiences described elsewhere in the archive.

Unaware of Apartheid. Similar in its uniqueness, Interviewee C-1-11-16-SN5 was clear that apartheid, however noxious, was not an immediate factor in her life. Jane was born in 1957, and was a native Zulu speaker. Over the course of the interview, she explained that she lived her youth in a rural area near Standerton, south-east of Johannesburg, and was educated in a school for farm workers. She moved to the city in 1988, she said.

In spite of living the majority of her life under White rule, Jane insisted no one had ever taught her about apartheid – although she admitted she had heard about “the Soweto 1976 vio-

lence,” but “I didn’t know what it was.” When the interviewer asked her to clarify, Jane repeated that no one had ever told her of the White minority rule: “They didn’t talk about apartheid. I don’t understand what is the apartheid.” The possibility of a miscommunication between Jane and the interviewer was very slim; the interviewer, possibly surprised by Jane’s answers, re-phrased questions in hopes of being clear.

Interviewer: Has anyone ever treated you badly, anybody ... because ... through being racist, through being ... ?

Jane: No, since I was here in Johannesburg, there is nobody.

Interviewer: So it hasn’t really come into your life in a direct way?

Jane: No, not directly. ... (Interview C-1-11-16-SN5)

Jane’s replies seemed to suggest the harsher realities of apartheid were unknown in remote corners of the country, even as late as the close of the 1980s. Asked if anyone had talked about the White government, Jane answered:

You know at home we don’t understand about this thing you know. I came here [Johannesburg] and was amazed, what is going on, but still I don’t understand what is apartheid. I was thinking because I’m working, it is white people who gave me a job, but still I don’t understand what is apartheid. Apartheid? I don’t know.

To add to the mystery, Jane seemed to feel Johannesburg prior to the 1994 election was safer, and held more opportunities than in the years afterward.

Interviewer: How did you feel about coming to Joburg [Johannesburg]?

Jane: I felt nice, because before it was nice. Joburg was nice before. Never mind apartheid, but it was nice.

Interviewer: You liked it?

Jane: Yes, there were not too much *tsotsis* [criminals], but now there is too much *tsotsis*, and there was lots of jobs. We were suffering about money, but there was lots of jobs. But now it's not nice, there are no jobs. It's not easy to get a job. So I was feeling nice, I'm scared even now. But before you could sleep open, but now everything is going on and on, and things are getting worse. (Interview C-1-11-16-SN5)

When asked if she voted in the 1994 election, Jane explained that her choice was balanced against her concerns for the future:

Jane: Yes, I did vote but I was thinking maybe if I vote the black one maybe we will be suffering.

Interviewer: So you were scared of the. . .

Jane: Yes, I was scared. [Laughs.] I was scared. So now I voted for the white one, and then after that I tried, I tried but the white one didn't go through. But now you see I don't understand. (Interview C-1-11-16-SN5)

Jane's professed lack of understanding of apartheid, as well as her trepidation at an opportunity to vote for change, are unusual in the array of submissions to the archive.

Generate Descriptions

The submissions considered in this study permit both a textural description and a structural description of education under apartheid. The textural description attempts to interpret the collective experiences of the individuals, while the structural description couches those experiences in a context or setting that contributed to them (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 129; Moustakas, 1994, pp. 96, 110, 112).

Textural Description. On the one hand, education under apartheid was very much an individual experience. The emotions a writer conveyed would vary in proportion to the degree gov-

ernment policy interfered his or her goals or beliefs, to say nothing of the color of their skin. Those who suffered worst provided the most visceral, most unforgiving recollections of apartheid education, and perhaps that is to be expected. The converse of that statement is also true though: The writers who were spared the ugliest moments of apartheid education seemed the least vigorous in their reproach – and that too is perhaps to be expected.

On the other hand, the experience of education under apartheid was almost universally negative. An uplifting memory of school was unusual, and where they did occur, they seemed insulated from the sharp edges of society. Even the most superficial of grievances against apartheid education was telling; authors who told of police abductions or institutionalized racism bore witness to the full grotesquery of the racist state, and how it was willing to twist their education to its own ends. Stories of long commutes and arbitrary assignments to schools may seem trivial in comparison, but those stories highlighted the petty interference that apartheid injected into the daily lives of common South Africans.

In nearly every case, participants who reached back far enough into their memory admitted they could sense divisions in schools, communities, and societies at an early age. The manifestation of apartheid was clear to the youngest South Africans, regardless of which side of the color barrier they lived. But sometimes on account of youth, and sometimes on account of complacency, they simply accepted those divisions as the reality of their daily life, and did nothing about them.

Did nothing, that is, until the reality turned personal. Apartheid piqued once it betrayed its artificiality. High school students agitated when apartheid imposed an absurd commute, or demanded they study a particular language, or forced their families to relocate. Pupils challenged school authorities to rationalize racist education policies when they sensed the immorality of

their lopsided education system. University students marched in protest when they were sidelined and their education stunted, because of the color of their skin. Once the reality of apartheid touched home, the participants in this study described how they mobilized against it.

And when those experiences brought students into contact with organized opposition groups, many took the opportunity to engage with other South Africans who felt the same. In that sense, the experience of education under apartheid was a track toward recognizing, then confronting, the illegitimacy of the regime. Even writers who admitted they escaped apartheid relatively unscathed had learned – perhaps in school, or perhaps in their daily life – that the oppressive policies were artificial, arbitrary, and antediluvian, and were propped up by politics of fear. Not every writer spoke to this, and it is always possible that other submissions to the archive suggested otherwise. But participant stories in this study consistently made the connection between their education and opposition to the nationalist government, in varying degrees.

Less often, the transition between education and opposition was a family legacy. If education was a track toward confronting apartheid, the support and experiences of family members helped propel that journey, directly or indirectly. In some cases, writers were unaware of a parent's opposition history until after they had begun their own struggle. And in fewer cases still, the writer followed that track against family advice.

Most authors described their educational experiences and their involvement in opposition movements with matching levels of intensity. Emotions ranged from frustration at apartheid's ubiquity, to annoyance at its meddling in their education, to despair at its seeming invincibility. On par with that, opposition experiences were painted in noble or inspirational terms: Confronting apartheid was a unifying effort for human dignity, it instilled self-worth, and it taught self-confidence, even as it fulfilled a sense of obligation, provided identity, and supplied belong-

ing.

For educators and school leaders, the experience of education under apartheid presented more than one challenge. Faced with the responsibility of inculcating future citizens, and at the same time aware of society's injustices, students recalled when teachers skirted those issues altogether. At the same time, authors remembered clear instances where educators and school leaders either rationalized the disparities of apartheid-era education, or acted in clear opposition to racist policies. For more than one writer, those actions became examples of leadership for later in life – or became examples where complacency, or fear, won over.

Structural Description. The historical portion of this study made note at several points where the presiding governments of South Africa – whether colonial, union, or republic – actively manufactured a society where color divisions were the accepted norm. This became the first structural element to resurface across submissions: an established sense of division that was put forth as a normal state of society. Children were taught from a young age that society required divisions, and the world around them reinforced that lesson. Young South Africans saw the color divisions and social compartments in every aspect of their lives, and they learned to accept them.

For most participants, that normalcy was dispelled later in life, once the inherent inequities of apartheid appeared. Confronted with the coarser reality of a society slanted against a segment of itself, writers quickly relabeled their environment in less flattering terms. A society that had been normal suddenly appeared abnormal, and an environment that had been negotiable now turned confrontational. Even where the state of affairs had been merely inconvenient, it now seemed antagonistic.

Not every writer confessed to that epiphany, and in some submissions, participants re-

ported experiences that differed strongly. As described above, one author acknowledged those disparities, but accepted them as part of the apartheid reality. In the other, the interviewee could not place the apartheid experience within her social and historical worldview. In either case, education may have played a part in the response, or it may not have held the importance that other submissions suggested.

Once the facade of apartheid was exposed, the environmental tone changed markedly. The prevailing emotions for most authors ranged from muted to subdued to cautious to apprehensive to fearful – particularly when writing about the 1970s and afterward. Through the schools or their communities, writers were aware that apartheid had adopted a threatening posture, and the malevolence of the regime was not to be dismissed. Harassment, threats, abductions, detainment, torture, death in custody – all of these things surfaced singly or in groups within the context for education under apartheid. Teachers as well as students acknowledged these realities – sometimes openly, sometimes not – as they went about their everyday interactions. When authors reported harassment by the secret police, or the disappearance of family members, or threats against fellow faculty members, they admitted the apartheid environment directly influenced their daily lives.

At the same time, this sense of confrontation or antagonism ran concurrent to a sense of identity and solidarity to the community. Even if the nationalist government had turned adversarial toward its own people, the distinction arose between that government and the communities beneath it. Unwittingly, writers described a second environment that had formed, where relationships and commonalities with fellow students and teachers emerged as counterpoint, and in some cases counteraction, to the oppressive conditions. More than one writer expressed solidarity with members of another racial identity, not out of a sense of altruism, but because the writer recog-

nized a kinship generated by the apartheid environment.

This second environment became the proving ground for many of the experiences that writers described in opposition to the apartheid superstructure. Secure in their newfound sense of identity, school leaders, teachers, and students described a separate context, one that stood in opposition to the divided society, that contributed to their experience of apartheid education as much as apartheid itself.

Report the Essence

From the textural and structural descriptions, it becomes possible to generate a report of the essence of education under apartheid, as represented in submissions to the Apartheid Archive Project. This integration of the textural and structural descriptions seeks to provide “synthesis of meanings and essences of the experience” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 113).

The experience of living, working, and studying under apartheid moved through two mindsets, even as it required two concessions. The first concession, and in that sense the first mindset, was the reality of a society split along color lines and the measure of acceptance that required – beginning at an early age. Schools reflected the state of society, and could not admit children of different colors, overtly teaching students that this was “for the norm” (Story B-1-21-30-N27). With both school and community split, the forced divisions became part of the structure of daily life, an observable truth brooking no argument.

But the lines drawn through communities implied a hierarchy, and depending on an individual’s position in that hierarchy, their response could range from indifference to absurdity to despondence to antipathy. For children on one side of the color barrier, society taught them “quite literally ... to fear blacks” (Story B-1-21-30-N27). For children on the other side, the message was “humiliation, insults, and exclusion” (Story B-1-41-50-N41). For some, the entire expe-

rience was deflating, “just a total waste of time,” coupled with the persistent theory that with a better education, “things could be different” (Interview C-1-6-10-SI8). But for nearly all, the discrimination inherent in a divided society was so pervasive that it “looked normal and natural,” and for that reason, many bore its insults – but “nobody asked why” (Story B-1-41-50-N44).

At some point in their maturation, students on both sides recognized the arrangement was forced. Perhaps not at an early age, but before long they decided that a divided society was “warped” (Story B-1-21-30-N27), that segregated schools were an “oddity” (Story B-1-51-60-N53), and a world where different people couldn’t live together or go to school together created arrangements that “did not feel right” (Story B-2-21-32-SN36). For those on the receiving end of apartheid hate, the “pain and anger” (Story B-1-11-20-N20) invited more questions – this time, about “why we did not have high schools nearby,” or why most of their peers “never went beyond standard six,” or why some classmates never went to “any high school at all” to extend their education (Story B-1-41-50-N44).

Questions in hand, they looked to teachers and school leaders for answers. Some saw what their teachers and principals did, and found the answers they wanted – school leaders who took down flags, stopped ceremonies, and denounced the apartheid government; or professors who covertly mobilized against government intrusion. Others were less enthusiastic about the response they received, finding school leaders who rationalized egregious social injustices, or teachers who withheld information or avoided issues, possibly for fear of retribution.

But once they began to question, they began to resist, moving into the second mindset of education under the oppressive state. The racist regime created worthy opponents in education, where the rankest inequalities of apartheid were clear for all to see. Students who suffered through overcrowded classes in decrepit facilities in underfunded institutions had brethren across

the color barriers, who commuted to segregated classes from forcibly relocated homes, or watched from a position of privilege and denounced the injustice. The commonality of being a student in an unequal education system was an ethos unto itself, with the nationalist government as the shared enemy.

Unfortunately, pushing back against apartheid – even more so in the 1970s and afterward – required the second concession: There was a very real danger attached to student activism. Police fired on students protesting against the state of education. Authorities arrested leaders of student movements. Officers harassed families and ransacked homes. Family members could be detained for weeks, if not months, to pressure students who resisted the government. The names of those lost in the struggle against apartheid were invoked with respect and veneration.

In essence, a pall hung over education. Students sensed the deliberate inequality. Teachers and school leaders were conscious of where apartheid enervated their profession. All three groups risked repercussions if they chose to resist. But joining that resistance implied a new-found sense of community, a membership in a group engaged in a noble effort that transcended the divisions they had been taught from their earliest days.

Narrative Report

Education is rightfully held in high regard in most cultures, with an implied corollary that teachers and school leaders are committed to see their students succeed. For the three immediate partners in an educational institution – students, teachers, and school leaders – this becomes a shared goal that permits them to move forward as a school community.

