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ABSTRACT
Examination of a sample of 25 South African school history textbooks published since 1972 shows that there has been an inadequate response to allegations of bias and inaccuracies in the treatment of San hunter-gatherers and the origins of South Africa's Black population. Although some attempt has been made to avoid overtly racist statements, almost no effort has been made to include recent research conclusions and there remains a noticeable lack of sensitiveness in the treatment of the subject matter.

INTRODUCTION
Over recent years considerable attention has been given to the distortion of history in South African school textbooks. Published research on this issue includes Auerbach's The Power of Prejudice in South African Education (1965), Cornevin's Apartheid: Power and Historical Falsification (1980), Dean et al. History in Black and White (1983), as well as several articles by Smith (1983, 1985). This paper makes no pretense at replacing or challenging the conclusions of the above-mentioned authors but, rather, aims to complement their work by means of a highly specific investigation. Indeed, for the purposes of this paper their conclusion that history teaching in South Africa tends to reflect 'Apartheid ideology' has been accepted.

This investigation is specific for two reasons, firstly, it is exclusively concerned with the depiction in school textbooks of two aspects of South African history, namely the attention given to the San hunter-gatherers and the arrival and settlement of Black South Africans. Secondly, it is confined to the period since the implementation of the 1972 syllabus for standards eight, nine and ten, and the 1974 syllabus for standards five, six and seven. This period includes the introduction of the most recent syllabus, for all these standards in 1984. Indeed, the intention of this paper is to examine the extent to which the history syllabus and history textbooks illustrate responses to evidence of bias and inaccuracies in the treatment of the San hunter-gatherers and the origins of South Africa's Black population in school history teaching.

THE ORIGINS OF THE BLACK POPULATION
In the period under consideration this issue was initially considered in standard eight. This was in accordance with the syllabus which was implemented in 1972 and replaced in 1984. During this period the South African section of the standard eight history course dealt with the "Expansion and Division in Southern Africa 1806 - 1854". Part two of this section deals with "The Southward Expansion of the Southern Bantu". "Bantu" history, then, was only considered when appropriate to White history rather than on the basis of historical continuity.

By arranging a sample of standard eight texts for the 1972 syllabus chronologically (Table 1), we attempted to see if any trend in their depiction of this southward expansion was revealed. With the exception of Boyce (1973) and Van Rensburg et al. (1976), all the books considered are, on the whole, consistent in their treatment of this event. The migrant nature of the "Bantu" is stressed and in many cases it is explicitly stated that South Africa is not the original home of the "Bantu".

Like the Whites and other population groups, the "Bantu" are immigrants to South Africa. Further, there is a common emphasis on the slowness of the southward migration. Theal, whose works date to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, is often cited as evidence that the "Bantu" lived north of an imaginary line from Walvis Bay through the upper reaches of the Vaal River to the Umtamvuna River on the east coast in the sixteenth century. Even when Theal is not mentioned the conclusions are similar. For instance Joubert (1977) maintains that the Nguni were still north of the Zambezi in AD 1400. These texts proceed to give the impression that the migrating "Bantu" arrived at the Fish River at the same time as, or shortly before, the Europeans. Latgean et al. (1979), is a slight exception in that the arrival of the Black farming communities at the Zambezi is said to date to the eleventh century. No date is given for the crossing of the Zambezi but it is claimed that in 1770 the Blacks reached the Fish River. It is worth noticing that by 1979, as illustrated by Latgean et al. (1979) the term "Bantu" was replaced by "Blacks".

Boyce (1973:136) disagrees with the above scenario. "It is one of the legends in South African history", he writes, "that these Bantu people were newcomers to South Africa, in fact there are school history books which still give the impression that the Bantu arrived in South Africa about the same time as the white colonist were moving towards the eastern frontier of the Cape Colony. Recent research, however, shows that the earliest Bantu invaders from the north may have reached Southern Africa as early as the eleventh or twelfth centuries AD."

Van Rensburg et al. (1976) is an interesting case in that it is admitted that the lateness of the arrival of the "Bantu" has been exaggerated. This text then attempts, however, to reconcile this observation with the prevailing thesis by claiming that the "Bantu" were not south of the Limpopo in great numbers before the twelfth century. It continues to state that by the eighteenth century the "Bantu" were established in much of South Africa, but the expansion was continuing. Van Rensburg et al. (1976) then, do not significantly contradict the view that the "Bantu" became established in South Africa at the same time as the Europeans.

