The exercises and stimulus material are an important aspect of this textbook. It appears to be the result of fresh and original planning. The one plus point remains the differentiation in exercises which could be of enormous help to a teacher who needs only to expand on this aspect.

Nasou's History is also a very good textbook. In certain instances it contains some very original stimulus material which would foster pupils' critical understanding of the historical process.

Shuter and Shooter submitted an excellent textbook in History Alive but there is no doubt in this reviewer's mind that this textbook is by far too difficult for matric pupils. The many graphs and data reflect "the key aspects of change...focus on factors such as industrialization, urbanization, capitalism, socialism, imperialism and underdevelopment" which in itself brings the rich tradition of African and revisionist history for the first time into classrooms, but from a purely didactic-pedagogical point of view Standard grade pupils will pay a heavy price. See for example p. 369 where pupils have to study figures which are far above the level of comprehension of even Higher grade groups.

It should be emphasized in the strongest possible terms that this criticism pertains to didactic-aspects only and not to the content. Space prevents us from singing the praises of this textbook as a product of eminent scholars who have succeeded in bringing the how instead of the what in history to the classroom.

The textbook which was placed fourth, New History to the Point, remains little more than a body of information with a half-hearted effort to test pupils' knowledge (memory?) with a few unimaginative questions. It would merely serve to create parrot-like repetition and would do precious little to stimulate pupils' understanding of history as a process of inquiry.

Conclusion

What emerged clearly while working through the submitted textbooks was the aspect of differentiation. In several textbooks stimulus material and exercises were presented in differentiated form. Two aspects arise from this: if exercises are formulated in differentiated form why not the same type of questions to every level - albeit at different levels of comprehension?

The second aspect calls for serious consideration: are teachers trained in the handling of skills? Which university or college presents history in the undergraduate years in terms of the "nature of history"? The teacher who majored in History and who subsequently would be responsible for senior classes (or Higher grade potential) is handicapped with an overload of knowledge.

It is seriously doubted whether teachers are trained to use the textbook in the skills-orientated approach. The tendency would rather be to opt for a textbook compiled in the mould of a set body of information rather than one demanding a higher degree of competence in handling the subject as a process of inquiry, selection and interpretation. Some excellent textbooks were submitted with the emphasis on the how of history (through the use of sources) indeed a significant and progressive step towards forming and improving a pupil's critical understanding of history as a process of inquiry. This approach augers well for the future of history teaching in South African High Schools, provided the undergraduate training of students adopts a similar approach and Education Departments discard the outdated concept of entrenching so-called Christian National Education through ideologically-motivated teaching, using History as a vehicle.

To criticise is easy and to write the perfect textbook in history is well-nigh impossible. However, had a book been submitted which contained a substantial, well-written body of information based on the "new-history" approach of History Alive, which contained the excellent skills approach of History for Today and which incorporated the differentiated approach of Timelines that book would have seen the light of day.

Herein perhaps lies the solution: that schools make use of a variety of textbooks (even in one standard) so as to get the greatest possible advantage of the books currently available.

\[\text{SOME ASPECTS OF THE TEACHING OF HISTORY}\]

\text{E H BROOKES}

\text{*Taken from The Mentor, Vol. 33, Nr. 7, October 1951. Many of the points brought forward by Prof. Brookes are still valid today and worth taking note of - EDITOR.}\n
It is not without hesitation that anyone who has not been teaching history in the classroom undertakes to speak to teachers of history on how to teach it. My qualifications for speaking on the subject are -

(a) the joy with which I learned history at school from two good teachers - one in primary school and one in high school - who made history live because they were interested in it;

(b) the fact that I have written one contribution of some importance to South African history in my "History of Native Policy in South Africa";

(c) the fact that I have taught history, although mainly to university or very senior school classes.

All these qualifications cannot make up for the lack of recent and regular classroom experience and therefore this address must consist rather of comments and suggestions than of any dogmatic statements on the subject.

In a Multi-racial Country

In one respect I have had unusually wide experience in that I have taught English-speaking, Afrikaans-speaking and Bantu students. The teaching of history in a multi-racial country is not an easy task. I learned at an early date that the Boer War must be described to Afrikaans-speaking students as "Die Engelise Oorlog" or "Die Vryheidsoorlog". I also faced the difficulty of talking to Bantu students about the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh "Kaffir Wars". I faced the fact that the Zulus regarded Shaka not as a sort of Nero, but as a kind of Zulu "William the Conqueror", the founder of the nation. Even though our teaching may be confined to one racial group it is a good thing to bring it into the breadth of understanding which such an experience must give. The unseen listeners to our history lessons should always be before us.

Why am I what I am?

I think that a very fruitful way of teaching history is to tell pupils that it is the answer to the question, "Why am I what I am?" I used this method very effectively with a senior training college class at Adams College. I began my first lesson by asking them to look at the textbook which they were using, a book printed in the Latin alphabet which, in its turn, was connected with the Greek and the Egyptian methods of writing. The pages were numbered with Arabic figures, and the printing was something which we owe to the Renaissance.

It was obvious that this was a very good beginning for a
Within the old framework of history, the framework in which European and Western civilisations are treated as the centre of things, I have found myself at variance with a good many textbooks and teachers, and in the greater stress which I have laid habitually on the later Roman Empire, an empire which is quite unfairly depreciated by H.G. Wells in his "Outline of History", and which many teachers seem to think parodied with Nero. (Reference to A.J. Kajee - Justinian - and to "Archbishop H.G. Wells"). I have also felt that a large number of our textbooks unduly depreciate the Middle Ages, which should be given greater prominence.

The Scope.