Education is a tool though, and like many other tools, it can be put to other purposes. The educational system of apartheid South Africa stands as a sharp illustration of living, working, and studying in an institution bounded by a system that obstructs that shared goal. In a system that

was openly intent on preventing the majority of its citizens from succeeding, apartheid is a strong example of policies twisted against the traditional role of education.

The recollections of the students, teachers, and school leaders of that era offer insight to that experience. Given the opportunity to record their memories of life under apartheid, a large number of the participants in the Apartheid Archive Project framed their experiences against schools and education. Asked to recall their earliest or strongest memories of the racist regime, many told of school experiences that described “humiliation, insults, and exclusion,” as one submission read (Story B-1-41-50-N41). Oppressive policies entered the classroom in many ways, forcing students to make long commutes to attend specific schools, requiring special permission to attend universities that catered to the dominant ethnic group, or starving schools of funding and resources because they were intended for one skin color.

Students were fully aware of these divisions in society, and the hierarchy that those divisions implied. For the youngest children, those divisions were simply accepted, normalized, or understood to be the reality they were born into. Even into later years, students might see racism, might experience discrimination, might suffer humiliation or exclusion, but they folded those experiences into their understanding of daily life. For some, it would be decades before they found the courage to unpack those experiences, and ask the relevant questions.

Educators were aware of social divisions as well. Pressure from beyond the school grounds forced them to re-evaluate their own role within the system, and in some cases, decide how they would confront issues of inequality and racism. Some school leaders were content to rationalize the uglier realities of their own society. Others confronted the intrusion head-on, standing in clear opposition to the symbols and ceremonies of the nationalist government. And others avoided the issues in their interactions with students, who suspected their teachers feared

retribution.

That fear was a recurring element in descriptions of education during apartheid. Once students realized a split society was untenable, many moved to confront it, and in doing so acknowledged the possibility that apartheid would target them specifically. In its desperate years, the apartheid police state could leverage harassment, abduction, detainment, torture, and even murder against citizens who opposed it, and those in the educational arena were not immune. Authors told of protesting against the White government, and of arrests, detention, or worse. Police harassed the families and invaded the homes of students who joined opposition movements. There was little, if any, legal redress.

In this respect the racist government was impartial in its persecutions. That impartiality likely contributed to its undoing; the effort spent manufacturing a splintered society was for naught when oppressed citizens of any color had the common experience of persecution to reunite them. While the harsher features of apartheid were undeniable influences on the experience of education, South Africans who opposed the racist government expressed a sense of unity in their shared struggle. Their intensity and passion was evident in their descriptions: The despair of facing an omnipotent and omnipresent police state was matched by their enthusiasm for human dignity and elation at cooperation.

Trapped within this uneasy arrangement, education itself was sometimes a casualty. Submissions told of interruptions of classes and even entire years of study, as students rallied to oppose apartheid. Teachers moved away from schools in volatile regions, or joined private institutions where much of apartheid's rancor could be at least deflected. Schools ejected students to fend for themselves when threats of violence were leveled against the institution. Students endured long commutes, inadequate facilities, a dearth of teachers, and substandard facilities in

hopes of reaching their educational goals.

In the years that followed, students reported the nagging worry that, “if you had had a better school, things could be different” (Interview C-1-6-10-SI8). This statement, contributed by a young man who was by any measure remarkably successful in his career path, became one of the most poignant among the submissions considered in this study. In spite of his education, he succeeded; in spite of his success, he doubted his education. His memories of apartheid evoked a sense of deflation, revealed in the lingering sense that, had his education been proper, things could have been better still.

These experiences, and the situations around them, portrayed oppression and liberation against the backdrop of schooling under apartheid. Freirean education not only corresponded to the experiences and emotions reported in archive submissions, but validated what former students, teachers, and school leaders described. At the core was the apartheid prescription. In any situation where an individual imposed his choice on another, with an aim to erode consciousness and force conformity, a prescription had occurred (Freire, 2000, pp. 46-47). When the oppressed accepted the state of society, they adopted a prescribed behavior that submitted to the demands of the oppressor (Freire, 2000, p. 47).

Apartheid relied on prescription to persist – this was clear in the some of the earliest memories of racism that the archive offered. Children grew up in a divided society – went to separate schools, rode in segregated buses, lived in reserved communities – and subscribed by default to the apartheid prescription of a society split by color. To be fair, young South Africans were not responsible for adopting the oppressor’s policies and instructions; they learned the prescription from their parents, teachers, and other adults, and accepted it as they found their place in the world around them.

As they grew older, students faced a dilemma: They desired the dignity and authenticity that freedom provided. But at the same time, they had internalized – normalized – the prescription of the oppressor, which could not permit that freedom. Claiming their freedom would involve rejecting the prescription, but compliance to apartheid would both acknowledge and accept their part in the act of oppression. More frightening was the thought that they had already adapted to the framework of domination, had resigned to it, and could not demand freedom because of the risk involved. This dilemma required students – and teachers and school leaders, in their way – to choose between the right to make a choice, or to accept the prescription; to act, or to pretend to act as they conformed to oppression; to accept the power to transform their world, or to relinquish it to a racist government.

Freirean doctrine would require that South Africans reflect upon the causes of their oppression before they could liberate themselves, and in that way transform apartheid into a new reality grounded in freedom and humanity. Apartheid was already ingrained in their education, having contorted it to meet its own goal of racial hierarchy throughout society. Schooling for Black Africans was trivialized and their students were neglected. Schools for other demographic groups soon followed, with educational departments meting out apartheid as policy, for better or worse. This was the reality of White minority rule, its ideology formalized, legislated, and institutionalized as the cornerstone of the national curriculum. Education was a means to that end.

Policy split South Africans into isolated groups, dividing them on the basis of skin color and language, confining them to communities separated by distance and bureaucracy. Relocated, repartitioned, repatriated to barren homelands, South Africans were denied the unity that would have allowed them to oppose a racist minority. Conscious of how oppression derived and persisted, and painfully aware that the apartheid government intended to resort to violence to pre-

vent its own demise, the desire to be free was not enough to propel singular individuals toward liberation – as Freire (2000, p. 47) explained, the risk was too great. That desire would only be realized when it also appeared among their family, friends, classmates, and teachers. Their dialogue revealed common ideas and aspirations, became a genuine communication of shared goals, and established a communion determined to cooperate to realize their own humanity.

Not surprisingly, this became the sense of unity and belonging that many apartheid-era students and teachers recalled years later, in their submissions to the archive. The awareness of their situation and the recognition of solidarity with other South Africans solidified their identity as an oppressed class arranged diametrically to the oppressor state. With unity and solidarity came organization, which could withstand the oppressor's efforts to manipulate and disenfranchise the racial majority populations. Now able to refute the oppressor's attempts to demean Indigenous peoples, activists could rely on a new cultural ipseity that would support one another in their journey toward liberation.

This returns to the setting for the question that began this narrative report: What is the experience of education when a government and its ideology actively work against it? The stories and interviews of the Apartheid Archive Project portray a government that deliberately stifled student success, resorting to fear tactics, physical intimidation, and even violence to maintain an artificial social structure. At the same time, students, teachers, and school leaders recognized where apartheid obstructed their shared goal, and found a sense of unity in opposing it.

Summary

This chapter reported the analysis of the data provided in stories and interviews available through the Apartheid Archive Project. The analysis followed the methodology described in Chapter Three, with Moustakas (1994) as the framework for phenomenological research. Archive

submissions were screened for their usefulness in a discussion of education, then inspected in detail for consideration. From the experiences collected in those submissions, two dominant themes emerged: first, the consistent portrayal of apartheid as an interference in education, and second, education as the root of anti-apartheid activism.

Both themes were investigated in detail, with corroborating passages from supporting submissions examined and explored. Where it was possible, the collected experiences were interpreted through Freirean philosophy. From those themes, textural and structural descriptions were generated, discussing how the two themes were represented in the individual experience of apartheid under education, and the context or setting that contributed to it. With those descriptions in hand, it was possible to report the essence of apartheid education, as well as the emotions and experiences common to the phenomenon. The final step was a narrative report that reintroduced, summarized, and reported the investigation, then encapsulated the interpretation of those experiences to show where Freire's (2000) theories corresponded to the essence of archive submissions, and how those theories supported the experiences described.

The next chapter will present the findings of this work, link them to existing research, then revisit the sub-questions that inform the central question for this study. The implications of those findings will be discussed, followed by recommendations for professionals and for future research, and contributions to the field.

Chapter Five: Conclusions

The previous chapter took pains to overlay Freirean philosophy on the experience of apartheid education, but Freire is not alone in his beliefs. Freire has a fellow thinker, if not a perfect parallel, in the American educational philosopher George S. Counts. Perhaps best known for his 1932 text *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?*, Counts expected – and in some passages, demanded – that educators step into roles that give them greater sway over the path of society's evolution. While not always symmetrical in their goals or arguments, the philosophies of Counts (1932) and Freire (2000) harmonize in more than one instance.

Their tone and mood were quite distinct though. Despite being 35 years its senior, Counts' (1932) work bubbled with zeal, regularly weaving aphorisms and axioms that prophe-sized Freirean (2000) dogma.

If the schools are to be really effective, they must become centers for the building, and not merely for the contemplation, of our civilization. ... We should ... give to our children a vision of the possibilities which lie ahead and endeavor to enlist their loyalties and enthusiasms in the realization of the vision. (Counts, 1932, p. 37)

If Counts (1932) was the high priest of education for social transformation, Freire (2000) was his tactician, ready with nuts-and-bolts advice for leaders entering a revolutionary posture.

Revolutionary leaders commit many errors and miscalculations by not taking into account something so real as the people's view of the world: a view which explicitly and implicitly contains their concerns, their doubts, their hopes, their way of seeing the leaders, their perceptions of themselves and of the oppressors, their religious beliefs ... their fatalism, their rebellious reactions. None of these elements can be seen separately, for in interaction all of them compose a totality. ... For the revolutionary leaders, the knowl-

edge of this totality is indispensable. (Freire, 2000, p. 182)

Either author alone was formidable in the proposition that education reform and liberate; in tandem, their argument was nigh unassailable.

This chapter considers the findings of the analysis described in Chapter Four, beginning with answers to the sub-questions and central question that guided this study, as were established in Chapter Three. Counts (1932) becomes helpful in this chapter, not for an added layer of interpretation, but for two other reasons. First, Counts (1932) becomes a touchstone for this study's primary audience: Reflexively, American readers will likely hear experiences of apartheid education and ask, "How does the American educational experience compare?" Counts (1932) has a proposition for that moment. Second, and more importantly, Counts (1932) extrapolates beyond the ground-level battles against oppression that characterized Freire (2000). The leap from apartheid to Freire (2000), and from Freire (2000) to Counts (1932), calls into question education, educational philosophy, the role of the teacher, and fundamentals of leadership – as those topics are broached in these findings.

Afterward, the implications of those findings, both to the field of education and to practitioners in schools, are explored. Recommendations for practitioners follow, with suggestions for future researchers who are intrigued by this study. The chapter closes with the contributions this study makes to both education and educational leadership.

Findings

The analysis that emerged in Chapter Four sought a perspective on five sub-questions. As described in Chapter Three, those sub-questions were:

- 1 What was the personal experience in an oppressive educational system?
- 2 What was the educational experience in an oppressive educational system?

- 3 How was learning affected by an oppressive educational system?
- 4 How did participants react to an oppressive educational system?
- 5 How did leadership influence the experience of an oppressive educational system?

The first sub-question was tied directly to the individual experience of national-level policies of oppression, as they filtered through the educational system. The second spoke to the individual school experience under an oppressive system, and how education was altered by those policies. Together they sought to connect authors' specific personal and school experiences to education in an oppressive state.

The remaining questions narrowed the focus of the experience to describe how education and leadership reacted to policies that openly sought to oppress. The third question asked what effect those policies had on education, to include its delivery or administration, from the viewpoint of school leaders, teachers, or students. The fourth question sought the response of the author to an oppressive education, and their reflection on what happened. The final question sought an evaluation of educational leadership under an oppressive school system, and an understanding of how leadership mediated – or aggravated – the experience.

Answers to the Sub-questions

The first sub-question was easily answered, as most authors had very little to say that praised their educational experience. South Africans of any background recalled a racist social structure transposed onto the school system, and how it created divisions through communities and schools. At the same time, they recalled how they learned their place in the structure from a young age, and how they acclimated for years before reconsidering it. For some, the apartheid divisions only seemed artificial; for others, they were a source of aggravation; and for others still, they were pointed and hurtful. Writers connected those emotions to experiences where they were

taught to fear, or to suffer under a misconception of inferiority. Even as apartheid expired, the experience of color differences in newly integrated schools influenced the viewpoints and opinions of students and educators. In that sense, the answer to the first sub-question becomes: The personal experience in an oppressive educational system was overwhelmingly negative, with the majority of participants describing how education had a lasting effect on their perceptions of themselves and the world around them.