This investigation would thus indicate that throughout this period little cognizance was taken of the mounting evidence, from the early 1970s onwards, that the occupation of South Africa was earlier and far more extensive than these textbooks suggest (cf Cornevin 1980). By 1975 it was already clear that Black farming communities had occupied parts of the Transvaal from the third and fourth centuries AD (Klapwijk 1974; Mason 1974; Prinsloo 1974; Evers 1975).

With the implementation of the new syllabus in 1984 the "Southward Expansion of the Southern Bantu" has been relegated to the standard six course, although the term "Bantu" has been replaced by "Blacks". Whatever the reasons for this shift it has had the effect of reducing the im
importance of this section. As before, the history of the Black people is dealt with when appropriate to European history. An analysis of recent standard six texts reveals three approaches to the origins of the Blacks. The first approach, identified by Mckee and Wallis (1986a) and Joubert and Britz (1985), is consistent with the approach taken in the standard eight course. Indeed Mckee & Wallis (1986a) and Joubert & Britz (1985), is consistent with the approach taken in the standard eight course. Indeed Mckee & Wallis (1986a) treat the issue in precisely the same way as they did in their standard eight text published in 1973. Joubert & Britz (1985) note that the first "tribes" reached present-day Zimbabwe between the eighth and ninth centuries but then cite Theal as claiming that the ancestors of the Nguni were still north of the Zambesi river in AD 1400.

The second approach was identified in Lambrechts et al. (1985) and Graves & Consul (1985a). Both texts mention the early history of the Blacks but do not develop it. For instance, Lambrechts et al. (1985) write that the Blacks were along the coast of South Africa by AD 200. Three centuries later they jump to the encounter between the Xosa and the trekboers at the Fish River. Graves & Consul (1985a) have a rather humanistic section on the methods of discovering the history of Blacks but their statements about this contribution are unsourced. Every Iron Age people are treated as if they appeared as opposed to the previously mentioned "this appears adjacent to a block in a volume's language in the case of "AD 1000 to AD 1500 of the language..." (Graves & Consul 1985a: 37) even so this block contradicts the text earlier.

We are described as being of negroid or African descent. The third approach is exclusive to Nisbet et al. (1985). This has an extensive section on the early history of the Black population. This text notes that the South African Iron Age began in about AD 250 and that the Iron Age people were different from the previous peoples. The text then deals with the contentment of cultivation of crops, cultural symbols like Artist, Pottery and Domestic animals. Other sections deal with Iron Age settlements from AD 250 to 800 and include considerations of trade, religion and contact with hunter-gatherers. This text then deals with the early history of Black settlement in South Africa, an issue which is either ignored or treated inadequately in all the other texts.

It would thus appear that with the exception of Nisbet et al. (1985) no textbooks in the period since 1972 have responded, in a significant way, to allegations of bias and inaccuracies in the treatment of the origins of South Africa's Black population in the teaching of history in South African schools, nor to the results of archaeological research.

SAN HUNTER-GATHERERS

Smith (1983:44) has noted that in the 1980s many of the more negative descriptions of the San hunter-gatherers which occurred in early school history text books are being downplayed. In order to test this hypothesis we examined the sections on the San in Standard Five textbooks written for the new syllabus which was implemented in 1984.

Under the new syllabus the term "Bushmen" has been replaced by San. An example of this is Oosthuizen et al. (1982) using "Bushmen" while the 1985 edition by the same authors use "San". The more derogatory term "Bushmen" is no longer used, there is still an obsession with the physical appearance of these people which is given an inflated importance in comparison to other aspects of their existence.

These descriptions are Eurocentric and make reference to small hands and feet, short yellow people, etc.

In the syllabus the San are dealt with in conjunction with the arrival of the Dutch. This gives the impression that these people only have importance when they share the stage of Southern Africa with the Dutch immigrants. In the texts themselves, three approaches to the origins of the San are evident.

The first approach adopted by Broodryk (1984), Olivier & Hom (1984), Graves & Consul (1985b) and Van Niekerk et al. (1985) makes no mention of the origins of the San. A second approach, identified in Lambrechts et al. (1985), Van Zyl (1985), Mckee and Wallis (1986b), and Oosthuizen et al. (1985) indicates that the San came from the north but makes no mention of when they arrived in South Africa. The impression is given that they are immigrants. This verifies Smith's observation that an "important central thread which appears consistently is that none of the people of South Africa are really indigenous" (Smith 1983:41).

The third approach, identified Nisbet et al. (1986), in Siebogter et al. (1985), and Chalgarooyen et al. (1986), treats the indigenous development of the San in South Africa. The Nisbet et al. book can be singled out as the only textbook which clearly deals with the pre AD 1500 history of the San. While the Chalgarooyen et al. book attempts to paint some background, it is confused and inaccurate in places. A case in point is an illustration of what appears to be a Khoi pastoralist camp (with cattle and a milking scene) which is meant to depict the lifestyle of early San hunter-gatherers.