But is the old framework sound? Are not the facts of the present day challenging it? It is much more important than it used to be to teach American history properly and the East can no longer be considered ancillary to Europe. The older civilisations, such as those of China and India, must be studied. If the present day child must answer the question, "Why am I what I am?", he must know much more of what lies west of Europe and east of Europe and the history behind it.

History is a study of great movements. It is also a study of great men. The younger the child the more refreshing would be the emphasis on the human factor, which is indeed a very important factor. Is there not considerable truth in the dictum of the old French philosopher, that if Cleopatra's nose had been half an inch longer the history of the world would have been different.

Shakespeare indeed has not underestimated the personal factor in history. "Anthony and Cleopatra" is on the whole a good history and gives, in many ways, a very clear picture of the transition period between the death of Julius Ceasar and the foundation of the Augustin Empire. Anyone who reads Lawrence Housman's plays is likely to form a better impression of the Victorian era than he would from a stodgy textbook. History and literature should play into each other's hands in a school. Even books of historical gossip have their value in making history live. Our school libraries and access to other libraries are an important part of history teaching to both teacher and taught. In this connection it may be said that reading is a far better preparation for a history teacher than "reading up". Bacon says "Reading maketh a full man", and this is very true.

Should it be Taught at all?

We know that history can be an explosive subject in South Africa. We are treading on a surface which has once been lava, a surface which has not quite set and the heat underneath which can be felt by the feet. Lest history should be abused, many people argue that South African history should not be taught. It will undoubtedly be abused in the future as it has been in the past, but to adopt the attitude of leaving it alone because it might be dangerous is a denial of life. Surely it is possible to use our imagination and be fair without having minds and hearts of a bloodless neutrality. Both sides can be put. The imagination can be used. A great deal of South African history, like other history, resembles Greek tragedy in that often both sides were right.

Even in schools and, of course, much more in universities, something should be done about the use of source. Some preliminary work should be done in school work from sources and estimating their value can be as interesting as a good detective story. There is room for the writing of a book on this subject with illustrative quotations for use in the upper classes of school.

Even if it is not included in the syllabus, some local history should be brought into the teaching programme. The history, in other words, of the town or village in which the school is situated.

There is the question which is sure to be asked in plain old tones, "How can I manage if I am not a history specialist?" I have a limited faith in specialists and specialisation. History is one of the subjects which an intelligent man can, to a large extent, make his own by proper reading and thought. No teacher should rest satisfied to make history a cramming of a list of dates of dictation of notes from an uninspired or uninspiring textbook. Better things than these can be done even by one who has not specialised.

PROBLEME UIT DIE SILLABUS
DIE RUSIEESE REVOLUSIE

Daar is twee sake wat by 'n behandeling van die Russiese Revolusie skynbaar heelwat probleme oplewer. Die eerste hang saam met die feit dat daar gewoonlik van dié Russiese Revolusie van 1917 gepraat word, of van die Kommunistiese Revolusie, terwyl daar in werklikheid twee revolusies in 1917 in Rusland pleegged het. Die tweede probleem staan in verband met die presie se rol wat Lenin en die Kommuniste gedurende 1917 gespeel het. Hette hulle werklik die Revolusie geleli of het die Revolusie in hulle skoot geval?

Alvorens op hierdie twee probleme ingegaan word, is dit nodig om eers 'n perspektief op die politieke klimaat in Rusland sedert die euwewending te kry. Daar was heelwat ontvredede groepe in Rusland, maar net drie van hulle is vir die ontwikkeling van die revolusie van weselijke belang:

- Die ontwikkelde en relatief welvarende hoër middelstand en burgerliken was ontvreden met die outokrasie van die tsaar en wou 'n parlementêre regeringsstelsel soos wat in Brittanje bestaan het, tot stand bring. Hulle wou dus die politieke mag van die tsaar en sy hoofdeling en raadgewers na hulleself verskuif. Daarom moes beperkte stemreg wat aan hooi en dommerskatvrielings gekoppel was, ingestel word en moes die parlement oor weselijke magte, veral volledige beheer oor finansies en ekonomiese sake, beskik. Heelwat van hierdie Konstitusionele Democratie of Liberales soos hulle bekend gestaan het, het geglo dat daar dalk vir die tsaar binne s o n stelsel ruimte sou wees soek maar gewillig sou wees om hom aan die mag van die parlement te onderwerp. Die leier van hierdie groep was Vasilii Maklakov wat sy hoop daarop gevestig het dat die samewerking van die tsaar verkry sou word en dat 'n beperkte parlementêre demokrasie geleidelik ingevorder sou kon word. Die instelling van die Doema en belangrike maatskaps wat deur die Doema en die plaaslike streekraad of zemstvo's ingevorder is, het Maklakov en sy ondersteuners bemoedig. Die teenwoordig het die oorlog gebring het en die ernstige verset teen die tsaar wat daaruit voortvloei het, het hulle hoop versel.

Die tweede groep liberales was onder leiding van Paul Miliukov. Hulle wou konstitusionele regering onmiddellik tot stand bring en het in geen kompromis hoegenaamd met tsarisem geglo nie. 'n Geskrewre grondwet moes opgestel word waarin die magte en pligte van die parlement duidelik omskryf is. Hulle het ook geglo in 'n sekere mate van sosiale hervorming, veral hervormings ten opsigte van grondbesit, sodat 'n beter bedeling vir die kleinoerbees geskep kon word.

- Die tweede groep is die kleinoerbees wat die oorgrote meerderheid van die bevolking uitgemaak het en wat sedert die vrystelling van die kleinoerbees van die feodale stelsel in 1861 'n baie moeilike bestaan gevoer