The second sub-question was specific to the educational experience, and here again the considered submissions were clear. Students and teachers repeatedly attested to their awareness of how apartheid had infiltrated their educational experience, and the effects were discouraging. Schools were established and arranged to reinforce social divisions, which left resources, facilities, funding, and even staffing highly unbalanced. Students were assigned to distant schools on the basis of their skin color or home language, which generated resentment. Teachers avoided topics, or withheld information altogether, presumably out of fear of repercussions. Even at the tertiary level, apartheid oppression reappeared to belittle and harass students, solely on the basis of their skin color. But perhaps most destructive, submissions that described the later years of apartheid repeatedly framed their education against the sense of intimidation generated by a police state. From those experiences, the answer to the second sub-question becomes: The educational experience in an oppressive educational system was a reinforcement of the oppression inflicted upon society on the whole, with the administration, pursuit, and delivery of education overshadowed by threats and intimidation.

The historical record supported the answers to the first two sub-questions, both in retrospective analyses and in contemporaneous criticism of Bantu Education. The policy was “scarring and deeply felt” (Moore, 2016, p. 85), even as it was intent upon reducing non-European

Africans to “dumb tools for the performance of menial tasks” (Tabata, 1974, pp. 78-79). Others felt apartheid education required teachers to “help enslave the hearts and minds of our children” (Luthuli, 1962, p. 52). Bantu Education was a “reactionary” and “racialist and fascist system of education” (Nokwe, 1954, p. 18), further characterized as “authoritarian, prescriptive, unchanging, context-blind, and discriminatory” (Jansen, 1999, p. 4). Education was a tool for successive White governments to impugn Black African identity: Indigenous peoples were painted as ineffectual, barbarous, primitive, and uncivilized. Even after the conquest of southernmost Africa was complete, one-sided lessons of history or unflattering portrayals of cultures belittled Indigenous cultures, with education as a means of validating the minority government’s rule. These published analyses reinforce the answers to the first two sub-questions, as they are manifested in archive submissions.

Where the second sub-question focused on the educational experience, the third asked how oppression affected learning: “How was learning affected by an oppressive educational system?” Fewer submissions spoke to this, but among those that did, there was a resentment that apartheid had diluted their opportunity to learn. Participants recalled interactions with teachers who downplayed their potential on the basis of ethnic heritage. In some stories, the learning experience omitted certain students while others of another skin color were given instruction. Perhaps more harmful, authors recalled early years where only a fragmentary education was offered, with no teachers to provide lessons in key subjects – and ironically, students were then congratulated on their school performance. Even students who managed to reach a level of success recalled their education, years later, with a lingering sense of insufficiency. The answer to the third question therefore becomes: The oppressive educational system stunted or neglected the learning experiences of entire groups of students, generating a lasting sense of disappointment and resent-

ment over their education.

Here again, the historical record and post-apartheid analyses supported the answer to the sub-question. Critics of the day accused the apartheid school system of “expunging academic education and placing a premium on illiteracy and ignorance” (Tabata, 1974, p. 78). Schooling for Indigenous Africans was described as completely inadequate, with minimal funding, poor facilities, and a lack of qualified teachers (Jarvis, 1985, p. 33). Discrepancies between education policies for White African students and Black African students reinforced a substandard delivery (Dube, 1985, p. 94). These points, among others, offer substance to the third sub-question, and the submissions it reflects.

In the fourth sub-question – “How did participants react to an oppressive educational system?” – a major theme of the data analysis steps forward. Most participants admitted to an unwitting acceptance of the apartheid prescription, then recalled their dissatisfaction at its toxic nature, and finally their conscious effort to oppose it. Of course, not every submission traced a history of activism to an education experience, but many that did could connect a specific event to their opposition to apartheid. In some cases, the struggle for liberation was a family tradition, but for others, pushing back against oppression had its roots in the educational domain – either through a direct interaction with a teacher, an epiphany of how apartheid mangled education, or an experience of injustice in school. The answer to the fourth sub-question becomes: Participants reacted to the experience of an oppressive educational system by making deliberate efforts to confront the system, as well as the government that propagated it.

This answer finds a wealth of support in literature describing anti-apartheid efforts. The Soweto uprising of 1976 is the prime example of student frustration at Bantu Education and the apartheid regime, and their concerted efforts to protest both (Ndlovu, 2006, pp. 345-347). The

connection between education and opposition was not an arbitrary or capricious decision; the national policy of racial stratification established that battleground when it placed education “at the heart of the struggle for power” (Lavin, 1965, p. 433). From that central position, liberation efforts emerged to oppose apartheid education, with late-era scholars invoking a “long, slow march towards an emancipatory pedagogy” that defied the oppressive nationalist education (Naidoo, 1990, pp. 140-141), even as they predicted an “authentic rebellion will continue” (Naidoo, 1990, p. 142). Two writers invoked Freire (2000) specifically, through the use of “conscientization” in the text of the submission (Story B-1-11-20-N17; Story B-1-11-20-N18). Albeit with some exceptions, those within the educational circle responded to their experience of oppression with opposition.

The last sub-question connected specifically to the central question: “How did leadership influence the experience of an oppressive educational system?” However, this was the most difficult of the five to answer. No single story directly reported the concrete experience of a formal school leader under apartheid, but many participants approached the concept obliquely. More than one writer recalled experiences with educators or students who demonstrated leadership, and several offered experiences with leadership in an educational context. To a lesser degree, other writers linked their understanding of leadership to the educational domain, or portrayed leadership events that challenged the oppressive educational system. In that sense, the stories considered in this study seemed distinct from one another, but not altogether divergent. These observations generated personalized views of leadership, and not all of them were positive: In some cases, the authors betrayed a sense of disappointment in the leadership they encountered. In an attempt to encompass all these points, the answer to the final sub-question becomes: Leadership influenced the experience of an oppressive educational system by highlighting the need for

leadership, providing a demonstration of leadership in practice, and presenting an opportunity to evaluate that leadership under adverse conditions.

This was the most elusive of the five answers, in part because retrospective discussions of educational leadership in the apartheid era tie the concept to a formal title (Grant, 2006, p. 512). This reliance on legitimate power, described at a national level as “entrenched bureaucratic and hierarchical management practices inherited from apartheid traditions” (Department of Education, 2001, p. 10), persisted into the second decade of post-apartheid South Africa (Williams, 2011, p. 194) and possibly beyond. Even with the experience of transformational leadership and the 1994 election within recent memory (Bass, 1999, p. 13), the dependence on authority and power in reference to leadership suggests the participants’ understanding of the concept may significantly diverge from contemporary leadership theory.

However, it bears repeating that through to the 20th century, school leaders under missionary education were predominantly White males (Collins, 1983, p. 372; Davis, 1984b, p. 132). Later, the nationalist policy replaced established tribal authorities with their own instruments of administration, which generated criticism (Dubow, 2014, pp. 64, 78). These points no doubt contributed to the opinions of Black Africans who accused apartheid education of attempting to “erase all African leadership,” because White South Africa did not want leaders who would lead, and the “emasculatation of our education” was a step toward that goal (Luthuli, 1962, p. 52). In this sense, historical and critical discussions of leadership under apartheid were not only tied to education, but followed the same process: A need for leadership was recognized, the practice of leadership was observed, and that demonstration was evaluated based on its motives and effectiveness.

Answer to the Central Question

The answer to the central question is a collation of the answers to the five sub-questions. In response to the question, “How do personal experiences of an oppressive school system, as interpreted through the framework of Freirean education, inform school leaders?”, the answer becomes: School leaders must recognize and embrace the role of schools and education in social change, as it leads toward the recognition of oppression and a means of liberation for both students and educators. The sub-questions describe how oppression infiltrates school systems, how it impinges upon the experience of education, how it robs students of learning opportunities, and how those within the institution will quite possibly rise to challenge it. In that moment, school leaders must also recognize their leadership role.

The answer finds support in discussions of the purpose of education, and the role of school leaders. Schools that find themselves pinned between policy and philosophy must collectively choose either to submit to external oppression, or to confront it for the benefit of students (Battiste, 2019, p. 175). In that moment, leaders and followers must recognize that there is no neutral education (Shaull, 2000, p. 34), and that the school community can decide to conform or transform, to domesticate or liberate (Battiste, 2019, p. 175). “The oppressed unveil the world of oppression and through the praxis commit themselves to its transformation” (Freire, 2000, p. 54). That is the opportunity for a school leader to demonstrate leadership before teachers and students – either directly, through a cooperative process of reflection and action; or indirectly, through an evasion of the responsibility. As the participants in this study have shown, students and teachers will recognize either case, and sculpt their own understanding of leadership from it.

Implications of the Findings

For educators, this may be a difficult responsibility – but it is not a new one. Long before

Freirean education made its debut, Counts (1932) had issued the same challenge: “Any individual or group that would aspire to lead society must be ready to pay the costs of leadership: to accept responsibility, to suffer calumny, to surrender security, to risk both reputation and fortune” (1932, p. 4). Putting aside the responsibility it implies, the answer to the central question returns the discussion to many of the ancillary questions that originally surrounded it: How does a school leader rationalize their role in a system they know – in some cases, from personal experiences – to be opposed to student success? How does a school leader willingly accept a role in an education system that openly obstructs their pupils? And how does a school leader maintain the ethical underpinnings of the profession if morality is vacated beyond the gates of the schoolyard? What do we know about educational leadership that even applies in this situation?

The last question may produce the least insight. In an atmosphere of police intimidation, fractured social structures, racist government policies, and student opposition to oppression, conventional leadership theories seem quaint by comparison. It is difficult to prescribe any singular leadership theory – even ones with demonstrable success in South Africa, such as the transformational leadership that brought about the peaceful transition of 1994 (Bass, 1999, p. 13) – when so many witnesses described an educational environment saddled with crippling social problems.

As mentioned previously, retrospective discussions of leadership in the apartheid era connected the concept to position, status, and authority, suggesting educational leadership rested with the headship, or principalship, of a school (Grant, 2006, p. 512). That statement, in turn, evoked Weber’s (1964) definitions for power and authority – power being “the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance,” and authority being “probability that certain specific commands (or all commands) from a given source will be obeyed by a given group of persons” (Weber, 1964, pp. 152, 324). Those

better resemble French and Raven's (1959, p. 264) idea of legitimate power than Rost's (1991, p. 102) influence-based concept of leadership that this study employed.

If the environment was as dire as historians and witnesses described, and if the prevailing understanding of leadership was rooted in legitimate power, then many of the leadership theories that have evolved in recent decades might not approach the experience of education under apartheid. To compound that issue, many conventional leadership theories carry their own cultural baggage, as they are the products of Western ideologies and may not transfer well into cultures that embrace their own standards or imperatives. It would be, after all, somewhat misguided to recommend authentic leadership, just as an example, and insist school leaders cultivate an inner ring of Western values matched to outer behaviors (George, 2003, pp. 36-38) while their students are being attacked and abducted by a police force imposing the racist ideology of a minority regime. The situation is quite possibly more toxic than those leadership theorists intended for their philosophies.

But that term – “toxic” – does provide a step forward. Jean Lipman-Blumen's (2010) conceptual framework defined toxic leadership against a series of destructive behaviors; those same behaviors could be creatively inverted and accurately describe apartheid. Where Lipman-Blumen (2010, p. 3) accused toxic leaders of “playing to the basest fears” of followers, nationalists played on White supremacists' fears of Black African domination (Dubow, 2014, pp. x, 7-8). Toxic leaders maliciously set constituents against one another (Lipman-Bluman, 2010, p. 3); apartheid policy splintered South African society into a hierarchy of competing ethnic groups (Beck, 2000, p. 126; Beck, 2014, p. 136; Thompson, 2001, p. 190). Lipman-Bluman's description of toxic leaders “feeding their followers illusions that enhance the leader's power” and “depicting themselves as the only one who can ‘save’ the followers” (2010, p. 2) echoed the

“Afrikaners’ sacred duty” set forth in the *Beleid* of Christian National Education (The Education League, 1949, p. 37). Even Lipman-Bluman’s laundry list of toxic misdeeds resembled a catalog of apartheid transgressions: “undermining, demeaning, seducing, marginalizing, intimidating, demoralizing, disenfranchising, incapacitating, imprisoning, torturing, terrorizing, or killing” (2010, p. 2).

The net effect of this comparison is to describe a “toxic environment” that expands from Lipman-Blumen’s (2010) concept of a toxic leader. Where the toxic leader exhibited qualities and behaviors that contorted leadership to serve amoral purposes, a “toxic environment” would feature qualities and conditions that create a moral vacuum and threaten to rob an institution of its ethical compass. This concept appears to be useful in this discussion, because it conveniently encapsulates both the historical analyses of apartheid, and the stories shared through the Apartheid Archive Project.