With regard to contacts between the San and the trekboers, all the texts mention that there was conflict. This conflict is seen as originating from the San attacks in response to Dutch efforts to rob the encroachment on their hunting grounds. Examples of this conflict are usually limited to the Sneeuwberg area, from 1786. In most textbooks, statistics of the number of herdsmen killed, stock stolen and attacks on farmers and farms are mentioned. In response the Dutch formed commandos to solve the "San problem". It often emphasises that the commando system, which subsequently became the fighting unit of the Dutch/Afrikaner and has assumed such significance in Afrikaner volk-culture, has its origins in the retaliation against the San.

The textbooks differ in their description of the consequences of the "San wars". While many mention the wholesale killing of the San in the Sneeuwberg region, only two textbooks (Oosthuizen et al.; Van Niekerk 1985) actually note that the San were almost exterminated. Some accounts even attempt to negate the scale of the killing by implying that the San retreated across the Orange River or into the interior (Siebogter et al. 1984; Lambrechts et al. 1985; Olivier & Hom 1985; Van Zyl 1985; Mckee and Wallis, 1986b). This reflects the popular myth that the Kalahari San are descendants of refugees that retreated into this area in the face of the Trekboer colonization of the interior. An explicit example of this is in Oosthuizen et al. (1985:159) where one finds, "They then had to flee from the cattle owners who chased them and killed many of them. The San fled to the Kalahari Desert. Elsewhere in the same text it is noted that "the San were nearly wiped out as a race". (ibid.: 174).

Further distortions and failure to take cognizance of research conclusions on the San since the 1960s, are evident in the way the San and San society have been portrayed. Some examples of these are presented.

To begin with, the view that the San were the most 'primitive' of the groups at the Cape is referred to in three textbooks (Broodryk 1984; Olivier & Hom 1984; Van Niekerk et al. 1985). For example, "The San had the most primitive (least developed) lifestyle of all the population groups in our country" (Broodryk, 1984:104).

In two textbooks (Broodryk 1984; Van Zyl 1985), the San are presented as being superstitious and practising witchcraft. For example, "The San were very superstitious. They believed in witchcraft and worshipped the sun, the moon, or the stars (Van Zyl 1985:99 our emphasis)."
(1986b) comment that the San spent most of their time seeking food. Recent research among the Kalahari San illustrates that this was not the case, even in the Kalahari which is regarded as a marginal environment (Lee 1979). Although researchers disagree on how much time the San spent on subsistence activities, it is clear that to portray the San as spending most of their time searching for food is erroneous. While the assertion that hunter-gatherer people were “the original affluent people” (Sahlins, 1972) cannot be easily justified, it is equally untrue to claim that they were almost wholly involved in procuring their subsistence.

The issue of ‘land ownership’ is another arena in which distortions, and even contradictions between texts, exist. Broedryk (1984:104) comments that “Each band of San had its own hunting ground which is defended against intruders”, while Graves & Consul (1986:212) maintain that “Like the Khoi, they also had no idea of possessing the land”. Research among the Kalahari San indicates that land is collectively “owned” of by groups, and that no member of this group has the right to withhold resources from newcomers or to demand a larger share of food.

Woodburn (1982:437) commented that “Among the IKung (a major grouping of Kalahari San) the relative freedom of access operates in spite of the fact that people long associated with an area claim to be ‘owners’ (k’ausi) of it and in particular its plant and water resources”.

Examples of other misleading statements are that the San “could not distinguish between the wild animals and cattle and sheep of the herdsman” (Broedryk 1984:104 our emphasis) and uncritical mention of the fact that “The Dutch referred to them as Bossmannen because they lived in the bushes” (Van Niekerk et al. 1985:105), which clearly paints them in a negative light. The first statement, along with others which claim that the San stole cattle because they thought of them as wild game that belonged to no-one (e.g. Oosthuizen et al. 1985; Van Zyl 1985) tends to give the impression that the San were somewhat simple and incapable of making basic distinctions between wild and domestic animals. Archaeological research has shown that the San would first have come into contact with pastoralists at least one thousand years before the arrival of the Dutch at the Cape (Smith 1986). Thus it is highly unlikely that the San hunter-gatherers would have been unable to distinguish between wild and domestic animals or fail to realise that domestic animals belonged to individuals or groups of people. The fact of the matter is that they probably deliberately chose to steal and kill the domestic animals knowing that they were owned by others. As it is pointed out in most textbooks, one of the reasons for this was the encroachment of the Dutch with their herds of domestic animals into San territory.