But on closer inspection, many of the specific items in Lipman-Blumen’s (2010) conceptual framework could be re-categorized into the tactics of oppression that Freire (2000) established decades earlier. The “feeding of illusions” and the “misleading followers through deliberate untruths” (Lipman-Blumen, 2010, pp. 2-3), bore a strong resemblance to the tactic of manipulation that Freire (2000, p. 147) explored at length. Where Lipman-Blumen (2010, p. 3) accused toxic leaders of setting constituents against one another, Freire (2000, p. 141) listed “divide and rule” among his tactics of oppression. In another passage, the destructive behavior of “stifling constructive criticism and teaching supporters ... to comply with, rather than to question, the leader’s judgment and actions” (Lipman-Blumen, 2010, p. 2) mimicked Freire’s insistence that oppressors would “attempt to destroy in the oppressed their quality as ‘considerers’ of the world” (Freire, 2000, p. 139) – the core contradiction being, “No oppressive order could permit the op-

pressed to begin to question: Why?" (Freire, 2000, p. 86).

With very few exceptions, the idea of a "toxic environment," as it arose from Lipman-Blumen's (2010) conceptual framework for toxic leadership, paralleled Freire's (2000) discussions of tactics of oppression and the role of the oppressed. Knowing this, Freire's (2000) own discussions of leadership begin to resemble the antidote for that "toxic environment." Freire (2000, p. 69) insisted leadership must focus on change. He usually discussed leadership in the context of both education and revolution (Freire, 2000, p. 69), in part because revolutionary leaders throughout history understood education to be a tool for both oppression and liberation (Freire, 2000, pp. 136, 68).

With those three concepts – education, leadership, and revolution – in close orbit, teachers and students must be "co-intent on reality," with both groups actively unveiling their situation, reflecting upon it critically, and acting to re-create it (Freire, 2000, pp. 67, 69). Neither the leader nor the followers has a monopoly on revolution; instead, they must act "together in unshakable solidarity" (Freire, 2000, p. 129). This cooperation would allow leaders and followers to discover themselves as the permanent re-creators of reality (Freire, 2000, p. 69). In a cultural revolution, this bond "is so firm that the leaders and the people become like one body, checked by a permanent process of self-scrutiny" (Freire, 1998, p. 518). Ultimately, the relationship between a leader and followers required a reciprocal state of trust (Freire, 2000, p. 91), established only when the leader provided evidence of true, concrete intentions where words coincided with actions (Freire, 2000, p. 91). "What the young folks want is proof that they can trust us, and the more serious a teacher is, the more they will believe in him or her" (Freire, 2015, p. 31).

Implications for the Discipline

Walking backward from modern theories on leadership, it becomes clear that Freire

(2000) was prepared to address the “toxic environment” that oppression creates, and had a formula for challenging it. Following that formula implies education as a whole has a responsibility to recognize oppression, reflect upon its effects, and inform action against it. This is not a new challenge; once again, Counts (1932) made a case for education as a tool of social reconstruction long before Freire (2000) explained how to wield that tool:

Under certain conditions education may be as beneficent and as powerful as we are wont to think. But if it is to be so, teachers must abandon much of their easy optimism, subject the concept of education to the most rigorous scrutiny, and be prepared to deal much more fundamentally, realistically, and positively with the American social situation than has been their habit in the past. (Counts, 1932, p. 4)

Counts’ (1932) call to action insisted education, which encompasses teachers, students, and school leaders in this study, had a role in sculpting society to better meet its responsibilities – which he annotated in a long list (Counts, 1932, pp. 41-42). Freire (2000) was in agreement on this point, but extended that role to liberation and humanization. Describing the man or woman serving in the role of a “humanist, revolutionary educator,” Freire (2000) explained that

her efforts must coincide with those of the students to engage in critical thinking and the quest for mutual humanization. His efforts must be imbued with a profound trust in people and their creative power. To achieve this, they must be partners of the students in their relations with them. (Freire, 2000, p. 75)

Counts (1932) echoed that image of teachers as partners in the educational process, toward a common goal of humanization.

Education as a force for social regeneration must march hand in hand with the living and creative forces of the social order. In their own lives teachers must bridge the gap be-

tween school and society and play some part in the fashioning of those great common purposes which should bind the two together. (Counts, 1932, pp. 30-31)

In the full swing of his argument, Counts (1932) escalated the imagery of social reform to approach a revolutionary tone reminiscent of Freire (2000).

The power that teachers exercise in the schools can be no greater than the power they wield in society. ... In order to be effective they must throw off completely the slave psychology that has dominated the mind of the pedagogue more or less since the days of ancient Greece. They must be prepared to stand on their own feet and win for their ideas the support of the masses of the people. (Counts, 1932, p. 30)

In light of their arguments, the answer to the central question of this study is neither novel nor unexpected; rather, both authors would likely agree that educational leadership has a mandate to recognize oppression, reflect upon its effects, and contemplate action against it. This becomes the implication of this study for education as a whole: An education that faces this challenge but does not step through that process has already made its decision to conform, rather than transform – to domesticate students, rather than liberate them.

Implications for Practitioners

This places a heavy responsibility on teachers and school leaders – and on students, after a fashion. If education is a tool of reform, as Counts (1932) and Freire (2000) argued, and if an institution senses an environment or policies that oppose or endanger the philosophical foundations of the profession, then it becomes the responsibility – not just the role, but the responsibility – of educators to strive toward a restructuring of society. Education is, after all, the ideal vehicle for the task:

To the extent that [teachers] are permitted to fashion the curriculum and the procedures of

the school they will definitely and positively influence the social attitudes, ideals, and behavior of the coming generation. ... Representing as they do, not the interests of the moment or of any special class, but rather the common and abiding interests of the people, teachers are under heavy social obligation to protect and further those interests. In this they occupy a relatively unique position in society. (Counts, 1932, pp. 28-29)

Freire likewise placed schools at the critical juncture of education, politics, and ethics:

There is no educative practice that is not political; there is no educative practice that is not involved in dreams; there is no educative practice that does not involve values, visions, utopias. There is, thus, no educative practice without ethics. (Freire, 2015, p. 22)

With education poised at this nexus of change, teachers must strive to build generations of students prepared for the tasks of liberation and humanization: “We have the responsibility not to try to mold our students, but to challenge them so that they will participate as subjects in their own formative process” (Freire, 2015, p. 22). Educators who vacate this responsibility risk diminishing their aptitude for the profession; while they direct social attitudes and behavior in coming generations, teachers

should resort to no subterfuge or false modesty. They should say neither that they are merely teaching the truth nor that they are unwilling to wield power in their own right.

The first position is false and the second is a confession of incompetence. (Counts, 1932, p. 29)

For Counts (1932), this was the consequence for teachers who abdicate their responsibility for social reconstruction.

For school leaders, the added responsibility is to catalyze the moment of change and liberation that both Counts (1932) and Freire (2000) predicted. Through history, leadership has con-

sistently recognized that the oppressed must accept their struggle for liberation – but at the same time, leadership has admitted the role of education in that struggle (Freire, 2000, pp. 67-68). If neither the school community nor its leadership takes the initiative, engages in a dialogue, enters into cooperation, reflects on the situation, and establishes plans for action, then the institution and its leadership have entered into a tacit acceptance of the role of the oppressed. Freire summarized this risk, and how education is tied to it:

The oppressed suffer from the duality which has established itself in their innermost being. They discover that without freedom they cannot exist authentically. Yet, although they desire authentic existence, they fear it. They are at one and the same time themselves and the oppressor whose consciousness they have internalized. ... This is the tragic dilemma of the oppressed which their education must take into account (Freire, 2000, p. 48)

Leaders do not have the luxury to demur. If the “cost of leadership” – the threats to security, reputation, and fortune that Counts (1932) described previously – is not being paid, “then the chances are that the claim to leadership is fraudulent. Society is never redeemed without effort, struggle, and sacrifice. Authentic leaders are never found breathing that rarefied atmosphere lying above the dust and smoke of battle” (Counts, 1932, p. 4).

Freire (2000) was equally emphatic that leaders acknowledge their praxis, and own their experience with oppression – or risk their authenticity as leaders.

The revolutionary leaders must realize that their own conviction of the necessity for struggle ... was not given to them by anyone else – if it is authentic. This conviction cannot be packaged and sold; it is reached, rather, by means of a totality of reflection and action. Only the leaders’ own involvement in reality, within an historical situation, led them

to criticize this situation and to wish to change it. (Freire, 2000, p. 67)

This becomes the final implication for school leadership: Education itself must play a role in social change, and teachers themselves occupy a premium vantage for social reform, liberation, and humanization. It remains for school leaders to recognize and accept their position in that transformation.

Recommendations

This study closes with a series of recommendations for practitioners who seek to put the findings to direct use, and researchers who may wish to investigate these concepts further.

Recommendations for Educators

For school leaders and teachers, the recommendations of this study are likely obvious. The submissions to the Apartheid Archive Project have provided a stark illustration of students and teachers pursuing their educational mission under bleak circumstances. For leaders who feel their situation compares to the phenomenon of education under apartheid, it is questionable whether the remedy will appear in conventional, modern organizational leadership theories, even where they intersect with the educational domain. While each of those theories has adherents and its reputation for effectiveness, the “toxic environment” that apartheid education generated may outstrip those theories by several orders of magnitude.

Instead, this research recommends educators follow the same pathway that apartheid-era students and teachers forged, and put Freirean theory directly into practice. Educators and school leaders need to recognize their role at the overlap of education, politics, and ethics, and enter into a dialogue with students to determine their community’s response – to conform or transform, to domesticate or liberate. Reflection and action lead toward the dialogic tactics of cooperation, unity, organization, and cultural synthesis, which combine to provide a means of liberation. Tied

to that process is the Freirean revolutionary leader, who cooperates with the people as they construct the theory of their liberation.

Recommendations for Future Research

The glaring weakness of this study, as described earlier in this chapter, is that no contribution to the Apartheid Archive Project could speak specifically to the overarching issue: the experience of a school leader facing the contradiction between the ethical imperative that is indivisible from education, and the dehumanizing policies of apartheid education. The submissions to the archive did illustrate the phenomenon of this study, but a preferred method would have been to speak face-to-face with surviving school leaders employed during the apartheid era, and gain their insight. For researchers who are in a position to pursue that project, the results would not only illuminate this study, but would present an opportunity to corroborate or refute the findings presented here.

From a theoretical vantage point, Lipman-Blumen's (2010) conceptual framework, when inverted to propose a "toxic environment," does lend specificity to Freire's (2000) anti-dialogic tactics and the relationship between oppressor and oppressed. A complete exploration of the framework and its analogs within Freire (2000) deserves attention, with the possibility of better connecting contemporary organizational theory to the processes of liberation and humanization. As an added twist, some of Lipman-Blumen's (2010) associated works – in particular Lipman-Blumen (2006) – ask why followers continue to support toxic leaders, which might possibly be expanded to discuss why some who suffer oppression do not move to engage it. Such an exploration would, by virtue of invoking Freire (2000), necessarily inform the discipline and practice of education in a variety of contexts.

As mentioned in Chapter Two, a variety of researchers have taken the time and effort to

substantiate Freirean theories as they were applied during the apartheid era, and in the evolution of the new South African democracy. There is abundant proof that Freire (2000) found plenty of adherents in the 1970s and 1980s, influenced any number of social organizations or educational efforts, and could still be applied to the society that grew out of apartheid (Naidoo, 1994; Nekhwevha, 2002; Thomas, 2009). With so much evidence that Freire (2000) played a large part in late 20th-century South African history, the more pertinent question seems to be, how deeply is Freirean philosophy ingrained in South Africa's social consciousness? For social science researchers who are prepared to ask that question and others like it, the results would likely show how Freirean philosophy evolves and manifests itself at a cultural or national level.

As a final suggestion, similarities were observed between the narration structure of many stories submitted to the archive, and the narration schema published in Teun A. van Dijk's chapter *Race and Stories* in D. K. Mumby's *Narrative and Social Control* (1993). van Dijk (1993, p. 135) observed that "complaint-stories" told by racial majority members about racial minority groups commonly omitted or abridged a resolution, possibly to lend weight to the racial component of the story. In doing so, the speakers ignored or downplayed any solution in favor of the judgment the experience allowed toward the racial differentiation. Curiously, many of the submissions to the Apartheid Archive Project – which generally give voice to the victims of racism and discrimination, rather than the perpetrators that van Dijk (1993) studied – follow the same structural pattern. It falls to future researchers to determine if the contributions to the archive follow the same practice, and if that form of storytelling offers any insight to the writer's content, effect, purpose, or intent.

Contribution to the Field

This study contributed to education and educational leadership by providing a discussion

of the experience of education as a tool of oppression. With the best intentions, education and educational leadership theory generally assume that the organization or institution dovetails with the environment beyond its borders – schools are in step with their school boards or school governing bodies, which align to the desires and needs of the community, and reflect the policies and regulations that embody the layers of society and government beyond. This study refuted those assumptions, and attempted to provide insight into a situation where the limits of the school are the limits of its ethical sphere: The study imagined schools as “islands of morality,” to coin a phrase, surrounded by governments, societies, or communities that directly and openly contravene the goal of student success. To that end, apartheid education was a case for examination.

The findings of the study likewise contributed to the field by reinforcing the role of education as a tool of social reform, liberation, and humanization. Schools, and in particular teachers, are positioned at the juncture of ethics, education, and politics, and for that reason are uniquely suited to the task of bringing about real change. While much hackneyed, the elevation of education to a noble pursuit is not undeserved praise. The findings of this study spoke directly to teaching as a critical profession within a critical arena, with serious and far-reaching implications if its purpose was corrupted or its practice was abused. Again, the apartheid education system served as an example for that discussion, with the submissions to the archive as testimonials to the experience.

Conclusion

One of the most powerful teachers I have ever worked with was a South African man who taught social sciences in a village primary school on the edge of the Kalahari Desert. I have had many opportunities to watch and coach teachers from many different countries and cultures, but it has been rare to meet someone with as much raw genius for teaching. In a primitive con-

crete classroom with only basic furniture and one textbook to every eight of his 45-plus students, he was still one of the most energetic, charismatic, and effective teachers I have ever seen. Students hung on every word. Discipline problems were nearly nonexistent. His presence and magnetism were mirrored in his students' affection for him, and their performance was evidence of his talent for the job, and his pleasure in doing it.

From my perspective, as a professional development resource for national-level curriculum revisions, there was little I could offer in the way of advice beyond the requisite paperwork. In one of our post-observation conversations, I told him he was an excellent match for the profession, and that I was pleased that he had decided to become a teacher – a statement that made him laugh. When I asked why that was funny, he replied,

Do you want to know how I became a teacher? I was walking down the street in my village and a white man in a truck stopped near me. He said, "Hey, do you want to be a teacher?" I said yes. "Get in the back of the truck," he said. And so I became a teacher.

(Name withheld, 2004, personal communication)

As a guest in South Africa, it was difficult to tell how much of his unglamorous entry into the teaching profession was hyperbole, and how much was the reality of a ground-level apartheid tactic to hamstring the education of Black South Africans. If it was the latter, then it was clear that, in this one case, apartheid's scheme had backfired: Instead of burdening the education of Black Africans with an underqualified and inexperienced teacher, years upon years of schoolchildren had instead found a talented and powerful educator who likely inspired them to reach greater heights than the racist government ever desired.

By contrast, another teacher at a nearby school was entrenched in techniques that were not just ineffective, but possibly illegal under post-apartheid school codes. Despite my best ef-

forts, I was never able to convince him to adopt more effective teaching methods, or at least to stop wielding a stick in class. While he was knowledgeable, congenial, and friendly, it was clear that his decades at the front of the classroom had sculpted him into a particular kind of teacher, that he was comfortable with it, and that he was unlikely to change.

I spoke to the headmaster of the school on one occasion, asking for a better understanding. Through the conversation it came out that the teacher had been involved in anti-apartheid demonstrations in the late 1970s and early 1980s, and suffered more than once at the hands of the police. The headmaster explained that, in one confrontation with officers, the future teacher was locked in a police van. A police dog was tethered to the opposite wall on a chain just long enough to reach within inches of his face. The young man was in there for an hour while officers stood outside laughing, the headmaster said.

Again, as a relative newcomer to South Africa, it was difficult to tell how much the story had been embellished in the years since it occurred. More distressing though, was the fact that the headmaster chuckled as he retold it. I was never sure if his laughter came from his discomfort in sharing the story with an outsider, or his incredulity at the things he and his peers endured through that dark period of South African history.

In many ways, those two educators exemplified the problem at the center of this research. Both began their careers in the closing decades of apartheid, which means they were not just products of nationalist educational policy, but enlisted with the school system knowing full well that the policy that worked against them would also be working against their students. For both men, stepping into the classroom on the first day of their new career was a concession that the system had not only held them back, but that it intended to do the same to the next generation.

That contradiction between profession and policy was the starting point for this study.

Many of the stories submitted to the Apartheid Archive Project carried similar tones of contradiction, but taken on the whole, they provided greater insight into what South Africans of many backgrounds experienced under the nationalist education system. The themes that arose through careful reading and examination supported an arc that began in schools, where apartheid injected its agenda of division into education, then rebounded as students and teachers moved to challenge it. That arc, in turn, exemplified the philosophies of Freire (2000), whose plan for counter-acting oppression relied on education as a key to liberation.

At one level, this study questions why we teach – and at another, it asks what kind of teacher we want in a school. William Govan Bennie, speaking before a committee for Native Education in the Cape of Good Hope in 1908, outlined the perennial need for good teachers: “If we could get good teachers, and then get the teachers to remain in the profession in larger numbers, it would probably do more than anything else to make education a success” (Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education, 1908, p. 402). While true in essence, it raises more questions: How “good” is a teacher who cannot – or will not – approach the ideals that Counts (1932) and Freire (2000) proposed? How good is a teacher who domesticates, not liberates? How can a school leader committed to social change identify which teachers will ask students to transform society, not conform to it?

Beyond that question, how willing is society to be transformed? Each community has its own expectations for schools, and schools that generate critical thinkers may not find favor. School leadership has its own legacy of divisiveness to wrestle as well: “The administration of education, much more than education itself, seems to have had the power of raising in the breasts of politicians of all parties, more hatred, more anger, and uncharitableness than any other subject” (Balfour, 1921, p. 12). If schools are beholden to communities that want students to con-

form, then a critical education, with liberation and humanization as consequences, makes neither side happy. This brings to mind Wilberforce's jab: "Happiness is the end for which men unite in civil society; but in societies thus constituted, little happiness, comparatively speaking, is to be found" (1797, p. 402).

For its own part, the South African experience suggests there is a higher priority for schools than to mollify the communities around them. Counts (1932) and Freire (2000), speaking with a philosophical bent, placed teachers at the crossroads between education, politics, and ethics. The unspoken corollary is that, from that vantage point, a failure to act would be tantamount to assent. "The most potent weapon in the hands of the oppressor is the mind of the oppressed" (Biko, 1972, p. 197). Both from published works and from personal experience, South Africans seemed to place great value on education after seeing it mishandled for so many centuries. With that unfortunate experience came advice, usually akin to Isaac Mdoda's appeal to future leaders, framed against apartheid as the struggle of his era: "The leadership of any race anywhere in the world today should concentrate on education as its primary factor in preparing it for its new defensive position" (Mdoda, 1943, p. 1).

A fainter irony of education in South Africa in the second half of the 20th century is that the word "apartheid" itself – which had no clear meaning at its outset (Dubow, 2014, p. 10) – is now wielded with a specific gravity. A social awareness of race accompanied South Africa throughout its growth and evolution as a nation; R. H. Brand, writing in 1909, insisted "it is useless to suppose that racialism will never trouble South Africa again" (Brand, 1909, p. 10). The word coalesced around that experience, but has metamorphosed beyond its demise. "Apartheid" is suffixed to any number of qualifiers in modern usage, to lend weight – and a suggestion of racism – to discussions of economics, politics, finance, and so forth. Writers who brandish the

term to add ballast to their own rhetoric might not grasp the full connotation. Those who lived through apartheid rampant, and therefore know its deeper import, are likely more sparing in their use of the term.

Having looked the beast of the past in the eye, having asked and received forgiveness and having made amends, let us shut the door on the past – not in order to forget it, but in order not to allow it to imprison us. (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa, 1998, p. 22)

Where “apartheid” as a word has followed its own evolution, those who experienced it can attest to its full meaning.

And, as likely happened with the two teachers described at the start of this section, find their own identity in response to it. The peasant who asked Freire, “What can I do? I’m only a peasant” (Freire, 2000, p. 61), stands as an example of an internalized sense of oppression – a resignation to ineffectiveness. But an educator or a school leader – or for that matter, a student, as participants in this study demonstrated – is empowered to a different degree. The question, “What can I do?” no longer carries a hint of surrender; instead, it asks for the first step toward change. Educators who pose this question to their schools have not only engaged their responsibility as school leaders, but have embraced the pivotal role education plays in social reform, liberation, and humanization.

References

- Abdi, A. A. (1999). Identity formations and deformations in South Africa: A historical and contemporary overview. *Journal of Black Studies*, 30(2), 147-163.
- Abdi, A. A. (2003). Apartheid and education in South Africa: Select historical analyses. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 27(2), 89-97.
- Alexander, N. (2013). *Education and the struggle for national liberation in South Africa: Essays and speeches by Neville Alexander (1985-1989)*. Skotaville.
- An Ambitious World Heritage*. (2002, February 1). <http://tanap.net/content/about/heritage.cfm>
- Apartheid in South Africa*. (1957). U. S. National Security Council. <https://archive.org/details/gov.archives.arc.649353>
- Appel, S. W. (1989). "Outstanding individuals do not arise from ancestrally poor stock": Racial science and the education of black South Africans. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 58(4), 544-557.
- Babb, I. P. (1984). *The development of educational policy for black Africans in South Africa: 1652-1948* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst].
- Balfour, G. (1921). *Educational administration: Two lectures delivered before the University of Birmingham in February, 1921*. Clarendon Press.
- Bantu Education Act, No. 47 of 1953, <https://www.sahistory.org.za/sites/default/files/archive-files2/leg19531009.028.020.047.pdf>
- Bantu Education: Socialization for dependency. (1979, November). *Work in Progress*, 10, 10-20.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9-32.
- Battiste, M. (2019). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit*. UBC press.

- Beck, R. B. (2000). *The history of South Africa*. Greenwood Press.
- Beck, R. B. (2014). *The history of South Africa* (2nd ed.). Greenwood Press.
- Beinart, W. (1994). *Twentieth-century South Africa*. Oxford University Press.
- Beinart, W. (2001). *Twentieth-century South Africa* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Berger, D. L. (1983). *White poverty and government policy in South Africa: 1892-1934* [Doctoral dissertation, Temple University].
- Biko, S. (1972). White racism and black consciousness. In H. W. van der Merwe & D. Welsh (Eds.), *Student perspectives on South Africa* (pp. 190-202). Abe Bailey Institution of Inter-Racial Studies.
- Bird, K. D. (2017). *A vision to serve the community: A grounded theory approach examining educational persistence among American Indian graduate students* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Montana].
- Bloomberg, C. (1990). *Christian nationalism and the rise of the Afrikaner Broederbond in South Africa, 1918-48*. Springer.
- Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *The Pacific Sociological Review*, 1(1), 3-7.
- Borcherds, P. B. (1861). *An autobiographical memoir*. A. S. Robertson.
- Brand, R. H. (1909). *The Union of South Africa*. Clarendon.
- Brookes, E. H., & Macaulay, J. B. (1958). *Civil liberty in South Africa*. Oxford University Press.
- Cape of Good Hope Education Commission. (1912). *Main report, minority report, notes, minutes of meetings and index*. Cape Times Limited, Government Printers.
- Cape of Good Hope Select Committee on Native Education. (1908). *Report of the select committee on native education*. Cape Times Limited, Government Printers.

- Carter, G. M. (1959). *The politics of inequality: South Africa since 1948* (2nd ed.). Praeger.
- Chall, J. S. (2000). *The academic achievement challenge: What really works in the classroom?* Guilford Publications.
- Chisholm, L. (2012). Apartheid education legacies and new directions in post-apartheid South Africa. *Storia Delle Donne*, 8, 81-103.
- Chisholm, L. (2017). *Between worlds: German missionaries and the transition from mission to Bantu Education in South Africa*. NYU Press.
- Chisholm, L. (2019). *Teacher preparation in South Africa: History, policy and future directions*. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Christie, P. (1985). *The right to learn: The struggle for education in South Africa*. Ravan Press.
- Christie, P., & Collins, C. (1982). Bantu education: Apartheid ideology or labour reproduction? *Comparative Education*, 18(1), 59-75.
- Christopher, A. J. (1994). *The atlas of apartheid*. Witwatersrand University Press Publications.
- Cobbing, J. (1988). The mfecane as alibi: Thoughts on Dithakong and Mbolompo. *The Journal of African History*, 29(3), 487-519.
- Coetzee, J. C. (1968). Christian National Education. In R. Tunmer & R. K. Muir (Eds.), *Some aspects of education in South Africa* (pp. 16-30). University of the Witwatersrand Institute for Advanced Social Research.
- Coetzee, M. (1995). *The relationship between the school curriculum and the struggle for power: A study in the philosophy of education* [Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch University].
- Collins, C. B. (1983). South Africa's first three hundred years of schooling: A possible re-interpretation. *History of Education Quarterly*, 23(3), 361-378.
- Collins, C., & Gillespie, R. (1984). "Moving education forward to keep society back": The South

- African “De Lange Report” reevaluated. *Comparative Education Review*, 28(4), 625-638.
- Colquhoun, A. R. (1906). *The Africander land*. J. Murray.
- Comaroff, J., & Comaroff, J. (1986). Christianity and colonialism in South Africa. *American Ethnologist*, 13(1), 1-22.
- Comaroff, J., & Comaroff, J. (1989). The colonization of consciousness in South Africa. *Economy and Society*, 18(3), 267-296.
- Cook, E. T. (1909). *Edmund Garrett: A memoir*. E. Arnold.
- Cook, P. A. W. (1949). Non-European education. In E. Hellman (Ed.), *Handbook on race relations in South Africa* (pp. 348-386). Oxford University Press.
- Cory, G. (1913). *The Rise of South Africa: 1820-1834* (Vols. 1-4). Longmans, Green.
- Counts, G. S. (1932). *Dare the school build a new social order?* The Stratford Press.
- Cowlin, J. R. (2018). *Pathways to understanding white poverty in South Africa 1902 to 1948* [Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch University].
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Cross, M. (1986). A historical review of education in South Africa: Towards an assessment. *Comparative Education*, 22(3), 185-200.
- Davis, R. H. (1984a). Charles T. Loram and the American model for African education in South Africa. In P. Kallaway (Ed.), *Apartheid and education: The education of black South Africans* (pp. 108-126). Ravan Press.
- Davis, R. H. (1984b). The education and financing of African education in South Africa 1910-1953. In P. Kallaway (Ed.), *Apartheid and education: The education of black South Africans* (pp. 127-138). Ravan Press.

de Montmorency, J. E. G. (1902). *State intervention in English education: A short history from the earliest times down to 1833*. University Press.