Another sphere in which San have been shown in a negative light is in drawings of them. In Broedryk (1984) there is an illustration of a group of San attacking a frontier farmer’s house and some of the San are clearly portrayed as childlike.

One concept used in anthropological and archaeological research, which has been incorporated by Graves & Consul (1985b) into their section on the San hunter-gatherers is that of adaptation. In terms of this concept, the specific nature of people’s social, economic and technological systems are viewed as products of their adaptation to a particular environment, and that changes in these spheres occur in response to environmental changes; in other words, parameters beyond their control. This essentially advocates the notion that people are docile and content to continue as before unless acted upon by external forces (Mazel 1987). The possibility of change being internally generated, and occurring through the emergence of tensions and conflicts within the social and economic spheres, is not considered.

In summary, besides two textbooks (Graves & Consul 1985b; Nisbet et al. 1985) there appears to be no attempt on the part of the authors to familiarize themselves with the research conclusions of the last 15 or so years, or, if they have, no attempt to incorporate them into their textbooks. This has not only resulted in the distortion of the history of the San and characteristics of the San and San society, but also the omission of significant features of their ways of life. In particular, we can point to the egalitarian nature of San society, their strong emphasis on redistribution and sharing, the significant contribution of women to subsistence, and the complex nature of their social strategies.

CONCLUSION

It would appear then, that on the whole there has not been an adequate response to allegations of bias and inaccuracies in the treatment of the San and the origin of Black people in school history textbooks. While it is evident that some attempt has been made to avoid overtly racist statements, there remains a noticeable lack of sensitivity in the treatment of the subject matter. In addition, almost no effort has been made by all but two sets of textbook authors to incorporate recent research conclusions.

This investigation would thus indicate that it is essential to continually monitor school history textbooks. Professional historians and archaeologists should regard this task as part of their social responsibility.
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INTRODUCTION
Although an analysis of pupils' responses in a small-group situation in history classes was the main purpose of the investigation described in this article, an incidental second purpose emerged: how did pupils respond to the discovery (imitation) teaching strategy? Is it very common for tasks given to pupils in small group work to depend on the pupils' own discoveries, guided, directly or indirectly, by the teacher. There has been little research done in either field to date in South African education, as was found during a recent study of the teaching of junior secondary pupils by these methods. The potential of either method can, however, not be denied, as anyone familiar with the success of the American Amherst Project (1970) or the greater success of the Schools Council History 13–16 project (Shemilt, 1980) will agree.

The writers are not the only persons currently interested in the use of group discussions in the history class. Ashby and Lee (1987) have recently begun (but not yet completed) an investigation into five levels of growing sophistication in pupils' historical understanding through appropriate group discussions.

The practical study was based partly on the theories of Kolb, whose experiential learning cycle depends on three variables:

1. We learn best when we are personally involved in the learning experience.
2. Knowledge of any kind has more significance when we learn it through our own initiative, insight and discovery.
3. Learning is best when we are committed to aims that we have been involved in setting, when our participation with others is valued and when there is a supportive framework in which to learn.

(Quoted in Jaques, D., 1984, P. xii)

Kolb claims that learning should begin with a concrete experience, which leads to further observation and reflection.

This aids concept formation and the development of further theories. This active experimentation provides the stimulus for new experiences.

Other writers stress the affective benefits of groupwork. Kaye and Rogers (1989, p. 76) have reported how the peer-group becomes a natural form of social organization for the secondary schoolchild.

Group work, say Kerry and Sands (1982, p. 5), helps pupils to learn to work co-operatively, allows children to learn from each other and removes the stigma of failure from slow pupils. Jaques (1984, p. 1), stresses the sense of identity and social belonging which the learner can gain from a well-run group.

Another important set of arguments, specifically about history teaching, concerns what is termed the "skills" approach. One of the earliest explanations was that of Coltham and Fines' (1971) who attempted to list objectives for the study of history. These have subsequently been refined and particularized, especially in the Department of Education and Science's paper (1989) and in Sylvester's (1980) presentation, which referred specifically to the objectives of the History 13–16 Project. The D.E.S. list, however, did not confine the skills to a particular project or syllabus, but suggested that these skills could be developed in any scheme of work. It is claimed (D.E.S., 1985, pp. 18–19) that by the age of fourteen, pupils ought to be able to use an increasing number of terms derived directly from the topics studied. They ought also to be able to use terms commonly found in all historical explanations (e.g. motive, cause, change, reform, progress, economic, political, social). Empathetic understanding ought also to be developed to the extent that the pupil can see two sides of
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