Debates of the House of Assembly, Fifth Session – Seventh Parliament, Union of South Africa. (1937).

Debates of the House of Assembly, First Session – Eleventh Parliament, Union of South Africa. (1953).

Debates of the House of Assembly, Second Session – Second Parliament, Republic of South Africa. (1963).

Debates of the Senate, Second Session – Eleventh Parliament, Union of South Africa. (1954).

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. Sage.

Department of Education, South Africa. (2001). *Education in South Africa: Achievements since 1994*. <https://www.dhet.gov.za/Reports%20Doc%20Library/Education%20in%20South%20Africa%20Achievements%20since%201994.pdf>

Doyle, A. C. (1902). *The Great Boer War*. McClure, Phillips.

du Toit, P. S. (1936). *Onderwys aan die Kaap onder die Kompanjie, 1652-1795*. Stellenbosch University.

Dube, E. F. (1985, February). The relationship between racism and education in South Africa. *Harvard Educational Review*, 55(1), 86-100.

Dubow, S. (1989). *Racial segregation and the origins of apartheid in South Africa, 1919–36*. Springer.

Dubow, S. (2001). Scientism, social research and the limits of “South Africanism”: The case of Ernst Gideon Malherbe. *South African Historical Journal*, 44(1), 99-142.

Dubow, S. (2014). *Apartheid, 1948-1994*. Oxford University Press.

- Dunston, J. T. (1923). Retarded and defective children: Native mentality, mental testing. *South African Journal of Science*, 20, 148-156.
- Eiselen Commission. (1951). Report of the Commission on Native Education. *Union Government*, 53, 1951.
- Eisner, E. W. (2017). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. Merrill.
- Eldredge, E. A. (1992). Sources of conflict in southern Africa, c. 1800-30: The “mfecane” reconsidered. *The Journal of African History*, 33(1), 1-35.
- Enslin, P. (1984). The role of fundamental pedagogics in the formulation of educational policy in South Africa. In P. Kallaway (Ed.), *Apartheid and education: The education of black South Africans* (pp. 139-147). Ravan Press.
- Fleisch, B. D. (1995a). Social scientists as policy makers: E. G. Malherbe and the National Bureau for Educational and Social Research, 1929-1943. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 21(3), 349-372.
- Fleisch, B. D. (1995b). *The teachers college club: American educational discourse and the origins of Bantu education in South Africa, 1914-1951* [Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University].
- Ford, J. W. (1931). *Imperialism destroys the people of Africa* [Pamphlet]. Harlem Section of the Communist Party. https://www.si.edu/object/imperialism-destroys-people-africa:nmaahc_2010.55.32
- Freire, P. (1976). *Education, the practice of freedom*. Writers & Readers Publishing.
- Freire, P. (1998). Cultural action for freedom. *Harvard Educational Review*, 68(4), 476-521.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed: 30th anniversary edition* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.).

Continuum International Publishing Group.

Freire, P. (2015). *Pedagogy of commitment*. Routledge.

French, J., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 259-269). Institute for Social Research.

George, B. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. John Wiley & Sons.

Gie, S. F. N. (1920). Preface. In *The memorandum of commissary J. A. de Mist* (pp. iii-vii) (K. M. Jeffreys, Trans.). Van Riebeeck Society.

Giliomee, H. B. (2003). *The Afrikaners: Biography of a people*. University of Virginia Press.

Giliomee, H. B. (2004). The rise and possible demise of Afrikaans as public language. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 10(1), 25-58.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2013). *The basic guide to supervision and instructional leadership*. Pearson.

Gopalan, D. (2021, February 15). *China overhauls Hong Kong's education system amid ongoing crackdown*. PBS News Hour. <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/china-overhauls-hong-kongs-education-system-amid-ongoing-crackdown>.

Grant, C. (2006). Emerging voices on teacher leadership: Some South African views. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 34(4), 511-532.

Guelke, A. (2004). *Rethinking the rise and fall of apartheid: South Africa and world politics*. Macmillan International Higher Education.

Hamilton, C. A. (1992). "The character and objects of Chaka." A reconsideration of the making of Shaka as "mfecane" motor. *The Journal of African History*, 33(1), 37-63.

Hamilton, J. T. (1901). *A history of the missions of the Moravian church, during the eighteenth*

- and nineteenth centuries.* Times Publishing Company.
- Hartshorne, K. B. (1985). The state of education in South Africa: Some indicators. *South African Journal of Science*, 81, 148-151.
- Hexham, I. R. (1975). Christian National Education as an ideological commitment. In *Collected Seminar Papers: Institute of Commonwealth Studies* (Vol. 20, pp. 111-120). Institute of Commonwealth Studies.
- Hofmeyr, I. (2018). *The portable Bunyan: A transnational history of the Pilgrim's Progress.* Princeton University Press.
- Horrell, M. (1952). *A survey of race relations in South Africa 1951-1952.* South African Institute of Race Relations.
- Horrell, M. (1953). *A survey of race relations in South Africa 1952-1953.* South African Institute of Race Relations.
- Horrell, M. (1957). *A survey of race relations in South Africa 1956-1957.* South African Institute of Race Relations.
- Horrell, M. (1965). *A survey of race relations in South Africa 1964.* South African Institute of Race Relations.
- Houghton, D. H. (1976). *The South African economy.* Oxford University Press.
- Hutton, J. E. (1909). *A history of the Moravian church* (2nd ed.). Moravian Publication Office.
- Hyslop, J. (1986, September 29). *Food, authority and politics: Student riots in South African schools, 1945-1976.* Paper presented at the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, South Africa.
- Jansen, J. D. (1990). Curriculum as a political phenomenon: Historical reflections on black South African education. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 59(2), 195-206.

- Jansen, J. D. (1999). Setting the scene: Historiographies of curriculum policy in South Africa. In J. D. Jansen & P. Christie (eds.), *Changing curriculum: Studies on outcomes-based education in South Africa* (pp. 3-21). Juta and Company Ltd.
- Jarvis, B. J. (1985). *Black education in South Africa: The case of the Qadi tribal area, Inanda reserve, KwaZulu* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Natal, Durban].
- Jones, R. C. (1966). *The development of attitudes leading to the nationalist apartheid philosophy of Bantu education in the Republic of South Africa* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma].
- Kallaway, P. (Ed.). (1984). *Apartheid and education: The education of black South Africans*. Raven Press.
- Kallaway, P. (Ed.). (2002). *The history of education under apartheid, 1948-1994: The doors of learning and culture shall be opened*. Pearson South Africa.
- Kaplan, I. (1971). *Area handbook for the Republic of South Africa* (Vol. 550, No. 93). U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Kestell, J. D., & van Velden, D. E. (1912). *The peace negotiations between boer and Briton in South Africa*. Richard Clay & Sons.
- Keto, T. (1990). Pre-industrial education policies and practices in South Africa. In M. Nkomo (Ed.), *Pedagogy of domination: Toward democratic education in South Africa* (pp. 19-42). Africa World Press.
- King, R. D., & Wheelock, D. (2007). Group threat and social control: Race, perceptions of minorities and the desire to punish. *Social Forces*, 85(3), 1255-1280.
- Kotzé, D. J. (Ed.). (1950). *Letters of the American missionaries, 1835-1838*. Van Riebeeck Society.

- Kruss, G. (2009). Trajectories of restructuring: The changing context for initial teacher education in South Africa. In *Teacher Education Research and Development Programme (TEP) Conference 2008: Proceedings of the TEP Concluding Conference* (pp. 76-89). Centre for Education Policy Development.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J. L., Buckley, J. A., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2006). *What matters to student success: A review of the literature*. National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.
- Laubscher, L. (2013). Introduction to Part I: Theorising the archive. In G. E. Stevens, N. E. Duncan, & D. E. Hook (eds.), *Race, memory, and the apartheid archive: Towards a transformative psychosocial praxis* (pp. 19-24). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lavin, D. (1965). The dilemma of Christian-National Education in South Africa. *The World Today*, 21(10), 428-438.
- Le Grange, L. (2010). South African curriculum studies: A historical perspective and autobiographical account. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum studies in South Africa: Intellectual histories and present circumstances* (pp. 177-200). Springer.
- Leibbrandt, H. C. V. (1896). *Precis of the archives of the Cape of Good Hope* (Vols. 1-14). W. A. Richards.
- Leibbrandt, H. C. V. (1902). *The rebellion of 1815, generally known as Slachters Nek: A complete collection of all the papers*. Juta.
- Leonie, A. (1965). *The development of Bantu education in South Africa, 1652-1954* [Doctoral dissertation, Montana State University].
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2006). *The allure of toxic leaders: Why we follow destructive bosses and*

- corrupt politicians – and how we can survive them.* Oxford University Press.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2010). Toxic leadership: A conceptual framework. In *Handbook of top management teams* (pp. 214-220). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Livingstone, D. (1858). *Missionary travels and researches in South Africa.* Harper & Brothers.
- Lodge, T. (2008, October 6). South Africa: Historical franchise arrangements. <https://www.eisa.org.za/wep/soubg2.htm>
- Loram, C. T. (1917). *The education of the South African native.* Longmans, Green & Co.
- Loram, C. T. (1926). *Address to a dinner given in his honour in New York.* Phelps-Stokes Fund.
- Loram, C. T. (1935). *Fundamental principles of African education.* Presentation to the Jeanes conference, Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, May 1935.
- Low, V. N. (1958). Education for the Bantu: A South African dilemma. *Comparative Education Review*, 2(2), 21-27.
- Ludlow, H. (2017). In Search of ‘One Good Public School’: The Cape Colonial Education Project, 1865-1873. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 43(6), 1235-1254.
- Luthuli, A. J. (1962). *Let my people go.* New American Library.
- MacCrone, I. D. (1957). *Race attitudes in South Africa: Historical, experimental and psychological studies.* Oxford University Press.
- Macedo, D. (2000). Introduction. In P. Freire, *Pedagogy of the oppressed: 30th anniversary edition* (pp. 11-27). Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Macmillan, R. (1967). Christian national education. *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, (28), 43-56.
- Macmillan, W. M. (1963). *Bantu, boer, and Briton: The making of the South African native problem.* Clarendon Press.

- Mahlangu, P. M. (1992). *A comparative study: Differences and similarities between Native Education and Bantu Education with regard to schooling for Africans in South Africa* (Publication No. 303930397) [Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Majeke, N. (1952). *The role of the missionaries in conquest*. Society of Young Africa. <https://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/role-missionaries-conquest-nosipho-majeke>
- Malherbe, E. G. (1925). *Education in South Africa: 1625-1922*. Juta.
- Mandela, N. (2003, July 16). *Lighting your way to a better future*. Speech presented at launch of Mindset Network at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Mann, H. (1868). *Life and works of Horace Mann* (Vols. 1-5). Walker, Fuller.
- Maree, L. (1984). The hearts and minds of the people. In P. Kallaway (Ed.), *Apartheid and education: The education of black South Africans* (pp. 148-159). Ravan Press.
- Marks, S. (1972). Khoisan resistance to the Dutch in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. *The Journal of African History*, 13(1), 55-80.
- Mayo, M. J. (1913). *The mental capacity of the American Negro*. Science Press.
- McEwan, C. (2003). Building a postcolonial archive? Gender, collective memory and citizenship in post-apartheid South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 29(3), 739-757.
- McIntyre, D. (1949). *Comets in old Cape records*. Cape Times Ltd.
- Mdoda, I. (1943, December 30). *Inkundla ya Bantu*, 6(69).
- Meth, C. (1981, October 12). *Shortages of skilled labour power and capital reconstruction in South Africa* [Paper presentation]. University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Molteno, F. (1983). *The schooling of black South Africans and the 1980 Cape Town students' boycott: A sociological interpretation* [Master's thesis, University of Cape Town].

- Moodie, T. D. (1975). *The rise of Afrikanerdom: Power, apartheid, and the Afrikaner civil religion*. University of California Press.
- Moore, N. L. (2016). *In a class of their own: The Bantu Education Act (1953) revisited* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria].
- Morphet, T. (1987, March). People's education: What can be expected? *Reality: A Journal of Liberal and Radical Opinion*, 19(2), 3-6.
- Morrell, R. (2001). *From boys to gentlemen: Settler masculinity in colonial Natal, 1880-1920*. University of South Africa.
- Morris-Hale, W. (1996). *Conflict and harmony in multi-ethnic societies: An international perspective*. Peter Lang.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Sage.
- Mpofu, W. J. (2013). Coloniality in the scramble for African knowledge: A decolonial political perspective. *Africanus*, 43(2), 105-117.
- Muir, R. K. (1968). Some critical comments on the theory of Christian National Education. In R. Tunmer & R. K. Muir (Eds.), *Some aspects of education in South Africa* (pp. 31-52). University of the Witwatersrand Institute for Advanced Social Research.
- Murphy, E. G. (1909). *The basis of ascendancy: A discussion of certain principles of public policy involved in the development of the southern states*. Longmans, Green, & Co.
- Murphy, E. J. (1973). *Bantu education in South Africa: Its compatibility with the contrasting objectives of African self-development or white domination* (Publication No. 302692359) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Murphy, E. J. (1978). Bantu Education: Instrument of political socialization. *Contributions in*

Black Studies, 2(1), 3.

Nachtigal, A. (1893). *De oudere zending in Zuid-Afrika*. J. H. de Bussy.

Naidoo, K. (1990). The politics of student resistance in the 1980s. In M. Nkomo (Ed.), *Pedagogy of domination: Toward a democratic education in South Africa* (pp. 121-146). Africa World Press.

Ndlovu, S. M. (2006). The Soweto uprising. In *The road to democracy in South Africa: 1970-1980* (vol. 2) (pp. 317-368). Unisa Press.

Nekhwevha, F. (2002). The influence of Paulo Freire's "Pedagogy of Knowing" on the South African education struggle in the 1970s and 1980s. In P. Kallaway (ed.), *The history of education under apartheid, 1948-1994: The doors of learning and culture shall be opened* (pp. 134-144). Pearson South Africa.

Nkomo, M. O. (Ed.). (1990). *Pedagogy of domination: Toward a democratic education in South Africa*. Africa World Press.

Nokwe, D. (1954). *The meaning of Bantu Education* [Pamphlet].

Nwandula, C. (1988). "The head of the native": Swiss mission education at Lemana, 1899-1954. *Perspectives in Education*, 10(1), 43-52.

Olen, H. (2020, June 21). Betsy DeVos is an abysmal failure and our nation's schoolchildren are paying the price. *Washington Post*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/06/21/our-schoolchildren-are-paying-price-betsy-devoss-failures/>

Omer-Cooper, J. D. (1966). *The Zulu aftermath: A nineteenth-century revolution in Bantu Africa*. Longmans.

Peace treaty of Vereeniging, May 31, 1902.

Pells, E. G. (1954). *300 years of education in South Africa*. Juta.

- Philip, J. (1828). *Researches in South Africa: Illustrating the civil, moral, and religious condition of the native tribes*. James Duncan.
- Philip, J. (1833). *A letter from the Rev. John Philip, D. D., superintendent of the missions of the London Society at the Cape of Good Hope, &c. to the Society of Inquiry on Missions, in the theological seminary, Princeton, New Jersey*. John Gray.
- Pretorius, F. (2009). Confronted with the facts: Why the Boer delegates at Vereeniging accepted a humiliating peace to end the South African war, 31 May 1902. In S. Miller (Ed.), *Soldiers and settlers in Africa, 1850-1918* (pp. 195-217). Brill.
- Quillian, L. (1995). Prejudice as a response to perceived group threat: Population composition and anti-immigrant and racial prejudice in Europe. *American Sociological Review*, 60(4), 586-611.
- Ransford, O. (1968). *The Great Trek*. Cardinal.
- Ratele, K., & Laubscher, L. (2013). Archiving white lives, historicising whiteness. In *Race, Memory, and the Apartheid Archive* (pp. 109-127). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rebusoajoang. (1979). Education and social control in South Africa. *African Affairs*, 78(311), 228-239.
- Report of a commission appointed, in accordance with addresses of the legislative council and house of assembly, to inquire into and report upon the government educational system of the colony*. (1863). Saul Solomon and Company.
- Report of commission of inquiry regarding Cape coloured population of the Union*. (1937).
- Report of the interdepartmental committee on Native Education*. (1936).
- Report of the Native Affairs Commission for the Years of 1939 and 1940*. (1941).
- Resolutions of the Council of Policy of Cape of Good Hope, Cape Town Archives Repository,

- South Africa. (2006, May 20). <http://databases.tanap.net/cgh/>
- Ritchie, G. (2019, February 5). Varsity disruptions as students protest financial exclusion, accommodation shortages. *Mail & Guardian*. <https://mg.co.za/article/2019-02-05-varsity-disruptions-as-students-protest-financial-exclusion-accommodation-shortages/>
- Robertson, N. L., & Robertson, B. L. (1977). *Education in South Africa*. Fastback 90.
- Rose, B. W. (1965). Bantu Education as a facet of South African policy. *Comparative Education Review*, 9(2), 208-212.
- Rose, B., & Tunmer, R. (Eds.). (1975). *Documents in South African education*. Donker.
- Ross, R. (1999). *A concise history of South Africa*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, R. (2008). *A concise history of South Africa* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Schaffer, K. (2002). Stolen generation narratives in local and global contexts. *Antipodes*, 5-10.
- Schapera, I. (1938). *A handbook of Tswana law and custom*. LIT Verlag Münster.
- Seroto, J. (1999). *A historical perspective of formal education for black people in the rural areas of South Africa with special reference to schools in the Northern Province* [Master's thesis, University of South Africa].
- Seroto, J. (2013). A revisionist view of the contribution of Dr Eiselen to South African education: New perspectives. *Yesterday and Today*, (9), 91-108.
- Seroto, J. (2018). Dynamics of decoloniality in South Africa: A critique of the history of Swiss mission education for indigenous people. *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, 44(3), 1-14.
- Shaull, R. (2000). Foreword. In P. Freire, *Pedagogy of the oppressed: 30th anniversary edition* (pp. 29-34). Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Shingler, J. D. (1974). *Education and political order in South Africa, 1902-1961* [Doctoral dis-

- sertation, Yale University].
- Skinner, J. (1999). Critical outcomes: Political paradoxes. In J. D. Jansen & P. Christie (eds.), *Changing curriculum: Studies on outcomes-based education in South Africa* (pp. 117-130). Juta and Company Ltd.
- Sonn, C. C. (2013). Engaging with the Apartheid Archive Project: Voices from the South African diaspora in Australia. In *Race, memory, and the apartheid archive: Towards a transformative psychosocial praxis* (pp. 128-145). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Soudien, C. (2005). Racial discourse in the Commission on Native Education (Eiselen Commission), 1949-1951: The making of “Bantu” identity. *Southern African Review of Education with Education with Production*, 11(1), 41-57.
- Soudien, C., Kallaway, P., & Breier, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Education, equity and transformation*. Kluwer Academic.
- South African Congress of Democrats. (1955). *Educating for ignorance: The South African Congress of Democrats' view of the Bantu Education Act* [Pamphlet].
- South African Institute of Race Relations. (2011, January 17). *The school, not race, makes the difference* [Press release].
- Statistics South Africa. (2017). *Recorded live births: 2017*.
- Stepan, N. (1982). *The idea of race in science: Great Britain, 1800-1960*. Springer.
- Stevens, G. E., Duncan, N. E., & Hook, D. E. (2013). *Race, memory, and the apartheid archive: Towards a transformative psychosocial praxis*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stevens, G., Duncan, N., & Sonn, C. (2010). The apartheid archive: Memory, voice and narrative as liberatory praxis. *Psychology in Society*, (40), 8-28.
- Steyn, J. (1990). *Die opvoedingsfilosofiese kontinuïteit tussen die sendingonderwys en onderwys*

- vir Swartes na 1953 in die RSA* [Doctoral dissertation, Potchefstroom University].
- Steyn, M. (2012). The ignorance contract: Recollections of apartheid childhoods and the construction of epistemologies of ignorance. *Identities*, 19(1), 8-25.
- Stow, G. W. (1905). *The native races of South Africa: A history of the intrusion of the Hottentots and Bantu into the hunting grounds of the Bushmen, the aborigines of the country*. S. Sonnenschein & Company, Limited.
- Tabata, I. B. (1959). *Education for barbarism: Bantu Education in South Africa*. Prometheus.
- Tabata, I. B. (1974). *The awakening of a people*. Spokesman Books.
- The Apartheid Archives Project [Data set]. (2011, August 7). <http://www.historicalpapers.wits.ac.za/?inventory/U/collections&c=AG3275/R/9023>
- The Education League. (1949). *Blueprint for blackout: A commentary on the education policy of the Instituut vir Christelike-Nasionale Onderwys*. Ivan Joffe & Co.
- The Empty Land Myth*. (2019, August 27). <https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/empty-land-myth>
- The gospel of work. (1878, August 1). *The Christian Express*, VIII(95), 1-2.
- Theal, G. M. (1896). *Belangrijke historiche dokumenten verzameld in de Kaap Kolonie en elders* (Vols. 1-3). Van de Sandt de Villiers & Co.
- Theal, G. M. (1898). *Records of the Cape Colony* (Vols. 1-36). Government of the Cape Colony.
- Theal, G. M. (1901). *Progress of South Africa in the century*. Linscott.
- Theal, G. M. (1908). *History of South Africa since September 1795* (Vols. 1-5). Cambridge University Press.
- Theal, G. M. (1909). *History and ethnography of Africa south of the Zambesi* (Vols. 1-3). Swan Sonnenschein & Company.
- Thomas, D. P. (2009). Revisiting pedagogy of the oppressed: Paulo Freire and contemporary

- African studies. *Review of African Political Economy*, 36(120), 253-269.
- Thompson, L. (2001). *A history of South Africa* (3rd ed.). Yale University Press.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1940). *Human nature and the social order*. Macmillan.
- Troup, F. (1976). *Forbidden pastures: Education under apartheid*. International Defence and Aid Fund.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission. (1998). *Report* (Vols. 1-7). Government printer.
- van der Walt, J. L. (1992). The culturo-historical and personal circumstances of some 19th-century missionaries teaching in South Africa. *Koers Bulletin for Christian Scholarship*, 57(1), 75-86.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Stories and racism. In D. K. Mumby (ed.), *Narrative and social control: Critical perspectives* (pp. 121-142). Sage.
- van Heyningen, C. (1960). Christian National Education. *Africa South*, 4(3), 50-56.
- van Manen, M. (2016). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Routledge.
- Vergerius, P. P. (1404). *De ingenuis moribus*. <https://history.hanover.edu/courses/excerpts/114vergerius.html>
- Villette, F. (2016, November 12). The effects of apartheid's unequal education system can still be felt today. <https://www.iol.co.za/capetimes/news/the-effects-of-apartheids-unequal-education-system-can-still-be-felt-today-2035295>
- wa Thiong'o, N. (1993). *Moving the centre: The struggle for cultural freedoms*. James Currey.
- Walker, E. A. (1957). *A history of Southern Africa*. Longmans, Green.
- Weber, M. (1964). *The theory of social and economic organizations* (A. M. Henderson and T. Parsons, Trans.). Free Press.

- Webster, L., & Mertova, P. (2007). *Using narrative inquiry as a research method: An introduction to using critical event narrative analysis in research on learning and teaching*. Routledge.
- Wilberforce, W. (1797). *A practical view of the prevailing religious system of professed Christians, in the higher and middle classes in this country, contrasted with real Christianity*. T. Cadell, Jr., and W. Davis.
- Williams, C. G. (2011). Distributed leadership in South African schools: Possibilities and constraints. *South African Journal of Education, 31*(2).
- Willoughby-Herard, T. J. (2003). *“Waste of a white skin” or, civilizing white primitives: The Carnegie Commission Study of Poor Whites in South Africa, 1927-1932* [Doctoral dissertation, University of California-Santa Barbara].
- Wilson, F. (1999, August 3). Interview by Mary Marshall Clark [Video recording]. Carnegie Corporation Oral History Project. Columbia University Libraries Oral History Research Office.
- Wilson, M., & Thompson, L. M. (Eds.). (1971). *The Oxford history of South Africa volume 2: South Africa 1870-1966*. Clarendon Press.
- Wolpe, H. (1990). *Race, class, & the apartheid state*. Africa World Press.
- Worden, N. (1994). *The making of modern South Africa: Conquest, segregation, and apartheid*. Blackwell.
- Wright, J. (1983, June). *Politics, ideology, and the invention of the “Nguni.”* Paper presented at the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, South Africa.
- Wright, J. (2006). *Beyond the “Zulu aftermath:” Rescrambling Southern Africa’s mfecane migrations*. University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg Campus.

Wright, T. E. F., Kerr, A., & Wright, E. (Eds.). (2015). *A dictionary of world history*. Oxford Paperback Reference.

York, T. T., Gibson, C., & Rankin, S. (2015). Defining and measuring academic success. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 20(1), 5.

Youngman, F. (1986). *Adult education and socialist pedagogy*. Croom Helm.

Appendix A

The following table presents a matrix of the stories and interviews provided in the Apartheid Archive Project, as of September 2020. The “Item” column lists the number assigned to the submission. “Source file” indicates the digital file where the submission can be located, as it was provided on the University of the Witwatersrand Historical Papers Archive website. “Format” is either story or interview, describing the form of submission. Some participants provided names or “demographic labels” apart from the content of their story or interview. It may be possible to infer demographic information from the submission content, but that does not appear in this table. “Topic(s)” allows a general idea of the submission content; it is not possible to authoritatively assign content labels to any of the material, and for that reason the topic is intended only as a loose interpretation of areas covered in the submission. Deeper inspection may reveal unlisted topics that better describe the contents.

Item	Source file	Format	Demographic labels	Topic(s)
N1	AG3275-B-1-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Male Coloured Thirties Academic/NGO activist	Youth
N2	AG3275-B-1-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Male White Thirties Academic	Education
N3	AG3275-B-1-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Female African Thirties Academic/Administrator	Education, activism
N4	AG3275-B-1-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Male Coloured Fifties Academic	Youth, relocation
N5	AG3275-B-1-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Male Coloured Thirties Academic	Education

Item	Source file	Format	Demographic labels	Topic(s)
N6	AG3275-B-1-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Male Coloured Thirties Academic	Youth, travel
N7	AG3275-B-1-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Female White Thirties Academic	Youth
N8	AG3275-B-1-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Male African Thirties Academic	Relationships
N9	AG3275-B-1-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Female Coloured Thirties Anti-racism activist	Youth, activism
N10	AG3275-B-1-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Male Coloured Forties Academic	Travel, family
N11	AG3275-B-1-11-20-text.pdf	Story	Female White Forties Academic	Relationships
N12	AG3275-B-1-11-20-text.pdf	Story	Female Apartheid classification: white Early forties	Youth, education
N13	AG3275-B-1-11-20-text.pdf	Story	Male Coloured fifties	Travel, religion
N14	AG3275-B-1-11-20-text.pdf	Story	Female White 30s/40s	Youth, family
N15	AG3275-B-1-11-20-text.pdf	Story	Female White Forties	Relationships, activism
N16	AG3275-B-1-11-20-text.pdf	Story	Female Coloured Fifties Administrative	Youth
N17	AG3275-B-1-11-20-text.pdf	Story	Female Forties Indian	Education, activism

Item	Source file	Format	Demographic labels	Topic(s)
N18	AG3275-B-1-11-20-text.pdf	Story	Male African Thirties Lecturer	Education
N19	AG3275-B-1-11-20-text.pdf	Story	Male Coloured Early 30s Academic	Education
N20	AG3275-B-1-11-20-text.pdf	Story	White Female Fifties	Youth, religion, activism
N21	AG3275-B-1-21-30-text.pdf	Story	Female Indian 46 years Academic	Family
N22	AG3275-B-1-21-30-text.pdf	Story	Male White Gauteng Forties	Education, activism
N23	AG3275-B-1-21-30-text.pdf	Story	Thirties Black	Youth, family
N24	AG3275-B-1-21-30-text.pdf	Story		Education, relationships
N25	AG3275-B-1-21-30-text.pdf	Story	Female Twenties Indian	Education, relationships
N26	AG3275-B-1-21-30-text.pdf	Story	Female Twenties	Youth, travel
N27	AG3275-B-1-21-30-text.pdf	Story	Female White Mid-twenties	Education, activism
N28	AG3275-B-1-21-30-text.pdf	Story	Male White Twenties	Youth
N29	AG3275-B-1-21-30-text.pdf	Story	Female White Forties	Youth, family
N30	AG3275-B-1-21-30-text.pdf	Story	Female Indian Forties	Youth, family
N31	AG3275-B-1-31-40-text.pdf	Story	Black Male Thirties	Youth
N34	AG3275-B-1-31-40-text.pdf	Story	Male White Fifties	Youth, education

Item	Source file	Format	Demographic labels	Topic(s)
N35	AG3275-B-1-31-40-text.pdf	Story	White Female Early-30s (born 1976)	Education, family
N36	AG3275-B-1-31-40-text.pdf	Story	Male White Thirties	Youth, relationships
N37	AG3275-B-1-31-40-text.pdf	Story	Male White Fifties Academic	Youth
N38	AG3275-B-1-31-40-text.pdf	Story	Male White	Youth, relationships
N39	AG3275-B-1-31-40-text.pdf			[Duplicate of N35]
N40	AG3275-B-1-31-40-text.pdf	Story	Male Black 40s	Education, activism, relocation
N41	AG3275-B-1-41-50-text.pdf	Story	African Black Female 50s	Education, activism
N42	AG3275-B-1-41-50-text.pdf	Story		Education, relocation
N43	AG3275-B-1-41-50-text.pdf	Story	Female Black Thirties	Youth
N44	AG3275-B-1-41-50-text.pdf	Story	Male Black Fifties Academic	Education, relationships
N45	AG3275-B-1-41-50-text.pdf	Story	White Forties	Youth
N46	AG3275-B-1-41-50-text.pdf	Story		Education
N47	AG3275-B-1-41-50-text.pdf	Story	Fifties White	Relationships
N48	AG3275-B-1-41-50-text.pdf	Story	Thirties	Youth
N49	AG3275-B-1-41-50-text.pdf	Story	White Thirties	Youth, education
N50	AG3275-B-1-41-50-text.pdf	Story	Thirties White	Relationships
N51	AG3275-B-1-51-60-text.pdf	Story		Relationships
N52	AG3275-B-1-51-60-text.pdf	Story	White Sixties	Youth, education, activism
N53	AG3275-B-1-51-60-text.pdf	Story	Male White	Youth, education

Item	Source file	Format	Demographic labels	Topic(s)
N54	AG3275-B-1-51-60-text.pdf	Story	Male Coloured	Youth, education, activism
N55	AG3275-B-1-51-60-text.pdf	Story	Female White Age 50	Family
N56	AG3275-B-1-51-60-text.pdf	Story	Male Indian-South African Forties Academic	Travel
N57	AG3275-B-1-51-60-text.pdf	Story	“Pumla” African	Family
N58	AG3275-B-1-51-60-text.pdf	Story	Black and African Woman 36 years old	Education, family
N59	AG3275-B-1-51-60-text.pdf	Story	Male White Mid Thirties	Youth
N59	AG3275-B-1-51-60-text.pdf	Story	Male White Mid Thirties	Youth
N60	AG3275-B-1-51-60-text.pdf	Story	Woman White Teacher Forties	Youth, education
N61	AG3275-B-1-61-66-text.pdf	Story	Female White Professional Fifties	Activism
N62	AG3275-B-1-61-66-text.pdf	Story		Relationships
N63	AG3275-B-1-61-66-text.pdf	Story	Female Of Indian descent Age 50-55	Education
N64	AG3275-B-1-61-66-text.pdf	Story	White Female 60-70 age range	Education
N65	AG3275-B-1-61-66-text.pdf	Story	White female 40-50 age range	Youth
N66	AG3275-B-1-61-66-text.pdf	Story	White female 60s age range	Education
SN7	AG3275-B-2-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Male Black 23 years old	Youth
SN8	AG3275-B-2-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Female Black 22 years old	Education

Item	Source file	Format	Demographic labels	Topic(s)
SN9	AG3275-B-2-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Female Black 26 years old	Education
SN10	AG3275-B-2-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Male Black 24 years old	Family
SN11	AG3275-B-2-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Male Black 29 years old	Education
SN12	AG3275-B-2-1-10-text.pdf	Story	Female Black 23 years old	Youth
SN13	AG3275-B-2-1-10-text.pdf	Story		Family
SN14	AG3275-B-2-1-10-text.pdf	Story		Education
SN15	AG3275-B-2-1-10-text.pdf	Story		Travel
SN16	AG3275-B-2-1-10-text.pdf	Story		Education, relocation
SN17	AG3275-B-2-11-20-text.pdf	Story		Youth
SN18	AG3275-B-2-11-20-text.pdf	Story		Education, activism
SN19	AG3275-B-2-11-20-text.pdf	Story		Education, activism
SN20	AG3275-B-2-11-20-text.pdf	Story		Family
SN21	AG3275-B-2-11-20-text.pdf	Story		Education, relocation
SN22	AG3275-B-2-11-20-text.pdf	Story		Education, family
SN23	AG3275-B-2-11-20-text.pdf	Story		Relationships
SN24	AG3275-B-2-11-20-text.pdf	Story		Youth
SN25	AG3275-B-2-11-20-text.pdf	Story		Education, family, relationships
SN26	AG3275-B-2-11-20-text.pdf	Story		Education, activism
SN27	AG3275-B-2-21-32-text.pdf	Story		Youth, family
SN28	AG3275-B-2-21-32-text.pdf	Story	Male	Family, relationships
SN29	AG3275-B-2-21-32-text.pdf	Story		Travel, relationships
SN30	AG3275-B-2-21-32-text.pdf	Story	“Claire”	Youth
SN31	AG3275-B-2-21-32-text.pdf	Story	“Emily”	Youth, relationships
SN32	AG3275-B-2-21-32-text.pdf	Story		Education, family
SN33	AG3275-B-2-21-32-text.pdf	Story	“Nelly”	Youth
SN34	AG3275-B-2-21-32-text.pdf	Story	“Penny”	Youth, family
SN35	AG3275-B-2-21-32-text.pdf	Story	“Tom”	Relationships
SN36	AG3275-B-2-21-32-text.pdf	Story	White Female Fifties	Education, activism

Item	Source file	Format	Demographic labels	Topic(s)
SN37	AG3275-B-2-21-32-text.pdf	Story	White Female Forties	Relationships
SN38	AG3275-B-2-21-32-text.pdf	Story	White Male Fifties	Youth, education, activism
SI1	AG3275-C-1-1-5-text.pdf	Interview	“Palesa” Born 1983	Relationships, family
SI2	AG3275-C-1-1-5-text.pdf	Interview	“Lerato” Born 1982	Youth, family
SI3	AG3275-C-1-1-5-text.pdf	Interview	“Sibongile” Born 1984	Youth, family
SI4	AG3275-C-1-1-5-text.pdf	Interview	“Pumi” Born 1981	Youth, education, family
SI5	AG3275-C-1-1-5-text.pdf	Interview	“Lulu” Born 1983	Youth, family
SI6	AG3275-C-1-6-10-text.pdf	Interview	“Mpho”	Youth, education, family
SI7	AG3275-C-1-6-10-text.pdf	Interview	“Lebo” Born 1981	Youth, family
SI8	AG3275-C-1-6-10-text.pdf	Interview	“Tshepo” Born 1979	Youth, education, family
SI9	AG3275-C-1-6-10-text.pdf	Interview	“Vusi”	Youth, education, family
SI10	AG3275-C-1-6-10-text.pdf	Interview	“Thenjiwe” Born 1975	Youth, education, family
SN1	AG3275-C-1-11-16-text.pdf	Interview	“Mavis”	Youth, education, family
SN2	AG3275-C-1-11-16-text.pdf	Interview	“Tebogo” 46 years old	Youth, education, family
SN3	AG3275-C-1-11-16-text.pdf	Interview	“Mahlodi”	Youth, family
SN4	AG3275-C-1-11-16-text.pdf	Interview	“Julie”	Youth, family
SN5	AG3275-C-1-11-16-text.pdf	Interview	“Jane”	Youth, education, family
SN6	AG3275-C-1-11-16-text.pdf	Interview	“Rebecca”	Youth, family

Appendix B

The following protocol guided the data collection procedures, as described in Chapter Three. Submissions that offered a relevant contribution to the study were examined in light of the criteria below, and evaluated for their application to the sub-questions, which in turn informed the central question.

School Leadership Under Apartheid Study Document Protocol

Item number:

Summary of contents:

Categories or themes:

Textural description (*empirical interpretation of the individual's experience*):

Structural description (*environment or situation that contributed to the experience*):

Interpretation through Freire (2000):

Noteworthy quotes: