

2017

Making (sense of) history after apartheid: neoliberal education in the 'new' South Africa

Caitlin Munchick
Vassar College

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalwindow.vassar.edu/senior_capstone

Recommended Citation

Munchick, Caitlin, "Making (sense of) history after apartheid: neoliberal education in the 'new' South Africa" (2017). *Senior Capstone Projects*. 715.
http://digitalwindow.vassar.edu/senior_capstone/715

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Window @ Vassar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senior Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of Digital Window @ Vassar. For more information, please contact library_thesis@vassar.edu.

Vassar College

**Making (Sense of) History After Apartheid:
Neoliberal Education in the 'New' South Africa**

A Thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree
Bachelor of Arts in Sociology and Education

By

Caitlin Munchick

Thesis Advisors:
Professor Carlos Alamo
Professor Maria Hantzopoulos

April 2017

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Chapter One: A Historical Account of the Raced and Classed South Africa.....	25
Chapter Two: Locating Education in the Past and Present.....	38
Chapter Three: What Happened to History?.....	60
Conclusions.....	82
Appendix A: Acronyms.....	91
Appendix B: NSC Examinations.....	92
Appendix C: Positionality.....	95
Reference List.....	96

Acknowledgements

I feel so lucky to have so many people that I love and hold close to my heart, that I have so many people to thank, and that I don't really know how to organize this page worth of acknowledgements. But I have to, of course, start at home. Thank you mom, for loving me always and for teaching me everyday what it means to be a generous, caring, and strong person. Thank you dad, for the love, dry sense of humor, and everything else you have given me. Lerato, my sweetest sister, I thank you for all that you are to me — family, friend, freak, teacher, TV partner, supporter — I love you. Thank you to my other parents, Betty and John, together you have forever changed the ways that I think about family and kindness. Thank you Lorin and Missy and Max and Andy for all making homes for me while I have been in the U.S., I appreciate it more than you know.

Thank you to my friends who have become my family. My oldest friend, Sets, I don't know who I would be without you. Kali, thank you for trusting me, growing with me, and loving me unconditionally. Sophie, thank you for seeing me and hearing me and supporting me even when I don't know I want it. Chris, thank you for helping me learn and laugh and ask for help.

Thank you to my teachers outside the classroom: Jonathan, Margaret, and Spencer. You all have taught me so much more than I could have ever imagined. Your commitment to your work inspires me everyday.

And finally, thank you to my teachers within the class, the Professors who have fundamentally changed the ways I think about the world: Eileen Leonard, Amitava Kumar, Christopher Bjork, Luke Harris, my thesis section advisor, Leonard Nevarez, and my thesis advisors, Maria Hantzopoulos and Carlos Alamo. Professor Leonard, you are the reason for so much more than my majoring in Sociology. Your classes have entirely altered the course of my future. Thank you for your incredible readings and classes, warmth, support, and belief in me. Maria, you flipped my world upside down in my first year and you have continued to do that ever since. I never knew that teaching could look the ways you teach. Your thoughtfulness, creativity, and dedication to education is energizing. And Alamo, thank you for changing my life. Thank you and Tanya and Felix for opening up your home and family to me. Thank you both for pushing me and this thesis further than I thought possible.

P.S. Thank you to Dunkin Donuts, particularly Mocha, for making my life run this year.

Introduction

In our last year of high school, we spent 18 weeks preparing for and writing examinations. I would pull out my set of colored pens and my class handouts, and sit for hours, rewriting them onto lined paper. I condensed those pages to a smaller number, and then condensed those pages, and then did it again and again until I had just one or two pages that I could read obsessively. For History, that meant reading it over and over until I knew, for sure, the names of leaders and the dates and sequences of significant events — *this led to that, which resulted in the other thing, which in turn caused those effects*. I printed out the national examinations on every subject written the previous three years, hid my notes, set the timer to three hours, and pretended that I was in the cavernous hall in which I would soon be taking the test. When that timer rang out, I graded my paper, taking record of areas that needed more study, more memorization. And then, I did it all over again. This is what school meant to me: repetition.

I wondered what I was really learning in high school. And then, I wondered what I *wasn't* learning. I thought about the things we *didn't* talk about. What most clearly came to mind was: racism. Despite being the first generation born out of apartheid, despite learning about it almost every year in History class, we *never* talked about race and racism in any real substantive ways. We never talked about how it continued to exist. We never talked about it as a structural phenomenon or as something that existed in any other form than the explicit manifestations of bias. I wanted to know if other South African students were learning similarly, and if they were, why? What forces were shaping the kinds of educations we were receiving *and* those we weren't? What I found was that despite the vast disparities between the kinds of schools that children attend — so much so that scholars often argue for the acknowledgement of two different

South African educational systems (Spaull, 2013) — *all* children, the ways they learned and didn't, were affected by neoliberalism's strengthening grip over the country.

Neoliberalism comprises of a set of social and economic policies and a powerful ideology behind them that work together to become a 'rationality' that shapes the ways we think, see, and act in the world. Most broadly, neoliberalism proposes that the state is ill-equipped and incapable of providing the services that people want and need. As such, the state should 'roll back' its social programming, and 'roll out' policies that support the freedom of private companies who *can* provide those services reliably and effectively (Peck and Tickell, 2002). *Everything* becomes subject to the processes and mindset of the market, including education. Schools are tasked with the project of developing 'human capital,' the skills and knowledge thought to increase one's productivity and profitability in the neoliberal market (Goldin, 2015). Rather than creating critical, questioning, democratic citizens, schools must create productive, competitive, and politically compliant workers and consumers (Hyslop-Margison & Sears, 2006). 'Quality' education is then marked by students' embrace of the neoliberal order and their ability to compete successfully in the global market.

This thesis interrogates how neoliberalism affects the ways that the South African government approaches education, particularly in regards to History education. I demonstrate the ways in which the government presents and frames their educational approach to the public, and question how this work engages with the inequalities left behind after the fall of apartheid. I argue that the strengthening grip of neoliberalism has pushed the South African government to approach education first and foremost as an economic project. In the process, students are positioned as assets in which to invest, and schools the primary means of maximizing returns for

the country's economy and its competitiveness in the global market. This task is twofold: developing the technical capacities, the skills and expertise, deemed profitable in the market, and at the same time, cultivating the social capacities necessary to participate productively, effectively, and reliably within it. History, as a school subject,¹ has a crucial role to play in cultivating those social capacities — socializing students into accepting and embracing neoliberalism and its major tenets of individualism, free choice, personal responsibility, and competition. The government presents this economic orientation of education — the development of human capital, the South African economy, and its global competitiveness — as means of eradicating the inequalities left behind after the fall of apartheid. As 'social justice' is incorporated into official agendas, it is disfigured, separated from material conditions, and reduced to the terms of the neoliberal market (Subreenduth, 2013; Melamed, 2011). In the process, the raced and classed inequalities are not eradicated, nor even challenged, but maintained, reproduced, and exacerbated. For neoliberalism is a new articulation, an extension of the very root cause of those inequalities: racial capitalism.

Critical Race Theory (CRT) centers analyses of race and power within thorough and multifaceted interrogations of inequalities, laws, histories, economic arrangements, and geographies. While race is centered, it is not treated as an isolated phenomenon within critical race theory. On the contrary, CRT stresses the importance of understanding and acknowledging how race intersects with class, gender, sexuality, and ability (Crenshaw, 1991).

'Intersectionality,' one of the most well known contributions of critical race theory, describes the ways in which structures of power — white supremacy, class exploitation, patriarchy,

¹ History is used with the capitalization throughout this thesis to denote it as a school subject.

transphobia, homophobia, xenophobia — are intersecting and inseparable. Though CRT originated as a movement of scholarship within the law during the 1970s, it has grown outward, finding homes in the literature of both Education and Sociology. Its growth outside the discipline of Law is in part because of its interdisciplinary embrace, the value it places on the voices of those most directly impacted by structures of power, and its social justice orientation.

A primary assertion of critical race theory is that ‘race’ is a socially, historically, and intentionally constructed category. ‘Race’ capitalizes on biological traits— skin color, hair texture, physical appearance, and genealogy — to make groupings of people appear natural and fixed (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). But race is anything *but* natural and fixed; racial categories are constructed and reconstructed, they change through history so as to best serve, protect, and maintain the dominance of white capitalists. Political Scientist Claire Jean Kim suggests the term ‘racial power’ to describe the processes by which these racial categories are reproduced to maintain a system of white dominance. She writes,

The cumulative and interactive political, economic, social, and cultural processes that jointly reproduce racial categories and distributions and perpetuate a system of White dominance are all manifestations of racial power. We might think of racial power as the systemic tendency of the racial status quo to reproduce itself (2000, p. 9).

Kim builds upon Michel Foucault’s understanding of power as something that cannot be possessed or exercised directly by a person or group over another. Instead, power is mobile — changing through people, institutions, structures, time, and place. Power is owned by no one, yet exerted on everyone, working to shape the ways in which we think, feel, and act. White people may benefit from racial power but they do not *own* it, for their very racial identity is constituted *through* the operation of racial power. Here, it is critical to note that power does not act in an

egalitarian fashion — to be sure, some groups are privileged by power while others are exploited and oppressed by it.

Racial power does not serve only to reproduce racial categories and attached meanings, Kim posits, but to reproduce them in the form of a specific racial order wherein white people are dominant. The concept of a racial order, as a dynamic and continuous process, illuminates how each racial group is positioned *relatively*. That is to say, that one group is constructed through its positioning against another. Kim writes that in a racial order, “group fates are relative and intertwined, one group’s incapacity becomes another’s opportunity” (2000, p. 15). As with the construction of race, the (re)construction of racial orders are specific to histories and socio-political contexts. In the case of South Africa, this has resulted in a particular racial order with different racial categories than recognized in the United States.

The system of apartheid, most conventionally understood through its legislated political, economic, and social discrimination, cemented the racial categories of white, those of European descent; Black,² those who were indigenous; Coloured, those of ‘racially mixed’ descent largely from colonizers and slaves from Africa, East Asia, China and Malaysia; and Indian, the descendants of South Asian and Middle-Eastern slaves and immigrants (Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2010; Teeger, 2015). Apartheid served to formalize a racial order, a hierarchy starting with white on top and moving vertically down from Indian to Coloured to Black, that attached material conditions to their positionality. The systematic classification of people’s racial identities, as implemented through the Population Registration Act of 1950 and its corresponding hierarchy,

² Different words have been used to name the Black identity in South Africa in various historical periods, including African, Native, and Bantu. In the past, however, these three terms have often been used in derogatory and dehumanizing ways. As a consequence, I do not make use of them, instead employing ‘Black,’ in the capitalized form.

necessitated neat and legible racial categories that did not, has not, and never will exist. Because the government needed to secure identities as stable, reasonable, and natural, however, the resorted to pseudo-science and random assessments like the “pencil test” in which officials would determine the race of a person by how easily a pencil passed through their hair (Watson, 2007, p. 133). The measures the apartheid regime took to secure racial identities reflect the chaotic, dynamic, and artificial nature of race.

Schools have played crucial roles in reproducing these racial categories and maintaining the racial order of South Africa. The very origins of mass schooling within the country are rooted in colonialism. While white and Coloured students filled the rapidly expanding public school system of the early 1900s, Black students were formally excluded from public education altogether. Missionary schools stepped into fill the void that colonizers had themselves created. Under the guise of charity, missionary schools worked to further colonialism while disguising its violence, attempting to ‘civilize’ Black children through European Christianity and the destruction of their language and culture (Chisholm, 2012). Apartheid fortified the racialized education system, creating separate departments, budgets, buildings, and curricula designed in relation to the designated social and economic roles of each racial group. Schools were carefully developed by those in power to protect, maintain, and strengthen the racial capitalism on which white South Africans thrived.

Schools have worked to reproduce racial power, but the students and teachers within them have consistently used their agency and consciousness to destabilize and challenge it. Foucault understood that power does not have the capacity to control in absolute terms, that it always produces resistance (Danaher, Schirato, & Webb, 2000), and so it is too, with racial

power. The Black Consciousness Movement of the 1960s flourished amongst students — producing a mass youth resistance that was decisive in the struggle against apartheid. Black Consciousness sought to destabilize the racial order in part through challenging its rigid racial categories and divisions. They defined black people as:

Those who are by law or tradition politically, economically and socially discriminated against as a group in the South African society and identifying themselves as a unit in the struggle towards the realization of their aspirations (Biko & Stubbs, 1982).

The definition sought to unite those oppressed under white supremacy — those defined as Black, Indian, and Coloured — as a collective. In this sense, ‘black,’ as an identification was and continues to be deeply powerful in that it actively undermined the divisive agenda of white supremacy that constantly sought to pit groups against each other. As such, I make use of the uncapitalized term ‘black’ to refer to those structurally, systematically, and historically oppressed by white supremacist projects in South Africa. However, the racial divisions, the pitting of groups against each other, held palpable and tangible material implications for different racial groups under apartheid that ripple through to the present. These differences in material conditions make the use of the socially constructed identities of ‘white,’ ‘Black,’ ‘Indian,’ and ‘Coloured’ pertinent in addressing the full dimensions of race and inequality in both the past and present, in spite of their limitations (Carrim, 1998).

Race is understood in critical race theory both as a social construct and as a structure that permeates every aspect of life, from our personal thoughts to the economic system at large. Importantly, CRT pushes back against the assumption that formal equality, that is equality under the law, creates a level playing field. Even as people of all races possess the same and equal political rights in the New South Africa, they do not possess the same and equal forms of wealth,

land, housing, education, or healthcare. On the contrary, black people's lives and material conditions continue to be shaped by racism. 90% of the South African poor are Black (Leibbrandt et al., 2011). While there is a growing Black and Coloured middle and upper class made of entrepreneurs, professionals, and government officials, white people continue to hold disproportionate wealth in the 'New' South Africa. This is in part because white households continue to earn the most of any racial group, on average earning six times more than Black households (Stats SA, 2011). But further, white people have had the legal ability, resources, and power to build wealth across generations. Wealth is the "most tangible long-term benefit that whites have accrued from a history of racial exploitation" (Zamudio et al., 2011, p. 27). Where white people often pass their wealth down, black people earning similar incomes have to pass their wealth *up* and *across* to support their parents, grandparents, and extended family members. It is essential to note that it is wealth, *not* income, that continues to provide the best indicator for one's life chances, one's ability to secure housing, health, safety, justice, and education (Oliver and Shapiro, 1997). Racial disparities in educational attainment persist on large scales: where 76% of white people have attained a high school degree by the age of 20, only 61.6% of Indian/Asian students, 36% of Black students, and 32.6% of Coloured students have. The kinds of schools that children are likely to attend are also deeply impacted by their race and class background. Poor Black students are much more likely to attend schools without libraries, computer centers, electricity, or running water. The formal equality under the law renders these disparities, this violence, illegible or invisible, "fatally limiting" the possibility of actually overcoming racism (Melamed, 2011).

Neoliberalism further obfuscates the structural dynamics of race and power, denying their existence as it builds upon them. As Jeong-eun Rhee writes, “neoliberalism builds silently on the structural conditions of racism while disabling the very categories that would make this racism recognizable” (2013, p. 60). Neoliberalism built off preexisting structures of power to maintain and extend processes of capital accumulation through the structural crisis of capitalism toward the end of the 20th century (Lipman, 2011). Its ideology most simply posits that the private sector is more efficient and effective than the state could ever be. Instead of attempting to provide social services inefficiently and unsuccessfully, the state should focus on ensuring an unregulated, yet supportive, environment for private markets to flourish, to provide better services than the state is capable, by implementing economic policies geared toward the achievement of strong property rights, fiscal austerity, privatization, deregulation, and free trade (Harvey, 2005; Narsiah, 2002). In retracting from their social obligations, states slash their budgets, diminish their services, or transfer them entirely to the realm of private enterprise — opening up new markets, new spheres for capital accumulation in education, housing, healthcare, sanitation, electricity, and water, to name a few.

The privatization and deregulation of public services and resources is suggested to be beneficial to everyone. Private enterprise flourishes with competition and newfound freedom, increasing their efficiency, improving their quality, and reducing their costs (Harvey, 2005). ‘Citizens’ with civil rights become ‘consumers’ with *choices*, with the ability to purchase goods and services that best suit their interests — having choices is “empowering,” it is the marker of “freedom” (Lipman, 2011, p. 11). Under neoliberalism, however, choice is only offered to those who can afford it. In this sense, choice is a pretense that serves to mask the fact that a person’s

means and networks — which are and have been determined by their race, class, and gender — continues to dictate the extent of their freedom even after apartheid (Goldberg, 2008). These inequalities, however, are proposed to be mediated *through* neoliberalism. Everyone is supposed to reap the rewards of successful enterprise, assuming that ‘a rising tide lifts all boats,’ that the wealth at the top, and in private companies, will inevitably trickle down to benefit those at the bottom. The assumption holds that the neoliberal policies of deregulation, privatization, and free trade present the best means of eliminating poverty in its entirety (Harvey, 2005). The responsibility of the state is thus to step aside from its former social roles and responsibilities to ensure that private enterprise can do its work.

With the lack of universal or governmental support, the responsibility of success and survival falls on the individual. The ‘individual’ stands at the center of the neoliberal imagination. We are on our own to pursue both what we want and what we need, with only our personal intuition, values, intelligence, and work ethic to rely on. Those who are unemployed, uneducated, or poor are only thought to be so because of their own volition, because of the *choices* they made. The emphasis on our individualism, our personal merits and faults, our choices, removes any conceptual understandings of power and privilege across lines of race, gender, class, sexuality, and ability — and most importantly, removes any obligations we may have held or felt toward our peers, co-workers, neighbors, citizens, and fellow humans at large. As Margaret Thatcher, the British Prime Minister and proponent of neoliberalism, once said, “[There is] no such thing as society, only individual men and women” (Harvey, 2005, p. 23). Under neoliberalism, we are alone, we are responsible for our own fate, and it is every person for themselves.

The concept of individual responsibility is highly racialized. Lipman (2011) argues, “Racism is the ideological soil for appeals to individual responsibility and ending “dependency” on the state. Constructing people of color as the undeserving poor... provides policymakers with a rationale... to diminish state responsibility for social welfare” (p. 12). Privatization offers a means of ‘escape’ from racial integration of public institutions — white parents can pull their children out of desegregating public schools and put them into inaccessible and unregulated private schools — all the while avoiding any accusations of racism or discrimination. For the market is proposed to be neutral, free from explicitly racist legislation, equity measures, and race-based means of redress. The market is *not* neutral, as it posits, for it functions upon the surpluses and deficits created over hundreds of years of colonization, slavery, and apartheid (Bobo, 1998). The fact that the majority of black people still live in poverty, live in segregated and under-resourced areas, and attend underfunded schools, is not suggested to be attributed to racism or its histories, but a result of their own volition or bad luck. Neoliberal discourse, the language and framework from which we make sense of the world (Danaher, Schirato, & Webb, 2000), does not have the capacity to address structures of power nor systematically assigned privileges because it has been created to reproduce them.

Most of the time we can’t see and discern neoliberalism or its discourse because of how deeply it has ingrained itself into every facet of our lives and minds. The term ‘neoliberal discourse’ may seem abstract and formal, but really, it’s just what we say and hear everyday in our contemporary world. It has “become incorporated into the common-sense way many of us interpret, live in, and understand the world,” according to the critical geographer and anthropologist, David Harvey (2005, p. 3). It is this, the generalization and ingestion of

neoliberal values and frameworks of thinking to the point at which it feels ‘natural,’ that marks the fullest and strongest expression of neoliberalism.

Through the naturalization of these ideas, neoliberalism disguises the ways that power is distributed and exerted in society, the ways that our current feelings and conditions are actually *unnatural* and socially constructed. Power is most effective when it is invisible and banal, blended into the fabric of our everyday life, for then it is unchallengeable, or rather, there is not yet a need recognized to challenge (Marais, 2010). Neoliberalism, to be sure, is very much centered about power, monetarily, racially, and otherwise. Harvey argues that neoliberalism was in part constructed as a “political project to re-establish the conditions for capital accumulation and to restore the power of economic elites” (Harvey, 2005, p. 19). The state came to play a central role in this accumulation — organizing, sanctioning, and legitimizing class domination through the reformation of its priorities and responsibilities

It is within the context of neoliberalism that colorblind discourse came to the fore of South Africa, which too seeks to obfuscate and disguise power, specifically racial power. The rise of neoliberalism, and its emphasis on individualism, coincided with the country’s transition to a liberal democracy. The law no longer resembled that of the explicitly discriminatory apartheid regime, on the contrary, the new constitution was being hailed across the globe for its centering of equality, dignity, and justice (Letseka, 2014; Marais, 2010). It was as if the slate had been wiped clear — South Africa was finally a country in which all were formally equal, under the law that is. But with racism removed from its legal and institutional legibility, it became reduced to interpersonal, individual, and explicit expressions of racial discrimination. Racism is now characterized as aberrational instances, rather than a defining feature of people’s lives and

the opportunities afforded to them, or the lack thereof (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Colorblind racism utilizes the rhetoric of formal equality to deny the existence of structural racism, often denying the ability to even *see* race, and in the process, perpetuates racial *inequality*. By obscuring the existence of racism, colorblindness protects it from challenge, thus enabling the processes of racial power.

With colorblindness, ‘post-apartheid’ is equated to ‘post-race,’ suggesting that the “structural and ideological bases of persistent racial disparities in income, wealth, employment, access to higher education, health, life span, academic achievement, and other aspects of social life and well-being,” had somehow died with the birth of the New South Africa (Lipman, 2011, p. 12). Institutional racism today must be enforced outside of formal policies, through “acts of indifference, omission and refusal to challenge the status quo” (Vandeyar & Killen, 2006, p. 383). Colorblindness and its emphasis on equality fuels myths of meritocracy that suggest *everyone* can work their way to stability and success. The neoliberal obsession with the ‘individual’ impedes any understanding of power structures, particularly along racial lines, and any acceptance of race-based reparations and affirmative action measures. Since we are all ‘equal’ under the law in the New South Africa, we must then all take personal responsibility for our own fates. Any race-based redress policies are then deemed ‘unequal’ under the assumption we all have access to the same rights and opportunities. Explanations for poverty and wealth inequality consequently fall into perceived ‘cultural’ or personal traits and shortcomings (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Lipman, 2011).

Colorblindness pushes ‘race’ out of dominant discourse, instead replacing it with ‘ethnicity’ or ‘culture’ in equally as fixed and generalized ways (Carrim, 1998). Often these

conversations pathologize non-white cultures, pointing to imagined deficiencies (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). By shifting the focus to the traits and tendencies of an ‘ethnicity’ or ‘culture,’ people are left with little ability to comprehend, and even less, address the lasting material implications that race continues to carry. When people do not ‘see’ race, but ‘culture’ instead, any references to discrimination or ongoing racism are assumed to be distractions from and excuses for their characters and decisions, their ‘laziness’ (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). As such, colorblindness ensures that racism goes unseen or ignored but ultimately unchallenged, leaving the status quo of white supremacy untouched (Teeger, 2015). To be sure, the equation of race and culture is nothing new. Systems of colonization and apartheid legitimized their violence through the equation of race and culture, namely that the cultures of black people were ‘backward,’ ‘savage’ even, and were thus in need of guidance from white people whose cultures were ‘civilized.’ The equation of ‘race’ and ‘culture’ today serve to the same objectives of the past: to obfuscate the violence and existence of white supremacy.

The seeming ‘appreciation’ of ‘cultures’ and ‘difference’ are no more benign. The New South Africa advertises itself as a Rainbow Nation, as the Archbishop Desmond Tutu named it, *united* by our differences instead of divided by them. ‘Culture’ and its complex and dynamic nature is trivialized — reduced to fixed rituals and ways of dressing, speaking, and eating. In the process, ‘culture’ is made a commodity under the neoliberal order that brings *everything* to the market rationale. ‘Cultural’ village tours, ‘ethnic’ dance performances, and ‘traditional’ food are offered as means of capital accumulation; South African Tourism offers these ‘experiences’ as opportunities to “step back in time” (South African Tourism, n.d.). Such conceptions of ‘culture’ are racist in that they exoticize, generalize, and stereotype the different cultures of Black South

Africans, while white culture is normalized and invisibilized. The differences between white people, between Greek and Afrikaans and Portuguese and English cultures, get lost under a supposed 'homogenous' white culture. White culture is invisible because it is dominant — it is held as the neutral standard by which Black, Indian, and Coloured culture(s) are marked different and thus inferior (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Carrim, 1998). Indeed, whiteness must remain invisible in order to protect it from challenge (Kim, 2000). When 'cultural difference' is spoken of in only broad strokes and between races, it becomes clear that the kinds of multiculturalism promoted in the Rainbow Nation are "reconstructed forms of racism" (Carrim, 1998, p. 313). Cross and Mkwanzazi go as far as to say that "apartheid may be seen to be an extreme form of multiculturalism itself" (Carrim, 1998, p. 315). I make use of the term 'shallow multiculturalism' to refer to the ways that culture is trivialized, reduced, and removed from its historical and socio-political context. Shallow multiculturalism works intimately with neoliberalism, obfuscating the power race holds through the proclamation of a 'neutral' market, focusing on individual choices and stereotyped cultures, and together, pushing any conversations of race and its material implications to the side or out altogether. As with colorblindness, shallow multiculturalism posit that equality under the law and access to the market constitute 'anti-racism,' thus disguising the ways in which structural violence persists *and* fundamentally limiting the realization of material social justice.

Shallow multiculturalism, colorblind racism, and neoliberalism are not unique to South Africa. On the contrary, much of the literature from which I draw inspiration is written from the context of the United States. They do, however, take on specific forms according to the particularities of historical, racial, and socio-political contexts. Neoliberalism takes on various

forms according to the specific combinations of place, time, culture, and histories. In early formation, for instance, neoliberal states often increase reliance on private-public partnerships before any formal privatization as demonstrated in South African education thus far (Harvey, 2005). As neoliberalism is shaped by its particular context at the time and place, it in turn shapes the context within which it is found — shifting balances of forces, morphing understandings of history, influencing cultural values and practices (Marais, 2010). Part of its success is owed to this flexibility, its ability to adapt. And successful it has been, according to its own articulated goals to “re-establish the conditions for capital accumulation and to restore the power of economic elites,” concentrating power and wealth amongst a tiny elite while broadening inequality to unseen levels within countries like South Africa and across the globe.

South Africa presents an opportunity to examine the intersections of race, power, neoliberalism, social justice, and education in some of their most extreme forms. Few countries have been so explicit racial exclusion and discrimination as South Africa in its past, and yet fewer, have been so explicit in writing race, gender, and sexual equality into their constitutions in the midst of immense change. The articulated and incorporated commitment to social justice, however, has been fundamentally restricted by its adoption of neoliberalism which was in part determined by global pressures and international institutions (Fiske & Ladd, 2004). Its levels of inequality are only second to Lesotho, one of two countries landlocked within South Africa, according to the Gini index of 2013 (CIA, n.d.). I argue, as Jewel Bellush and Dick Netzer do, that “there are lessons to be learned in extreme manifestations” (1990, p. 3). This thesis is specific to the historical and socio-political context of South Africa but speaks to larger structures that structure the world, namely U.S.-led global capitalism, white supremacy, and

heteropatriarchy. This thesis, in the vein of critical race theory, seeks to contribute to literature about these structures in order to resist, challenge, and transform them.

Education, as a distinctly neoliberal economic project, positions students and schools as investments through which to develop human capital, and in doing so, advance South Africa's economy and its competitiveness within the global market (Bantwini & Letseka, 2016). Schools become means of producing certain kinds of workers, rather than critical, engaged, and active citizens. These workers possess the skills most valuable in the global economy, the skills that render them most productive and profitable, excelling in math, science, technology, and economics. They are efficient and productive, yielding quantifiable results consistently. Entrepreneurial in spirit, neoliberal workers embrace individualism, take personal responsibility, and thrive amongst competition (Hyslop-Margison & Sears, 2006). To be sure, they are not isolationist or socially inept. Collaboration, cultural competency, and diversity holds high value only so far in that it is not accompanied with an acknowledgement or analysis of power structures. Of course, these workers do not critique or challenge structures of power, for they must not accept them as material or legitimate realities. These notions of the 'ideal' neoliberal worker impact the ways that education is approached, which subjects are taught and the number of hours assigned to them, what subject material gets emphasized and what subject material gets ignored, how that subject material will be taught and framed, and which kinds of assessment that will be implemented. That the needs of the market encompasses education is not presented as an issue, so much as a remedy to the economy and society at large.

It is proposed an education system oriented toward human capital development will solve economic issues, and in doing so, social ones too. The project frames its mission as one of 'social

justice,' suggesting that equipping *all* children with competitive market skills will eradicate poverty and the lingering effects of racism through increased employment and earnings (Chisholm & Leyendecker, 2008). As 'social justice' is incorporated into the official agendas of neoliberalism, it is pulled out of its foundations in the material conditions of everyday life, and planted into the abstract principles of equality, freedom, and choice. That everyone is granted the 'right' to education, housing, and food becomes more important than that everyone *actually* is able to attend quality schools, live in stable and safe housing, eat healthy food regularly, and access healthcare. As critical race theory makes clear, legal equality does not ensure equality in the concrete social world (Zamudio et al., 2011). As 'social justice' is incorporated into the official agendas and discourses of neoliberalism, it is decisively limited to symbolism and rhetoric. This incorporation functions to disguise the reality that "neoliberalism remains a form of racial capitalism," to conceal the violences that continue to permeate life for the majority of black South Africans, and to prevent the pursuit of a material, collective, and transformative form of justice (Melamed, 2011, p. 42). This thesis asserts that a market-driven education system serves to prevent social transformation, reproducing inequalities, rather than eradicating them as it proclaims.

The limiting of education to a market focus, the intentional reproduction of dominant ideologies, norms, and values serves to maintain and further the inequalities that have been cultivated over three hundred years of colonization, racialized capitalism, and apartheid. If children cannot understand structures of white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, and capitalism, because they have not been taught how to, they cannot challenge or disrupt them. Social justice, *meaningful* social transformation, is only made possible through the challenging and disruption

of those structures of power and oppression (Zamudio et al., 2011). History education has an important role to play in developing children's understandings of those structures, their identities, connections to the past, and potential paths of the future (Teeger, 2015). But under neoliberalism, History (as a school subject) confines the past to the past, locating it outside of a structural and sociopolitical context, and instead focusing on the individual acts, events, laws, persons significant to the time period. To do otherwise, History would challenge the stability of neoliberalism, it would render it visible, problematic, and in need of changing. A complex, structural, anti-racist, radical approach to history education has the capacity to expose the ways that racism, classism, sexism, and intersecting forms of violence persisted through the fall of apartheid *because* of the maintenance and extension of racialized capitalism under global neoliberalism. And so, instead, History is relegated to neat timelines of events and laws and protests and leaders that can be memorized and regurgitated in high stakes tests. History is framed in a shallow form of multiculturalism in which racism is understood only in interpersonal terms, in which a supposed appreciation for diversity equates the experiences and opinions of very differently situated people.

Organization

Chapter one provides a race and class based analysis of South Africa in order to trace the construction of race, the development of capitalism, the economic crisis of apartheid, and the resulting transition to neoliberalism. The chapter illustrates the ways that neoliberalism served to extend the lifespan of racial capitalism through the integration of demands from the anti-apartheid struggle. This historical overview familiarizes readers with the specific

socio-political context of South Africa as well as provide a foundation from which I can build further claims on schools and history education in the present day.

Chapter two introduces educational theory from prominent scholars within the field, making use of a critical race theory of education as put forth by Gloria Ladson-Billings and William F. Tate (1995). Using this theory, I locate education and history curriculum development through South Africa's past, to examine the ways that education has been used to maintain and further racialized class relations. This is pertinent in situating my investigation into the ways that neoliberalism affects educational goals, subject material, pedagogy, and assessment tools, and my argument that education serves to reproduce existing power structures rather than transforming them.

Chapter three reviews my methodology in analyzing the Department of Basic Education's twelfth grade History curriculum and corresponding final examinations. The breadth of content required by the state, with little explanation or guidance, serves to water down and simplify history. At the same time, it leaves a lot of room open to schools, teachers, and their biases to influence what is taught and for how long. Several ethnographies illustrate the dangerous implications of vague curricula guidelines. With few accountability measures, the final examination of twelfth grade serves as the 'be all, end all.' The question papers, addendums, and marking memorandums of these tests reflect what the government thinks is most important as well as what is most likely being taught and learned given the high stakes of the test. Within these materials, I draw out themes that reflect the integration of racial neoliberalism within schooling.

My conclusion reviews my argument, summarizing each chapter, and presenting critical multiculturalism as an alternative to history education. In closing, I draw attention to current work of resistance in South Africa amongst teachers and students who demonstrate the persistence of agency and critical consciousness even through overwhelming neoliberal racial power.

Chapter One: A Historical Account of the Raced and Classed South Africa

The history of South Africa, like the histories of all African countries, does *not* begin with colonization. Dominant accounts, however, tell a different story that begins with the ‘explorer’ who ‘discovers’ new land (Seroto, 2011). Bright and rich and complex histories (and herstories) were in existence long before colonizers stepped on African soil and drew the borders that would come to confine the land that marks countries like ‘South Africa.’ Given the focus and constraints of my thesis, I do not present an account of those histories. I focus instead on the construction of race, the development of white-dominated racial capitalism, and the transition to neoliberalism in the ‘New South Africa.’ I do so to build a historical foundation from which to illuminate the ways in which white supremacy is perpetuated after the fall of apartheid and to more thoroughly reckon with neoliberalism’s effects on (History) education. Just as important as the history I lay out here, are the histories that were occurring simultaneously, those histories of resistance in all of its different forms — strikes, boycotts, marches, riots, uprisings, armed struggles, coalitions, relationships, love, kinship, and community building — that deserve to be recognized and heard.

This historical account seeks to familiarize my readers with the facets of the country’s distinctive racial order and history, some of which read similar to that of other African countries and the United States. Where I seek to depart from more mainstream accounts of South Africa’s history, I argue that apartheid did not *create* racism or the vast inequalities as we know them to be in South Africa today, but instead, that it extended and furthered the racial project that began with the capital accumulation enterprises of Dutch and British colonizers. I am not so much

interested in getting into the specifics of history; I do not expend my time introducing the ‘characters’ and ‘figures’ of the periods I explore. Rather, I draw out larger trends and movements to elucidate the ways that racial identities, capital accumulation projects, and structures have developed and changed (and not changed) over the past 300 years to create the country and the education system I interrogate today.

A Race and Capital Focused History of South Africa

Colonization, capitalism, and the construction of racial identities are processes which cannot be disentangled. The interconnected development of ‘whiteness’ and ‘blackness,’ arranged in opposition to one another, served to justify and further escalate the enterprises of slavery and colonization. The critical race scholar Melissa Steyn argues that European contempt for Africans, who then became ‘Black,’ “was an attitude born of the slave trade... and later, of the cultures of European capitalism” (2001, p. 5). Steyn points to the interwoven relationship between processes of racial construction and capital accumulation; ‘race’ was a concept born to serve and further the material interests of European colonizers, of an imagined ‘white’ group. Race offered what seemed to be a stable means of categorization — one was born to a skin color, and unlike class, people could not change what appeared to be a ‘natural’ marker. The naturalization of race obscured the socially constructed, the *unnatural*, essence of a racial hierarchy that was designed as a means of social control to protect and ensure colonizers’ economic prosperity.

What set South Africa apart from so many of its neighboring colonies, was the competition and antagonism between its two different sets of colonizers: the Afrikaans, descendants of the Dutch, and the British. Their intense competition prevented a cohesive white

identity, with Afrikaners believing that the British were in fact invading and colonizing what was *their* land. The fissures in a cohesive 'white' identity were mended, however, through the extremely racialized capital accumulation projects of mining industry and apartheid that provided meaningful and lucrative stakes in 'whiteness.'

The discovery of diamonds and gold in the late nineteenth century accelerated both the development of capitalism and a racial hierarchy in South Africa. Hein Marais, the author of *South Africa Pushed to the Limit: The Political Economy of Change*, argues that the discoveries increased the stakes or "upped the ante" for the British in particular: transforming South Africa into a "potentially huge capital asset" (Marais, 2010, p. 8). The mining industry came to solidify South Africa's economy in the terms of a racialized capitalism. European immigrants rushed to fill the needs of the mines' 'skilled' and 'semi-skilled' labor, increasing the white settler population beyond the numbers seen in similar African colonies (Marais, 2010). The need for a steady supply of cheap, obedient, and 'unskilled' labor necessitated the destruction of independent Black communities and economies, the cultivation of competition, and intensified control measures. The division of skilled/white labor from unskilled/Black labor served to ally white workers to the capitalist class, to prevent multiracial union organizing by offering the financial and ideological rewards of a racialized economy. The division was strictly regulated as a means of 'controlling' Black people, their labor, and their aspirations. The development of the mining industry thus presents a concrete example of how the white capitalist class utilized the concepts of 'racial affiliation' to their own interests of capital accumulation.

The roots of uneven development were dug most deeply in the emergence of the settler-economy in the nineteenth century (Bond, 2000). This understanding diverges from

mainstream historical narratives that depict apartheid as a grand departure from South Africa's economic and political context, as a *creative* endeavour taken on by the Afrikaans population alone. Any historical account that undertakes a thorough investigation into an analysis of the mining industry, and colonization processes at large, must then acknowledge how apartheid was a continuation and intensification of a white supremacist project of capital accumulation. As the South African sociologist Melissa Steyn writes, "Apartheid did not come from thin air; it was grafted onto ideas that were already there" (2001, p. 38). The material interests of white capitalists, predominantly within mining, drove a racialized class project to align white workers to their racial identity — to give them stakes in the project in order to write them loyal and compliant participants. The establishment of the Union of South Africa through the partnership of the British and Afrikaans in 1910 further strengthened white workers allegiance to their racial identification, exempting all black people from citizenship and representation in law-making processes, setting a precedent that for the next eighty plus years to come. Laws like the Natives Land Act of 1913, which allocated 7% of arable land to Black people, came to serve as prototypes off which the apartheid regime modeled its own policy (Steyn, 2001). The election of the National Party in 1948 built off the momentum of a racist class project set in motion by settler-colonialist enterprise to codify the 'separateness' of races in South Africa.

Under the National Party's leadership, race soon became the definitive criterion for access to privileges, to opportunities, and to the basic foundations of life: freedom of movement, education, stable and secure housing, food, and employment (Marais, 2010). The material implications of one's perceived racial identity were written into every facet of South African life, most explicitly through the law. The Population Registration Act was used to determine one's

access to land, housing, education, voting, employment, and movement — to determine where one was placed both geographically and socially. Each ‘population’ was confined to its own districts through the Group Area Act of 1950, its own public amenities and facilities, and its own schools and administrations through the Bantu Education Act of 1953. The obsession with separation, the historian David Welsh (2009) elucidates,

extended to every sphere of society, including public facilities, restaurants, transport, beaches and even learned societies; ‘mixed sport’ was prohibited, blood given by donors was racially separated, and the dead were buried in racially segregated cemeteries (p. 56).

The most important feature of this separation is its overt inequality. Black people were not granted the same percentage of land as white people nor the same quality; Black people were assigned a minute and disproportionate percentage of land, most of which was far from city centers and infertile. Indian and Coloured schools received four times more funding than Black schools. White schools received *sixteen* times more funding than Black schools. By giving Indian and Coloured folks stakes in maintaining apartheid — making it seem as though they were “better off” than Black people — the apartheid regime sought to win their loyalty and obedience. At the same time, this racial order functioned to redirect the resentment and anger of Black people toward Indian and Coloured communities from the real beneficiaries of racial capitalism: the white ruling class.

Apartheid was always a racialized class project. To diminish the role that capital accumulation played in formulating racial segregation is to paint an incomplete and warped picture of what white supremacy is, how it functions, and to what ends. White people were not merely invested in their ideological supremacy but in their material conditions, in the luxuries that apartheid and colonization afforded them. The destabilization of the economy in the late

1970s, and consequently the processes of capital accumulation, exposed the limits of apartheid and brought in sight its downfall. “The apartheid growth model was decaying,” Marais contends, “the ‘conditions which had sustained a form of capital accumulation based predominantly on cheap, unskilled black labour’ was beginning to undermine that accumulation strategy” (2010, p. 41). The weaker the economy became under apartheid, the less stakes white capitalists had in it. To best protect their capital and potential to accumulate more of it in the future, white capitalists needed a new political system, and with it, a stabilized economy. More simply, if apartheid was not profitable, it would have to be abandoned.

In the face of economic crises, the National Party took out an ‘emergency loan’ from the International Monetary Fund in 1976, and set in motion the transition to a neoliberal democracy. The loan was granted with the promise of neoliberal adjustments, the reduction of government spending, and the liberalization of South Africa’s market and trade. The adjustments were matched with shallow reformatory efforts that attempted to regain the control that was increasingly challenged by a growing local and global anti-apartheid movement. But the National Party only made things worse — increasing inflation and unemployment rates, further emboldened the anti-apartheid movement who called out their failures to address the fundamental structures of apartheid. By 1982, the National Party had sought out another IMF loan, this one with even stricter neoliberal adjustments attached. People, particularly Black people, continued to lose their jobs while seeing the price of living rise exponentially. Opposition was powerfully growing internally and internationally, and South Africa’s economy was suffering with it. In order to ensure the prosperity of their capital accumulation processes, the white capitalist class needed to give up on apartheid and co-create a new political order that

provided the stability necessary for making profit. And to create that stability, they needed to incorporate the demands of the anti-apartheid movement into the new political order (Marais, 2010).

Acknowledging the interests of the white ruling class in abolishing the apartheid project does not require a devaluation or defamation of the anti-apartheid struggle. The struggle played a central role in creating the conditions by which white capitalists approached the negotiation table. Nevertheless, it is crucial to acknowledge the role that racialized class interests played in the negotiation process and transition to a multiracial, neoliberal democracy. To do otherwise is to deny the daily violences that persists through the rearticulation of racial capitalism. White privilege would soon need not rely on legislated supremacy, through the “constant and explicit intervention of the state” (Marais, 2010, p. 210). Rather, white privilege could be maintained, reproduced, and even strengthened through the free market, through the repealing of regulations, through neoliberalism. The retreat of the state allowed for the upward mobility of a number of Black, Coloured, Indian, and Asian people in order to sustain the life of white supremacy. Rather than a destruction or transformation of the racial order, South Africa’s white supremacy was reconfigured.

Making the Neoliberal Leap

South Africa embarked upon its transition to democracy in the context of a flourishing neoliberalism that was sweeping across the globe in the early 1990s. The Soviet Union, who had been a primary ally to the anti-apartheid struggle and its most prominent political organization, the African National Congress (ANC), had officially fallen by the end of 1991. The anti-apartheid struggle, which had historically aligned itself with socialism, soon distanced itself

from the USSR and its economic alignment; the National Party and Western powers could no longer claim that the suppression of black activists was a practice of communism prevention. Communism was ultimately positioned as a ‘failed project’ that had to be abandoned, for capitalism had emerged as the sole survivor.

Capitalism seemed to be the only means of ensuring a stable and ‘bloodless’ transformation in the midst of extreme, widespread physical violence. The numbers were staggering — as negotiations took place in the early 1990s, 250 people were killed each month in political turmoil, much of which was supported and even incited by the National Party to force the anti-apartheid representatives’ hands (Marais, 2010). The possibility of a full blown civil war on the horizon coerced the ANC to proceed with “moderation, stability and compromise” in mind so as to avert a potentially devastating cataclysm (p. 72). Formal negotiations ended in 1993 with the agreements of an interim constitution, a transitional government with minority representation, and the deferral of a genuine majority rule to 1999. Later that year, and five months before the first inclusive democratic election, the African National Congress and National Party together accepted an \$850 million loan from the International Monetary Fund. But the interference of the World Bank and the IMF had begun even earlier, toward the beginning of the 1990s. In with a number of “missions,” the World Bank sought out the ANC’s top cadres for special ‘conversations’ and invited them to ‘train’ at their Washington headquarters and the transnational bank Goldman Sachs (Narsiah, 2002; Marais, 2010). The World Bank proudly boasted that South Africa was the only country in which they spoke to the opposition. Through their intensified ‘trust’ and ‘relationship’ building efforts, the World Bank and the IMF had cultivated neoliberal allies and factions in the ANC, most notably: the future

Governor of the South African Reserve Bank, Tito Mboweni, and the deputy president who would succeed Nelson Mandela, Thabo Mbeki. The IMF loan of 1993 had proven those efforts well-placed. It was relayed to the public that the loan was accepted on behalf of drought-relief efforts, though the drought had ended a year and a half earlier. The political scientist who served as a policy writer on Mandela's government, Patrick Bond writes that this loan, this date, December 1, 1993, marked "the point at which the struggle for socio-economic justice in South Africa was conclusively lost, at least temporarily" (2004, p. 45). The leaking of conditions of the loan to the press — lower import tariffs, cuts in state spending, and lower wages in the public sector — revealed that South Africa was well on its way to becoming a neoliberal state after the fall of apartheid.

The failures of neoliberalism were already so apparent, so palpable — regressive taxing, increasing interest rates, foreclosures, unemployment and debt, and the rise of pernicious loan sharks and pyramid schemes — that they presented the ANC with a feasible opportunity to depart from and even disown entirely its predecessor's economic approach. Instead, the ANC embarked upon an active and intentional path toward an official neoliberalism in one of the fastest transitions to 'home grown' structural adjustments programs in Africa (Bond, 2000). Bond argues that four decisions by the ANC were crucial to the creation of what he calls, the "elite transition" to neoliberalism: first, the decision to formally repeal the use of "nationalization" from its rhetoric in 1992; second, the decision to repay the \$25 billion of debt accrued by the apartheid regime in 1993; third, the acceptance of an IMF loan; and lastly, the decision to grant the central bank formal independence from the state that same year (2004, p. 54). These key decisions were undoubtedly influenced by a desire for a 'peaceful' transition, to

avoid further death and injury, and to prevent the economic disaster caused by white and Western capital flight. ‘Peace,’ in this sense, is marked by the absence of interpersonal, physical violence, rather than the active presence of justice. But this ‘peace’ came with a cost — allowing whites to keep their companies, mines, factories, and banks, and perhaps most importantly, to keep the majority of their land assigned to them through apartheid laws like the Group Areas Act — to the black people who placed their trust in the ANC (Bond, 2004). The transition then, allowed white people to keep the “jewels,” their material possessions, while giving up “the crown,” full control over the state. The ANC hoped the trade-off for this transition, Marais (2010) posits, would be swift economic growth that allowed for the political and social stability off which positive changes could be built. Stability, however, necessitated visible developments and the removal of apartheid’s most visible and appalling vestiges in order to subdue the black majority’s demands and aspirations. Calls for more radical change have to now be regulated, disciplined, and silenced.

One of the ways that the ANC attempted to contain opposition was through maintaining its leftist rhetoric as it undertook the neoliberal project. Or more simply articulated through the saying, ‘talk left, act right’ (Bond, 2000). The South African Constitution serves as one of the most concrete manifestation of the ways that ANC’s leftist rhetoric seems to come into conflict with their embrace of neoliberal ideology and policy. The constitution was hailed as one of the most progressive in the world for its centering of human rights and dignity (Letseka, 2014; Marais, 2010). Its preamble read that the adoption of the Constitution seeks to:

Heal the divisions of the past and establish a society based on democratic values, social justice and fundamental human rights; Lay the foundations for a democratic and open society in which government is based on the will of the people and every citizen is

equally protected by law [and]; Improve the quality of life of all citizens and free the potential of each person (p. 1243).

To this end, the Constitution enshrined a Bill of Rights that first and foremost centered ‘equality’ through the prohibition of discrimination on the bases of various identity markers including race, gender, sex, color, sexual orientation, disability, religion. It recognized the rights to organize, to dissent, to join trade unions, to strike, to form political parties; and obligated itself to taking action to realize the accessibility of adequate housing and health care, sufficient food and water, basic education, and social assistance. At the same time as the progressive agenda was being laid out, property rights were being written into “every major economic policy statement and the Constitution itself” (Bond, 2000, p. 16). The resources promised by the constitution were soon made unaffordable and inaccessible after their partial and even full privatization, with millions of people having their water, electricity, phone lines, cut off and their homes taken away. Inequality in South Africa has grown to new heights, making it one of the most unequal countries in the world (Bond, 2011). The constitution was not contradictory to neoliberalism as it seemed, but rather a repackaging of it, in the rhetoric of social justice. By incorporating the liberatory language of the struggle, neoliberalism disguises the ways in which the structures of apartheid live on through a reconstituted racial capitalism. Neoliberalism did not heal the wounds of apartheid, but ensured that they would not repair, that they would be continually pried open by a free market so that economic apartheid broadly confirmed the racial apartheid that preceded it (Harvey, 2005).

The Fight Continued

The demands for more radical change did *not* stop with the election of the African National Congress, as dominant versions of history suggest. Anti-neoliberal critique and protests

propagated following the 1994 victory by an array of stakeholders, including “trade unions, community-based organizations, women’s and youth groups, non-governmental organizations, think-tanks, networks of... NGOs, progressive churches, political groups, and independent leftists” (Bond, 2011, p. 357). Fiscal conservatism, tax cuts for corporations and the wealthy, liberalizing international trade, lack of regulation, and enabling capital flight were just some of the complaints voiced soon after the establishment of the ‘New South Africa.’ Anti-neoliberal organizing and action continued through the election of the ANC and into the new century. The number of protests has grown each year, reaching a post-apartheid high (Marais, 2010).

From as early as 2002, the ANC took repressive action to quell dissent — meeting protests against the UN’s World Summit on Sustainable Development with armed senior police officers, many of whom were part of the apartheid force, harassing and detaining leading activists in the townships of Johannesburg and Cape Town for resisting evictions, utility cut offs, and the installations of prepaid meters for their services (Bond, 2004). Because the neoliberal state is assigned with the task of expanding “opportunities and options for private capital accumulation,” and managing the “political and social consequences of the adjustments,” the state’s surveillance, policing, and carceral activities often grow (Marais, 2010, p. 136). The most notable of which was the 2012 Marikana Massacre in which the police killed 34 striking mineworkers who were privately employed. Such repression and retaliation has alienated millions of South Africans from their supposed ‘liberators,’ resulting in a number of new political parties and the ANC’s worst election performance in 2016 (Macharia, 2016).

What the ANC gave up for a ‘peaceful’ transition was the needs and concerns of their primary constituents, the poor and working class black people who make up the majority of

South Africa. The resolution to ‘violence,’ in its most limited form of physical and interpersonal injury, carried with it “the seeds of extreme inequality” (Bond, 2011, p. 355). This was an elite deal, Bond argues, that left those most marginalized out in the cold — most literally. Marais (2010) notes that South Africa has “more luxury-car dealers than any country outside the industrialised north, yet almost half of its population lives in poverty and more than one third cannot find waged work” (p. 7). The ways that poverty levels do not reveal the ways that people struggle just above the “line,” the ways that unemployment rates work do not disclose the ways that people are underpaid, exploited, and violated by their employers. This is not the full picture, but it is a telling and devastating vignette.

Conclusion

This chapter has rendered visible the overlapping processes of racial construction and capital accumulation through a historical account of South Africa. I demonstrated the ways in which the economic failures of apartheid set the stage for a negotiation process and transition toward a multiracial, neoliberal democracy that prioritized the interests of white capital over those most marginalized in South Africa. Crucially, this chapter revealed how neoliberalism has incorporated ‘social justice’ into its official agenda so as to disguise the processes of racialized capital accumulation by which it maintains and extends the inequalities and violences of apartheid. Chapter Two builds upon this work, articulating the particular roles schools have played in these processes — both reproducing racial class power and challenging it over the course of South Africa’s history. The development of curriculum, discussed in the next chapter, reflects the tensions between neoliberalism and social justice demonstrated by the country’s larger negotiation process.

Chapter Two: Locating Education in the Past and Present

Education is and always has been extremely political in nature — the ways that an education system is organized can tell you *a lot* about a society and its values; it can tell you both where a society is and where it hopes to go. Critical race theory is useful framework from which to interpret these connections, making sense of the roles that schools have played in South Africa, and the values they have upheld. Chapter One outlined the processes of racialization in the specific context of South Africa, the processes by which race and racism were created to further the capital accumulation processes of colonizers. This chapter seeks to not only locate the history of education within the account of South Africa's past provided in the previous chapter, but to illuminate the role that it played in building, maintaining, and furthering the racial capitalist order and the values it continues to uphold. In the language of critical race theory then, schools have served to *reproduce* relations of power.

I begin this chapter with a brief overview and historical context of claims made by critical race theorists in relation to education. By overviewing the eminent work of economists Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, I provide a foundation from which to understand the ways that CRT have built upon and expanded the Marxist roots of reproduction theory. Where Marxists see the ways that schools serve to reproduce capitalism, critical race theorists see the ways that capitalism is intrinsically racialized, and thus how they also serve to (re)produce racial power. After expounding upon my theoretical framework, I locate education, the roles it has played, and the values it had put forward, in South Africa's history. By tracing the long, long histories of racialized educational inequalities, the reforms of today become visible as what they

often are: rhetorical, symbolic, and insufficient. The necessity of transforming material conditions and the structures of power — capitalism, white supremacy, and patriarchy — that undergird educational issues, becomes especially clear when those issues are located in a critical history.

Lastly, I sketch out the processes of curriculum development after the fall of apartheid with a particular focus on the school subject of History. After four rounds of curriculum development revisions, the African National Congress has arrived at its current articulation of national content and pedagogy guidelines in the form of Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS). I revisit the twelfth grade CAPS documents in the next chapter, where I investigate its implications for History education in the neoliberal era. I name the stakeholders and forces shaping the processes of curriculum development, throwing light to the growing role of neoliberalism in educational policy and decision-making even as it is veiled under the language of social justice and transformation. Most importantly, this chapter serves to demonstrate very concretely *how* education has played and continues to play an integral role in disseminating racial power and perpetuating the violences of colonization, apartheid, and racial capitalism at large.

Critical Race Perspectives on Education

Schools, as critical race theorists understand them, have historically and contemporarily served to (re)produce unequal power relations. That is to say, they produce inequalities in their own terms while *also* reproducing larger inequalities that exist outside of schools, in society at large. The theory of reproduction is undoubtedly influenced by Marxist modes of analysis which draw connections between structures, institutions, and practices to the economic order of

capitalism. In the foundational text *Schooling in Capitalist America*, Marxist economists Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis (1976) posit that rather than preparing students as political agents or democratic citizens, schools prepare children for the exploitative needs of capitalism. In other words, the first and foremost priority of schools in a capitalist society is to produce workers. The task is twofold: to develop the *technical* capacities needed in the market and to develop the *social* capacities needed to participate productively, and without complaint, within it. They argue that the latter “helps to defuse and depoliticize the potentially explosive class relations of the production process, and thus serves to perpetuate the social, political, and economic conditions” (p. 11). Schools then serve to the interests of the dominant, and for Marxists, the dominant are those who possess the means of production: capitalists.

Building upon this work, critical race theorists draw attention to the ways in which capitalism, society, and its institutions are *racialized* (Zamudio et al., 2011). Capitalists aren't always white, and those who are white aren't always wealthy, *but* capitalism itself is a racialized project. As chapter one demonstrates, capitalism has been built upon white supremacy, the slavery and exploitation of Black and Brown people. The kinds of workers being produced in schools are inextricably tied to the positionality of their students within the racial order. In the context of South Africa, the priorities of white schools may have been to produce scientists, doctors, entrepreneurs, and the like, whereas the priorities of black schools were to produce cleaners, gardeners, miners, and other historically exploited workers (Dlamini, 1990). From the CRT perspective then, schools do not just serve to reproduce relations of capital, but a distinct racial order as well. Critical race theorists go further, arguing that schools have been generative – *creating* inequality, not just perpetuating them (Au, 2009).

It is imperative to acknowledge the capacities individuals have to recognize, make sense of, and challenge power structures, even within the processes of reproduction. This is in part why critical race theory brings in the voices of those most directly impacted by racial power, class exploitation, and patriarchy — because they see and *know* these structures from their underbelly. While this is not an explicit dimension of this chapter or thesis, my work here in a broader sense argues for a History education that *does* bring in, recognize, and value those voices. Nevertheless, critical race theory presents a useful framework from which to build my analyses, offering the race-centered approach necessary to investigating the educational structures, institutions, practices, and inequalities that have been so explicitly racialized over the past three hundred years.

It is then the task of this chapter to analyze the role that schools have played in producing and reproducing racial power and the relations of capital through a historical analysis. With a critical race perspective, I contend that race has served as *the* principal grounds for deciding who receives a formal education, of what quality, and to what purpose. At the same time racial constructions and hierarchies shape schools in South Africa, schools simultaneously work to create, reinscribe, and reproduce racial power. Rather than one feeding the other, I show how the relationship has been symbiotic through history and into the present.

Locating Education in South Africa's Past

As with history, education in South Africa does not begin with colonization, for indigenous education systems are as old as the people themselves. In *An Analysis Of Educational Challenges In The New South Africa*, Zandile Nkabinde (1997) notes that those systems were systematic, though at times informal, orally passing down societal values, norms, religion,

rituals, histories, and economic matters from one generation to the next. Education sought to prepare children for the work of the future while providing a cultural, moral, and cognitive foundation. Community and family members were at the center of education as a “natural process embedded in everyday life and its activities” (Seroto, 2011, p. 77). Children learned through observation and action, performing the tasks modeled by elders, like hunting herding, manufacturing of tools, and the preparation of food. Colonization, however, changed the social, economic, and physical landscapes of South Africa, creating with it new educational demands. A formal colonial educational system, with its own structures, pedagogical methods, and aims, was hence established — setting in motion what would be an explicitly racialized schooling system for hundreds of years to come.

The first formal school opened in 1652, before South Africa was officially South Africa, before its borders were drawn. The Dutch opened the school to slaves, teaching them the Dutch language, the bible, and the doctrines of their church. The school encouraged compliance, offering alcohol and tobacco in exchange for their obedience to the rules (Dlamini, 1990). From the very beginning, schools played an important role in creating and cultivating the diligence and obedience required of slaves and other exploited laborers. The project of mass schooling, however, only began in earnest two centuries after the beginning of colonization, toward the end of the 19th century. The two hundred years prior, were marked by a relatively small and sparse group of settlers, and thus never necessitated a formal and standardized education system (Pells, 1970). That is, until the discovery of gold and diamonds. The consequent influx of white laborers brought about the development of infrastructures needed to accommodate their growing population, including systematic schooling. Edward George Pells, a Professor of Education at the

University of Cape Town writes then, that “it is ludicrous to attempt to give details on any so-called system of education until well on into the nineteenth century” (1970, p. 12). From the 1867 discovery of diamonds, to 1900, the number of white and Coloured students had more than tripled.

Even as there was some integration amongst white and Coloured students, Black children were excluded from public education altogether, well into the establishment of the Union of South Africa in 1910 (Chisholm, 2012). As a result, most of their schooling, if they were to receive any at all, took place in (mostly British) missionary schools. The role that missionaries played in Black education was immense — managing 5,000 of the 7,000 Black schools up until apartheid (Christie & Collins, 1982). Cloaked in benevolent generosity, missionary schools served the violent colonist project of ‘civilizing’ and evangelizing Black children through the destruction of their own cultures and languages, grounded in the firm belief that European culture and Christianity were intrinsically superior. With limited funding and increasing student enrollments, however, missionary schools began reaching out to the state for support, making a deal to adopt secular state curricula in exchange for expanded financial aid. Even with expanded funding, only one of 1,000 Black people had reached high school by 1940 (Pells, 1970). For many Black parents, however, the stark racism of the schooling system had deterred them from ever enrolling their children (Nkabinde, 1997).

From as early as the 17th century, Black people rejected colonial and racist forms of education as expressions of agency and resistance (Nkabinde, 1997). The curriculum for Black students was grounded in racist assumptions about what ‘they’ were like and what ‘they’ would go on to do. The emphasis on the subject ‘hygiene,’ for example, played into the racial

stereotypes that were utilized to justify colonial violence: that Black people were ‘dirty,’ ‘backward,’ and ‘savage’ and thus in need of those more civilized, white people, to purify them. Schools emphasized the importance of punctuality, the acceptance of the law, and the threat of discipline, in an “ideal preparation for factory work, mining, and farming” (Dlamini, 1990, p. 41). Gardening, carpentry, dressmaking, and other forms of manual work were apart of regular programming in order to ‘prepare’ Black students for the future ‘unskilled’ and cheap labor they were to be confined. From early on, schools functioned to maintain the exploitative needs of racial capitalism, to funnel students into the economic roles determined on the bases of their racial identities.

The election of the National Party escalated the already racialized character of formal education in South Africa through its apartheid project. Bringing *all* schools under state-control under the Bantu Education Act of 1953, the National Party sought to divide schools, funding, and curricula according to racial identities and the perceived role of that race-group in apartheid society (Spaull, 2013). Nazir Carrim, an education professor at University of the Witwatersrand, describes that “every level of schooling was cast in a racial mould; educational budget provisions, the structure of educational bureaucracies, the composition of staff and pupils in schools, the kind of curriculum followed, and the ethos prevalent in schools” (1998, p. 301). Schools thus acted as potent weapons of the state, serving to at once define and regulate racial identities by socializing students into their racially designated socio-economic roles. The hierarchy was marked by its strict divisions and levels, “In 1969–70 for every one rand spent on an African child, R4,29 was spent on a so-called coloured child, R4,76 on an Indian child, and

R16,59 on a white child” (Dryden-Peterson & Sieborger, 2006, p. 396). Bantu education quantified, ingrained, and secured the racial order of apartheid.

As the funding suggests, Black schools were at the bottom of the rung. Black schools were overcrowded, understaffed, and under-resourced, the schools that existed at least. By 1990, there was a shortage of 165,000 Black classrooms across the country. Where the student to teacher ratios were 16:1 in white schools, they were 41:1 in Black schools (Bower, 1990, p. E-3). Where white students had complimentary textbooks, compulsory and free schooling, Black parents had to purchase learning resources on top of paying school fees — if they could afford it. For schooling was not compulsory for Black children. These differentials served to send a message to Black children that their value did not hold up to that of their white counterparts, that education was a privilege, not a right, for them at least. Many Black children were turned away from overfilled schools, while many white schools operated at half their capacity on a consistent basis. For those who *did* find their ways into schools, education was extremely limited, if not dehumanizing. The dual task of socializing Black students into their perceived roles, according to capitalist reproduction theory, was to develop the *technical* capacities needed in the market and to develop the *social* capacities needed so as to participate productively and compliantly within it. Nombuso Dlamini, a Black teacher and academic in South Africa, argued (1990) that then to analyze Bantu Education, one must analyze how the education system sought to produce the necessary skills *and* the necessary attitudes for productive participation in the economy. I organize my discussion of Bantu education accordingly.

The formal education of technical skills necessitated by racial capitalism were extremely limited, for Black workers often learned the technical specificities of their occupation on site. Of

those skills that *were* formally educated, basic literacy and comprehension of the employers' languages was of the utmost priority (Christie & Collins, 1982). English and Afrikaans were prioritized over every subject, together receiving almost half of *all* instructional time in the school week. Familiarity with the languages of the dominant was critical in applying for work, taking orders, and completing tasks successfully. Gardening, carpentry, dressmaking, and tree-planting continued to be important subjects, taking up twenty percent of the allotted instructional time. Here, it is especially pertinent to note the ways in which sexism played out. Gender, *along* with race, determined which subjects were of importance or even available. Black girls were not being trained to cut wood or build, they were being schooled for domesticity, for housekeeping, for child-rearing (Christie, 1985). Where the other school systems sought to provide their students with the skills of leadership — creativity, problem-solving skills, numerical literacy — the Black school system emphasized rote learning, strict discipline, over any leadership skills at all. Black students were not destined to be employers, but the employed. The lack technical or skill development functioned to limit the futures and opportunities of Black children, sustaining a workforce of 'uneducated' and 'unskilled' laborers.

If Bantu education were to fundamentally limit the futures of Black students without igniting the "potentially explosive" racialized class relations, it needed to work vigorously to normalize and validate the status quo. Schools sought to *socialize* Black students into the racial capitalism, that is to legitimate its existence while developing its prescribed attitudes, values, and norms. Social sciences offered a means of "moral and mental training" to emphasize the importance of work and the acceptance of the law for a "harmonious" society (Nokwe, 1955, p. 16). Comprised of Geography, History, Citizenship, and 'Good Training,' the Social Studies

curriculum attempted to make work a central part of one's character, one's morality, and inculcate a loyalty to the apartheid state. For Bantu education served not only to create subservient Black workers, but loyalists who were capable of quelling the anti-apartheid struggle within their own communities. One of the ways the apartheid state worked to ensure their control over History education was to prescribe specific textbooks to each grade, each of them written by white South Africans. In his research, Dlamini (1990) found that the inaccurate, and often contradictory, narratives of South Africa's past glorified the crusades of white colonizers while diminishing the strength, intelligence, and importance of Black people. Each History textbook he studied began with the arrival of white people, erasing the prior contributions, cultures, and even existence of indigenous people — *Black* people. These textbooks, presented as fact, sought to legitimate the dominant frameworks of white superiority off which apartheid was built. History as a subject, and schools at large, then have played an incredibly significant role in legitimating, disseminating, and furthering racial power and class exploitation.

Just as schools have played a key role in building and maintaining apartheid, however, so have they in challenging and disrupting it. Activism and resistance amongst students crucially worked to build and fuel the anti-apartheid movement. Black Consciousness Movement (BCM) emerged most powerfully amongst young people in the 1960s, filling the political vacuum caused by the imprisonment of key leaders from and the official banning of the ANC and other prominent anti-apartheid organizations. Rooted in a radical politic, BCM recognized that liberation necessitated both structural and psychological transformations. Young BCM activists clandestinely distributed hundreds of copied versions of the state-banned *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* by activist and educator Paulo Freire (Vally, 2007). Students worked to apply his

liberatory pedagogies in their everyday lives, implementing ‘consciousness-raising’ classes in their own communities, and critiqued the oppressive classroom dynamics of Bantu education. In what became a turning point in history, students inspired by Black Consciousness, organized a protest against the implementation of Afrikaans as the primary language of instruction in 1976. Dozens of children and allies were severely injured and killed by police, making the brutality of the apartheid regime perhaps more public than ever before. Scholars argue that this, the Soweto Uprising, fundamentally altered the course of South Africa’s history, describing it as the “beginning of the end of apartheid” (Welsh, 2009, p. 142). The immensely powerful and political nature of South African education made it a priority in the apartheid regime’s reformatory attempts of the late 80s.

In 1990, the Minister of White Education Piet Clase put forth a limited form of desegregation amidst a number of bargains offered by the apartheid regime in its last stand. Clase announced that white schools would possess the legal possibility of enrolling Black, Coloured, and Indian students in what Carrim argues was “linked inextricably to reformist initiatives of Nationalist government” (1998, p. 308). Given that fact, the policy’s limited scope presented a shallow alteration to a deeply racialized education system while essentially maintaining its form. For the policy gave white schools options to reopen as private or semi-private so as to not be obliged to accept black students, mandated that state schools had to remain majority white, and freed these schools (and state altogether) of any responsibility to provide financial aid, special programming, or support to facilitate the enrollment of black students. This reform illustrated the limitations of reform designed and implemented by those in power, for it only served to protect their power from any further resistance or disruption. The apartheid regime sought to preserve

itself, offering ‘changes’ as means of pacification. Carrim contends that the conditions of desegregation “demonstrate clearly that the ‘opening’ of ‘white’ South African schools was done in ways intended to ensure ‘white’ privilege and security” (p. 308). The Clase announcement was significant in its symbolism: that desegregation would take place on white terms and conditions, and ultimately serve to assimilate black people into white spaces, values, and standards.

The education system in some ways represented the epitome of white supremacy, the ultimate means of reproducing racialized divisions of labor and society at large over three hundred plus years. Hence, the visible transformation of education administrations, schools, and curricula became a priority of the new government’s post-apartheid agenda (Hues, 2011; Spaul, 2013). Carrim goes further to argue that non-racializing schools was the “first thing that needed to be done in the ‘new’ South African order” (1998, p. 302). The initial actions taken by the ANC collapsed the 18 racial and ethnic education departments into a single system. Scholars like Nic Spaul, however, argue that conceiving of a singular educational system is insufficient in addressing the vast disparities that exist within it today.

While most of white, Indian, and Coloured schools are desegregated to a certain degree, the majority of schools in South Africa remain all Black, under-resourced, and ‘low-performing’ (Marais, 2010). The ‘free-market’ dynamics of neoliberalism have prevented the implementation of equity measures necessary to address the vast disparities that remain from three hundred years worth of colonization and apartheid. The privatization of education has served to maintain white privilege and exclusivity, denying access to black students through the ‘neutrality’ of the market. It is not so much their race that prevents inclusion, supposedly, but their class. As I have made clear in this thesis, however, the historically interconnected processes of racism and capital

accumulation prevent any way to wholly separate the two. The number of private schools had increased fivefold within 10 years of the ANC's election (Seloda & Zenoub, 2003). Much of 'quality' education has been made inaccessible through the soaring school fees of formerly white institutions and a growing private education sector. At the same time, the public education sector receives less and less money, disproportionately affect those most marginalized, and reproducing racialized class inequalities. In the majority of public schools, Black students face severe obstacles — high grade repetition and dropout rates, inadequate learning resources like textbooks, overcrowding and large class sizes, little homework, under-qualified teachers, high teacher absenteeism — and many more outside of them (Letseka, 2014; Spaul, 2013). Poorer students have been documented to perform 'worse,' than their wealthier counterparts — most of whom are white (Spaul, 2013). Such vast disparities in educational success, quality, and resources have led many scholars to describe South Africa's educational landscape as comprising of two entirely different school systems (Marais, 2010; Spaul, 2013). A middle to upper class racially diverse constituency on one side, and a mostly Black poor and working class on the other. In post-apartheid South Africa, "the 'average' South African learner does not exist in any meaningful sense" (Spaul, 2013, p. 437).

These vast disparities made processes of (History) curriculum development and implementation incredibly complex, and ultimately, difficult. The process of negotiations was fraught with the sometimes competing interests of strong labor unions, educators, academics, foreign technical advisors, activists, and representatives from the transitional government, which comprised of the African National Congress, the National Party, and the Inkatha Freedom Party. The historical account of this section situates the ground on which these negotiations took place,

providing a concrete foundation from which to examine the processes of curriculum development. Given the critical role that History had played in creating, disseminating, and perpetuating myths and values of white supremacy, its process of curriculum development was of particular importance — and conflict.

Making (History) Curriculum

History was to perform a crucial role in creating the future of the New South Africa— in honoring the voices of those who had systematically been silenced, telling the stories that had been hidden and erased, memorializing the struggles of freedom, challenging biases, and constructing a united national identity. Professor of Education Rob Siebörger (2000) documented that historians had been imagining and developing the kinds of pedagogy and content required for History to play this role even before apartheid had died. From as early as the 1980s, progressive historians had been conceptualizing, working on, and debating post-apartheid history curriculum. They created ‘alternative’ textbooks, organized conferences, and campaigned for a new national curriculum grounded in “skills-based, discipline-led pedagogy” and content that aligned with the new Constitution (Siebörger, 2000, p. 39). Simply, this meant that children were to learn *how* to act, investigate, and write like a historian. But this would take time. The first steps would necessarily be more immediate, and in that, less transformative.

The new government faced an immediate need to “cleanse” apartheid-era curricula and textbooks from its most clear forms of racial and gender bias. This first stage of investigation confirmed that beyond content revision, there would have to be an undertaking of major pedagogical and methodological transformation. But the ANC was under immense pressure, from within the country and out of it, to demonstrate that it was working hard and working well.

They needed to *produce* something, and soon. The revised curriculum had to be designed as soon as possible (Hues, 2011). From as early as this stage of revision, business partners were included in the processes of curriculum development. The history sub-committee relied on stakeholder representatives, “including a departmental official who had served on apartheid-era syllabus committees, five representatives of teacher organisations, a high school and a university student” (Siebörger, 2000, p. 40). Historians, academics, and their representatives were noticeably absent from these negotiations (Lowry, 1995). The process reflected the worst of efficiency — relying on political administrators rather than educators and scholars for the sake of streamlining and time constraints. Consequently, a curriculum that was similar in approach and somewhat revised in content from that of apartheid was released in 1995 to the approval of few.

With renewed criticisms and pressures, the new government set on developing and releasing another curriculum before the next election. Siebörger, a participant and scholar of South African history curriculum processes, observed that the negotiation processes were similar to that of the initial round: forming curriculum committees on a “stakeholder basis, with a majority of departmental officials (who were not appointed in any systematic way and served as representatives rather than experts)” (2000, p. 41). While the process saw the involvement of historians, teachers unions, and foreign consultants, those who would be *teaching* this new curriculum, did not get a seat at the table and time constraints further limited participation of the public (Hues, 2011). One group felt particularly excluded from these processes of curriculum development: Afrikaners. Feeling as though their knowledge and experience had been devalued and even demonized, Afrikaner academics and teachers distanced themselves from the country’s

education community. The impending deadline of the upcoming election of 1999, however, meant that tensions like these, between different stakeholders, went unresolved.

The result of this process was a set of curricula presented as Curriculum 2005 that attempted to carry integrating themes across all subjects rather than discipline-specific themes and content (Chisholm, 2015). C2005, as it is more colloquially known, put forward an Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) framework, heavily influenced by the trade union movement which sought to interlink adult education and training within the school system (Harley & Wedekind, 2004). The framework sought to challenge the rigid boundaries between subjects, as well as between formal education and labor training. Learning outcomes were to be applied without any reference to the specific subjects of which they were a part; content became a point of contention that had to be avoided. For History, this meant that students were to evaluate historical sources and evidence, studying historical *processes*, rather than analyzing historical events and narratives. Critical textbook scholar Henning Hues wrote, “the advancement of skills instead of content, led to a quite limited, systematic or chronological teaching of history... Academic historians saw the ‘end of history’ and feared that the general interest in history after 1994 would continuously decrease” (2011, p. 80). Historians were not alone in their disappointment of their subject’s curricula.

Indeed, such an approach was incongruent with the ways that most teachers had been trained, particularly those who taught in the later years of school. Many teachers felt as though they had not been consulted during the construction of C2005, and that further, they were not prepared to teach it. As much as teachers were excited by the values and goals it represented — equity, redress, and multiculturalism — teachers were confused by it. When it came to

implementing the new curriculum, many teachers were at a loss, confused by its language, format, and trainings. With inadequate preparation and resources, those who suffered most were the very teachers who had been historically marginalized. The learner-centered approach fell short in classrooms since most teachers had training and experience with more authoritative styles of teaching, or little training and experience at all. In formerly white schools, however, the learner-centered pedagogies matched what they had *already* been practicing as they had the small classes, teacher training, and resources to do so. In sum, C2005 reproduced the disparities that already existed: schools historically disadvantaged found themselves faring the worst while historically privileged schools continued to thrive as they had always done. Without teacher participation in curriculum development, redistributive funding, intensified training in formerly black schools, the liberatory, progressive hopes of C2005 fell short.

With those concerns being echoed around the country, the Department of Education embarked upon a new round of revisions. The process, beginning in 2000 shortly after the strong election performance of the ANC and in the midst of intensifying neoliberalism, saw the increasing roles of academic educationalists and the stepping back of labor interests (Hoadley, 2011). The shifting involvement in revision processes led to what some called a ‘compromise curriculum’ — the Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS) maintained the ideals of OBE while simplifying its language, improving teacher training, and most importantly, stipulating more explicit content specifications (Hoadley, 2011). Still, the same concerns arose, for the *material* conditions had not changed for the majority of schools and teachers. The reality was that teachers, particularly in formerly black schools, did not have the capacities — small classes, funding, time, training, books, libraries, classrooms — needed to implement the

learner-centered, skills-based pedagogy of OBE. In 2009, the Minister of Education announced yet another, and the latest, revision. This time, the revision was one of ‘implementation’ rather than the curriculum itself. Citing the failures of teacher overload, stress, confusion, and student underperformance both in global and national standardized testing, the Department of Education arranged a review committee of government representations, union leaders, and academics to embark upon the task of revision (Moodley, 2013). The committee fielded comments from hundreds of teachers and union members through provincial hearings, collected electronic and written submissions, and reviewed RNCS documents to produce the 70 page report that set into motion the process of developing South Africa’s most current curriculum (Department of Basic Education, 2009).

The review committee issued strong calls for knowledge-based learning, increased textbook usage, and renewed teacher authority, which were met with the creation of the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS). Released in 2012, CAPS attempts to supplement the gaps in content in initial rounds of OBE curriculum while maintaining its core pedagogical values. In fact, CAPS wasn’t even presented as a new curriculum but a “refined and repackaged” version of the RNCS (Department of Basic Education, 2010, p. 4). With introducing specific topics, content, and themes came an urgent demand for learning and teaching materials, namely textbooks. What usually takes 18 months — developing, editing, and publishing textbooks — was reduced to *three* months on average (Hove & Maruma, 2014). Textbooks were proposed to support teachers re-establishing their authority in the classroom and reducing their workload in developing curricula and lesson plans. Rajendra Chetty, a post-colonial scholar in South Africa, articulated his distress at the prospect of re-installing a textbook education,

describing it as a “re-appropriation of the very capitalist, exclusionary thinking that caused so many of the colonial and apartheid wrongs of the country” (2015, p. 2). To echo Chetty, the rearticulation of knowledge-based learning, and its tendencies for rote-based instruction and assessment, is extremely concerning, for it does *not* address the structural inequities that have undergirded the failures of previous curricula. Instead, CAPS acts as a Band-Aid solution to deep, deep wound. Relying on content-specific curricula and textbooks to address the structural issues of under-trained teachers and under-resourced schools, CAPS serves to maintain and reproduce the material conditions in which educational inequalities are based.

Even worse, is that CAPS utilizes the liberatory rhetoric of social transformation as it acts upon retrograde impulses, pulling national education toward the apartheid era’s program of rote memorization (Chetty, 2015). Its philosophy, still rooted in the values of Outcomes-Based Education, lends itself to such rhetoric. OBE very much seeks to transform the usually hierarchical relations of teachers, students, and learning more broadly, to resemble that of a democracy. Students become active participants and co-constructors of their learning, teachers act more as facilitators than authorities, and knowledge is consistently questioned.

Learner-centered, or ‘democratic,’ education has a strong social justice tradition as modeled by the activist and educator, Paulo Freire. This tradition suggests that learner-centered pedagogy is fundamentally at odds with the use of textbooks or an economically-driven education system, but the work of those like Education Scholar Richard Tabulawa can make sense of the connection and the collaboration between learner-centered pedagogy and neoliberalism. Tabulawa (2003) argues,

The ascendancy of neoliberalism... elevated political democratisation as a prerequisite for economic development. Education, then, assumed a central role in the democratisation project. Given its democratic tendencies, learner-centred pedagogy was a

natural choice for the development of democratic social relations in the schools of aid-receiving countries (p. 7).

Political democratization after the fall of the Soviet Union, Tabulawa contends, set the conditions for neoliberalism to thrive. As articulated in Chapter One, the fall of the Soviet Union had a significant impact on South Africa's in pushing forward its negotiation processes. With the establishment of a multiracial democracy in sight, the World Bank re-concentrated its relationship building processes with the country and played a substantial role in training ANC cadres, developing national economic and educational policy. Under this context, neoliberal agencies like the World Bank took an avid interest in 'learner-centered' pedagogy as a means of contributing to the democratization processes by which neoliberalism came to the fore. Tabulawa points to the thrust of this thesis — how neoliberalism incorporates the language of social justice and anti-racism in order to further itself, and in doing so, fatally limiting the actual possibilities of social transformation. For under all its rhetoric, OBE *and* the new curriculum are driven by the needs of the market.

From its very introduction in 1997, OBE was held in high regard amongst both the unions *and* the business community for its proposed capacity to produce and funnel high-demand, marketable skills into the South African economy. Marais asserts that OBE represented a “fundamental recasting of education, with its content and value determined chiefly by economic usefulness, positioning it firmly within neoliberal rationality” (p. 331). Simply, neoliberalism positions education as an investment for the prosperity of the nation and its economy. In a particularly blatant exhibition of this rationality, Department of Basic Education's website reads, “Every child is a national asset” on the top of every page (Department of Basic Education, 2017). This slogan rests next to the handprints of a child and the South African flag, pointing to the

ways in which market-driven education is at once presented as a humanistic endeavor (represented by the small handprints of a child) and a nation-building project (the South African flag).

CAPS is explicit about its attentiveness to the needs of the market, articulating that it serves to facilitate the transition from schools to the workplace and provide employers with sufficient profiles of learners' competencies (Department of Basic Education, 2011, p. 4). The descriptions of the students that the curriculum seeks to “produce” read like a job description — the ability to “solve problems... work effectively as individuals and with others... organise and manage themselves... communicate effectively... [and] use science and technology” (p. 5). These are the neoliberal workers the education system seeks to produce. They are efficient, productive, responsible, and prepared for one of the quickest growing and highest paying fields of today's market: STEM, or more fully, Science, Engineering, Technology and Mathematics (Carnevale, Smith, & Strohl, 2013; De Villiers & Ntshoe, 2014). The rapid skills development of CAPS, suggested to open up ‘professional’ and well-paying jobs to historically discriminated students, is depicted as a means of quickly overcoming the racialized class inequalities of apartheid. As this economic project incorporates the rhetoric and symbolism of social justice — equality, human rights, inclusion, active learning, critical thinking — it confines social justice to neoliberalism, or in reality, what is just an extension of racial capitalism. The tenets of neoliberalism like choice, individual rights, free markets become signifiers of what social justice is and limits it to what it can ever be.

Conclusion

This chapter presented critical race theory as a framework with which to examine the roles that schools play in creating, maintaining, reproducing, and resisting the dominant ideologies and structures of society. I trace the roots of mass education, illuminating the depth to which schools are racialized in South Africa in order to make visible the insufficiency of symbolic and rhetorical change in addressing racial inequalities. The processes of History curriculum development demonstrated the ways in which neoliberalism impedes upon the possibilities of educational transformation. The next chapter builds upon the work done here to analyze the hard-copy of the History Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement for twelfth grade and its corresponding set of standardized examinations. Chapter Three presents the concrete manifestations of neoliberal rationality within History education, problematizing its simplistic and individualistic focus.

Chapter Three: Broad Histories, Simplified Narratives

As a ‘governing rationale,’ neoliberalism poses a fundamental threat to a critical History education which seeks to make sense of the structures and systems that shape our lives. Its emphasis on quantifiable tools of assessment, on measurement, and ‘objective data’ is incapable of grappling with the complexities, nuances, and forces of the past. Standardized tests, produced in the image of neoliberalism, sanitize and simplify the the messy, overlapping nature of the past. Within a market-driven education, History is reduced to events, laws, and people arranged in linear narratives which seem distinct from each other rather than interconnected. The structures and ideologies that drive history are invisibilized in exchange for the more tangible, the choices and deeds of particular actors. Neoliberalism’s unwillingness, its active refusal, to critically reckon with structures of power along lines of race, class, gender, sexuality, ability, and language renders an incomplete and violent account of history. To *not* name racism, capitalism, sexism, homophobia, or ableism is to make them invisible, and thus unchallengeable. In effect, this omission reproduces violent ideologies and structures.

First, I describe my methodology: a critical race guided “content analysis” of 25 documents comprising four years’ worth of final twelfth grade History examinations and their relevant History CAPS document. I introduce the methodology more broadly and name my motivations in choosing it, namely the appeal of its flexibility that lends itself to the multimedia formatting of the History examinations I study. For content analysis possesses the capacities to account for text, image, layout, and organization, that lends itself to the multimedia formatting of the History examinations I study. This section also addresses the scope of my data and my multifaceted processes of analyses.

Second, I document the ways in which the wide breadth of content requirements within national curriculum and the high stakes assigned to testing impede the kinds of critical and active learning that is advocated for by the Department of Basic Education. The simplification that occurs both within content and pedagogy serves to invisibilize the forces and systems behind history. This severely obstructs students' abilities to make connections between the past and present, and understand the power that race continues to exert in South Africa today. I argue that the 'social justice' aims and principles articulated throughout the History Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) — disconnected from adequate infrastructural changes, teacher support and training, and redistribution of resources — are limited to rhetorical devices rather than active practices.

I then turn to a critical analysis of the themes emphasized through the Grade 12 final history examinations. Without comprehensive curriculum content description and without state produced textbooks or teacher guides, the final examinations and their grading memorandums serve as critical documents by which teachers can discern what is important and satisfactory to the Department of Education. This chapter constitutes my original research to illustrate concrete examples of the ways that neoliberal ideologies, of democratic capitalism and oppressive communism, of equal playing fields and shallow multiculturalism, manifest in every part of education — working to reframe and limit History education so as to serve the expansive needs of racial capitalism.

Methodology

My work is driven by a methodology of “content analysis” rooted in a critical race perspective. Content analysis is fundamentally broad and flexible, encompassing a “systematic,

rigorous approach to analyzing documents obtained or generated in the course of research” (White & Marsh, 2006, p. 22). Because of its flexibility, content analysis has been used across disciplines including anthropology, library and information studies, political science, and most relevantly, sociology. The value of this methodology lies in its breadth — its capacity to look behind and around and through text, to note of what is included and what is not, to look at the ways that documents are organized, and to analyze the images included. Importantly, content analysis *situates* material, drawing out observations not just out of content but the context in which it is used. Later in this section, I analyze material specifically within its context of the final, standardized, and high stakes History examination. One of the contributions that content analysis makes then, is that I can draw out the purposes that concepts, themes, and patterns in content serve and the results they cause. For these examinations are not just important in that every public school student will take them, but that they inform how teachers teach and how students study *because* of their high stakes. Content analysis helps draw out these connections.

I started with a content analysis of the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) for twelfth grade History. Quickly, I realized that I didn’t have much to work with — the curriculum was extremely broad and vague, with limited descriptions of the content that was to be covered. The content *appeared* to present a critical account of history, one that engaged with themes of racism, capitalism, and imperialism. But these weren’t the histories I learned, and a number of ethnographies I read suggest that these were not the histories that others were learning either. I read accounts of Afrikaans teachers who barely touched on apartheid (Hues, 2011), accounts of Black teachers who brought in personal testimonies to teach long segments of the struggle (Dryden-Peterson & Siebörger, 2006), and other accounts of both Black and white

teachers who taught apartheid all the while avoiding discussions of systematic beneficiaries, perpetrators, and victims (Teeger, 2015). The question arose: how were these teachers being held accountable to curriculum guidelines? The most systematic and comprehensive measure, unfortunately, were the final examinations of twelfth grade.

Known as the National Senior Certificate examinations (NSC), the standardized and government-created tests count for 75% of a student's entire grade. Basically, they determine whether a child will be able to attend college, graduate high school, or fail the entire year. The stakes are incredibly high. As such, I theorize that the NSC History examinations influence what teachers teach and students study. They present what is acceptable and what is not. Lastly, I argue that they represent what is deemed most important by the Department of Basic Education. Thus, the majority of this chapter engages with the concepts, themes, and patterns extracted from these examinations.

I collected four years worth of the NSC History examinations. Each year has two different question papers, and each question paper has a corresponding addendum with historical sources from which to work with and a memorandum used to systematically grade papers. In total, I was left with 24 documents from 2012 to 2015, each ranging from 10 to 35 pages. Each question paper included a set of extended writing prompts and sections of shorter questions based on the sources provided in the addendums. These sources included photographs, cartoons, newspaper headlines, and extracts from speeches, textbooks, and articles. I approached this data set with a predominantly qualitative content analysis rooted in a critical race theory perspective. That is to say, I approached my data not with a *hypothesis* as I would within a quantitative approach, but with foreshadowing questions about how racial power and dominant ideologies are

constituted and (re)produced. With my questions in mind, I looked through the dataset for concepts, themes, and patterns that illuminated those kinds of processes (White & Marsh, 2002). These patterns are explicated below, namely the breadth of curriculum, the positioning of communism against democracy, and lastly the use of shallow multicultural framing in engagements with racial violence. Given my qualitative grounding, I weave quotes from my data collection throughout the chapter to support and illustrate my claims (Krippendorff, 2004).

Broad Content, Simplified Histories

The Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) of History mandates the teaching of six historical ‘topics’ during the course of twelfth grade, including:

1. The Cold War
2. Independent Africa
3. Civil Society Protests 1950s To 1990s [in the United States]
4. Civil Resistance 1970s To 1980s in South Africa
5. The Coming Of Democracy in South Africa, and Coming to Terms with the Past
6. The End Of The Cold War And A New Global World Order 1989 to Present (DoE, 2011, p. 12)

Each topic is assigned four weeks of time, which is 16 hours of instructional time as dictated by the Department of Education’s specified distribution of time (Department of Basic Education, 2011). The wide breadth of content paired with the narrow time constraints negatively impacts the ways in which students are able to critically engage with the past. Students leave only with ‘broad overviews’ of history, which is not so much seen as a failure, but a *goal* by the Department of Basic Education. In fact, the term ‘broad’ is so warmly embraced that it is mentioned 24 times in the 42 pages worth of the CAPS document. The breadth of this curriculum has several significant implications. First, it enables extremely disparate approaches to teaching history that can perpetuate stereotypes, myths, and biases rather than challenge them. Second, it

exerts pressure on teachers to cover wide areas of content, and in the process simplifies both the pedagogy and content of History education. Paired with an emphasis on examinations, the ‘active’ learning proposed by CAPS is severely undermined, in favor of rote memorization — the primary means of learning under apartheid.

First, the broad and vague language of content guidelines allows for excessive teacher autonomy and agency to determine the framing, length, and methodology of teaching specific topics. This leads to vast discrepancies in how students from different schools, or even classes, learn, discrepancies that are overtly racialized. Hues (2011) spent four months in Afrikaans classrooms, documenting the ways in which new curriculum was applied in everyday contexts. What he found was that even as white teachers ‘covered’ curriculum guidelines, they presented limited, distorted, and biased versions of history. In a specific instance, students opened their government-approved textbooks to a recent photograph of Nelson Mandela with text underneath that asked them to analyze why he was considered a hero. In this case, the teacher ignored the question, instead projecting a slideshow of assassinations, sabotage, burning houses, and destroyed roads. Afterward, he dramatically revealed, “This was the work of Umkhonto we Sizwe, the work of Mandela and the other boys” (Hues, 2011, p. 86). Throughout Hues’ study, Afrikaans teachers presented Mandela as an assassin and a terrorist, actively challenging the positive depictions of him in the media. Another ethnographic study by Sarah Dryden-Peterson and Rob Siebörger (2006) presented similar findings — that the content and methods of History education were decisively influenced by teachers, their racial identities, and their political leanings. At a number of majority-white schools, teachers spent more time teaching European history than South African because they felt it was more “relevant” to the lives of their students.

In the same study, they found that some teachers, particularly Black and/or anti-racist teachers, spent a lot of time engaging with the history of apartheid. Through the use of their own testimony, they opened space for questions and established interactive learning environments. These two studies start to get at the incredibly high stakes of History education and the discrepancies within it.

Secondly, the pressure to cover wide areas of content often pushes teachers toward simplified pedagogies and content in the name of time efficiency and test preparation. These pedagogies are most often teacher-centered and lecture-based, or what activist and educator Paulo Freire (1970) calls ‘banking’ modes of education. Freire describes the processes by which teachers act to ‘deposit’ knowledge into students as they attempt to get through assigned material. Students become empty vessels that must be filled with information, rather than active thinkers with opinions, experiences, and identities who can contribute to their own, their peers’, and their teachers’ education. The kinds of activities that allow for active participants, co-creators in the classroom — debates, dramatic performances, conversations, inquiry-based research, long-term projects — take time that may not feel available given the constraints. This banking education squashes the creativity and critical capacities of students, rendering teachers as final authorities on what is true and factual in the world.

What gets missed content-wise, in these ‘broad overviews’ of history, is often the ideologies and structures of power, it is often the stories of those most marginalized, and it is often the connections to the present. History is reduced to events, actions, and people. As my high school history teacher would tell us, “You’re only dipping your toes into history here.” The ‘coming of democracy in South Africa,’ for example, is reduced to the fall of the USSR, the

negotiation processes that followed, to F.W. De Klerk and Nelson Mandela, to the violence between different political parties. This is valuable information, to be sure, but it is not enough. The reduction of history to neat and chronological time-frames, to a chain-reaction of events, and to simplified characters, serves to prevent young people from interrogating the deeper forces behind history, from making connections to the present, and thus from challenging the status quo.

These kinds of simplified histories and pedagogies stand in opposition to the kinds imagined, at least rhetorically, in the CAPS document. The Department of Education writes that the National Curriculum Statement Grades R-12 is based on the principles of “social transformation” and “active and critical learning” (p. 4) that history is “a process of enquiry” (p. 8). The heavy weighting of tests, particularly of the final examination that counts for 75% of a student’s entire grade, however, counteracts such pronouncements. As Chapter One revealed, the ANC has a tendency to ‘talk left, act right.’ Active learning will not take precedence over rote memorization because the curriculum statements said so, if the same document goes on to explain that a student’s high school graduation relies on a standardized test a couple pages later.

CAPS does not so much interrupt as enable some of the worst results of high stakes testing: rote memorization and ‘teaching to the test.’ The proposed investment in “active and critical learning” is rendered hollow as the Department of Basic Education continues to note which sections will not be tested, provides sample test questions, and instructs teachers to guide their work off the ways the Grade 12 final examination treats certain topics. For example, the conclusion of twelfth grade curriculum asks teachers to lead discussions on the questions, “What have we learned from history? How has studying the past helped us to draw lessons for

present-day society? To what extent can we understand why people behaved the way they did? Has history taught us more about the ‘human condition’?” This entire section is prefaced with a heading that reads “not for examination purposes” (CAPS, 2011, p. 31). These overarching questions that drive much of historical inquiry are fundamentally compromised by the articulation that they are not examinable, and accordingly, not of priority. The decision to include these questions are presented as an afterthought, an add-on, and as a result: an option that can be foregone. It is not enough then, to formally state an opposition to rote-memorization, teacher-centered classes, and ‘teaching to the test’ if this opposition is not matched with concrete measures able to create the support structures for schools, teachers, and learners necessary for a genuinely critical and active, learner-centered approach to education.

The language utilized by the Department of Education is seductive, but until it is matched with material changes within education and South African society at large, it remains rhetorical and insufficient. This section has outlined my primary concerns with the vague language and wide breadth of content guidelines, particularly given the lack of accountability measures during the school year. Given the pervasive surveillance of apartheid, many teachers today are averse to classroom visits from Education officials for quality monitoring. That, with neoliberalism’s emphasis on ‘objective’ and ‘measurable’ data, has made final twelfth grade examinations the primary means of accountability to curriculum adherence. In the next section of this chapter, I document themes from the NSC examinations, namely the equation of capitalism with democracy and shallow multiculturalism. These themes are of importance not just because of the number of students who encounter them, but because they impact how teachers and students prepare for future examinations.

'Bad' Communism/'Good' Democracy

Both the twelfth grade History curriculum and final examinations are bookended with discussions of communism, specifically in relation to the Soviet Union. Between these bookends are explorations of Angola, China, Tanzania, Vietnam, the Congo, and their experimentations with alternatives to capitalism. And the conclusion that emerges from the sources and the kinds of questions posed in the tests is that communism and socialism have been, and are, failures that stand in opposition to freedom and democracy. The language used to describe and question these alternatives to capitalism is provoking, with words like 'propaganda,' 'instrument of expansion,' and 'concentration camp' consistently paired with communism. Such strong, emotive wording serves to paint the differences between communism/capitalism as the dichotomies between dictatorship/freedom, and correspondingly, bad/good. I argue that this process of dichotomization serves to align students with the current economic order of neoliberal capitalism.

The treatment of Tanzania and its implementation of socialism within the NCS examinations of 2013 illustrates the concrete manifestation of these dichotomization processes. I argue that this case demonstrates the ways in which language, question construction, evidence, and exclusion are used to disparage alternatives to capitalism and those who advocate on their behalf. The addendum of Paper One, 2013 begins with an excerpt from Julius Nyerere, the president who implemented socialist policies in Tanzania. Students are asked to extract information from the source, locate answers within the text, and recall a definition of the term 'nationalisation.' They are just being introduced to the section — and then it gets interesting. The

next source, written by a Tanzanian reporter, describes Nyerere as a humble leader, dedicated to the “well-being of the poorest of the poor, yet without ignoring the rights of others” (Addendum Paper One, 2013, p. 7). The description is seductive, illustrating a politician made of dreams: a righteous man of and among the people. The text is paired with a photograph of Nyerere walking in the center a group of men, smiling, as he tours a farm. The questions for this source take a turn, ask students why they would regard the description to be biased, why the photograph would be used as propaganda. Just after students are finished with critiquing the suggested value of Nyerere, they are faced with an extract from a historical text whose author goes unmentioned that focuses on the ‘failure’ of African Socialism. The source suggests that socialism, its emphases on social services rather than profit, drove the country into an economic disaster that could take decades to overcome. It quotes James Adams, the World Bank’s country director for Tanzania, as he describes the desolate landscape of a country with more loans per capita than to any other nation (Addendum Paper One, 2013, p. 9). Students are not asked to determine who the author is or what their biases are, they aren’t asked to question the interests of a World Bank representative. Instead, they are asked to recite the debilitating effects as referred to by Adams.

What is evidently missing is any accounting for the roles that ruthless global capitalism, unequal power relations, and colonial histories played in the supposed ‘failure’ of socialism. What if it were not the ‘failure’ of socialism as an inherently defected project, but the failures of a profit-driven, Western-dominated global capitalism that relies on the exploitation of those most marginalized? Has capitalism not too impoverished, made food inaccessible, left people hungry? These questions are put to the side for a clearer narrative in which socialism is enacted upon a population by a leader, who may not really be who he says he is.

The disparities between how sources are approached, questioned, and assumed to be biased or not, subtly reinforce the idea that socialism and communism must be approached with suspicion. The phrasing of the question, “Why would you regard the information in the written source as biased?” conveys that it is undoubtedly skewed, its content untrustworthy and invalid. It is worth noting, of course, that *every* source is biased to some degree — including this thesis. For the ways that we see and think about the world are influenced by our values, by our intentions, by the ways we are socialized, a process so heavily affected by our identities and background. So, then students could be asked to look for the bias in every source, but they aren’t. That *certain* sources are highlighted as biased then, while others (particularly textbooks) aren’t, reinforce racialized and classed notions about what objectivity looks like. The positionality and interests of a World Bank representative are made neutral, irrelevant to the narrative he presents. The problem is not that students are asked to think critically about socialism, to look for bias and account for it, but that they are not asked to do the same with capitalism. A Tanzanian reporter should no more questions than a Western World Bank employee; an appreciation of socialism should be approached with no more suspicion than a critique of it. What’s more, the disparities in treatment are matched with substantial, historical, and present differentials in power. Since whiteness was created it has been assumed to be neutral, to be free of bias, to be invisible, all so that it can be without challenge. The fact that James Adams is not questioned, while a Black Tanzanian reporter is, is just one of the ways that racial power is (re)produced constantly, and often, subtly.

The Tanzanian question presents a window through which to begin examining the ways that alternatives to capitalism are both implicitly and explicitly placed in opposition to

democracy. Asking students to “explain why this photograph would have been used by Nyerere's government as propaganda,” starts to implicitly position Tanzania as a dictatorship. At other points, however, the suggestions are more explicit. One question asked students to imagine how the following people would respond to a cartoon depicting the Cuban Missile Crisis: a) a communist living in Cuba, b) a democrat living in the USA (Question Paper One, 2013, p. 3). The phrasing of the question positions the two, communist and democrat, in opposition — as antithetical. In another question, students are asked to explain why the Angolan Civil War became a focal point of the Cold War. Its grading memorandum offers correct answers, including two variations of responses that posit that the battle was between “pro-communist” and “pro-democratic” forces:

Candidates could include the following aspects in their response.

- The Battle of Cuito Cuanavale was fought between the pro-communist and pro-democratic forces (Sources 2A, 2C and 2D)
- It was a battle between FAPLA/Cuban forces supporting communism and SADF/UNITA forces supporting democracy (Source 2C)

(Memorandum Paper One, 2015, p. 13)

The memorandum clearly positions communism as antithetical to democracy. While the sentiment was perceivably contained to the grading memorandum, its consequences are far reaching, because the document is referred to by both teachers *and* students in order to prepare for future examinations. Memorandums indeed carry the potentially serious consequences for the ways that teachers approach subject material and the ways that students learn and study, for they delineate what is acceptable, what will be tolerated.

If communism and socialism are at odds with democracy, then capitalism is inherently aligned with it, or at least that is what is conveyed. This sentiment is made clear not only through what is said, but what is not, what questions and words are excluded from conversations about

capitalism or the United States. The 2014 examination, however, presents a more explicit connecting of capitalism and democracy. It opens its discussion on globalization with an extract of a speech from the managing director of the IMF in 2002, Horst Köhler,

Globalisation is the process through which an increasingly free flow of ideas, people, goods, services and capital leads to the integration of economies and societies. It is often viewed as an irreversible (permanent) force which is imposed upon the world by some countries and institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank. However, that is not so. Globalisation represents a political choice in favour of international economic integration, which for the most part has gone hand-in-hand with the consolidation of democracy. Precisely because it is a choice, it may be challenged, and even reversed but only at great cost to humanity. The IMF believes that globalisation has great potential to contribute to the growth that is essential to achieve a sustained reduction of global poverty... Trade liberalisation is the best form of help for self help... (Addendum Paper Two, 2014, p. 9)

Students are then asked to explain the ‘relationship’ between ‘globalisation,’ which serves as a substitute for neoliberalism, and ‘democracy.’ Students are expected to extract from the source, to say that the international economic integration has consolidated democracy, that the free flow of ideas and goods and democracy go hand in hand. The source is not once questioned for bias. The author is never called to light. Trade liberalization, Köhler contends, is the best form of self-help. Globalization is a free ‘choice’ that goes hand in hand with the ‘consolidation’ of democracy. Köhler suggests that the world and all of the countries within it are playing on a level field, one on which every country is free to make independent choices, and responsible for their own fate. His erasure of power structures, histories of colonization and exploitation, financial coercion serve to make possible the equation of capitalism with fairness and democracy. The sentiment conveyed here is exactly what this thesis is about: how peace, democracy, and social justice are incorporated into the rhetoric of the new formation of racial capitalism: neoliberalism. What is understood to constitute peace, democracy, and social justice are confined to the narrow

confines of capitalism — to formal equality, freedom of choice, unregulated markets, property rights, and personal responsibility.

The particular thread of communism versus democracy, of failure versus success, is woven throughout multiple sections of the twelfth grade history examinations. This messaging serves to justify and build consent for the neoliberal order in South Africa, to inform children that “there is no alternative” possible. These tests offer crucial learning moments for children coming of age and transitioning to the ‘real world’ as good workers. That is to say, workers who possess both the technical capacities needed for the market *and* the social capacities to function productively, and quietly, within it. This is an essential task of maintaining neoliberalism and the processes of capital accumulation it makes possible, ensuring that the racial order is not transformed, and preserving white privilege through seemingly ‘neutral’ market policies. The next thread of shallow multiculturalism functions to obfuscate the power that race continues to hold in post-apartheid South Africa through the sanitization of language and an equation of ‘opinions’ and ‘viewpoints.’

Shallow Multiculturalism

Twelfth grade History offers several opportunities to teach and learn about racism, both structurally and interpersonally, ideologically and materially with topics like Black Consciousness, the Civil Rights Movement, and the end of apartheid. Yet, the examinations do not name racism or racists within these very histories rooted in white supremacy. In place of the term ‘racist,’ white people were referred to as ‘conservative’ or ‘right-wing’ in both the contexts of the Jim Crow South and apartheid South Africa. Below are excerpts from the question papers of 2012 and 2013 that illustrate the evasion of accurate and explicit wording:

- 1.3.1 How do you think the following would have reacted to De Klerk's parliamentary address: (Written source)
- (a) Conservative white South Africans
 - (b) The majority of black South Africans
- (2 x 2) (4)

(Question Paper Two, 2012, p. 3)

- 1.5.2 How do you think the following would have reacted to De Klerk's decision to release Nelson Mandela:
- (a) The majority of black South Africans
 - (b) Conservative white South Africans
- (2 x 2) (4)

(Question Paper Two, 2013, p. 4)

These similarities reflect the standardization of question types, but further, a refusal to name racism or racists. The term ‘conservative,’ however, grants legitimacy to the internalization of and possessiveness in white supremacy, rendering it a valid political leaning. By distancing students from explicit and accurate terms — racists or white supremacists — these tests reinforce the notion that ‘political’ opinions or leanings are equally valid, and in the process, completely obscure power differentials and the material stakes attached to them. Racism is a matter of life and death. The distancing from explicit naming of racism and racists is a staple of colorblind ideology that works to invisibilize and minimize the stakes of racism on the interpersonal and structural levels.

Colorblindness flattens differences of identity and power. Therefore, is theoretically incapable of recognizing the persistence of racism through “formal” equality. Distinctly framed through neoliberalism, colorblindness emphasizes the individual, their choices, actions, and experiences. Because of its aggressive individualism, colorblindness refuses to acknowledge how people are systematically advantaged and disadvantaged on the bases of their racial identities.

In the final History exams, the lack of acknowledgement of asymmetrical power relations, manifested itself in a consistent pairing of stories of South Africa’s past. Throughout the tests, a typical question structure asks students to imagine how a certain group would respond

to an event or source. I call such questions the “In Someone’s Shoes” questions, and there were usually one or two of them in every question paper. Often times, they ask students to imagine how groups in opposition would respond to the *same* event — for example, how would the majority of black South Africans *and* how would conservative white South Africans respond to the same speech? Rather than presenting real opportunities to build empathy, I argue that the “In Someone’s Shoes” questions perpetuated superficial understandings of people, race, and power.

Firstly, the diversity within entire populations — the differences between gender, sexuality, class, religion, language, political stances — goes ignored, glossed over, for wide sweeping generalizations. These generalizations themselves are often racist manifestations of shallow multiculturalism, supposing a homogeneity of thought and rationality among people of the same race. The power differentials between and within those groups are invisibilized.

And equally reductive, the questions often suggested a moral equation of opinions or responses, conveyed a colorblind myth that *all* perspectives are equally valid. Everyone’s opinions or feelings or responses may *feel* equally real and legitimate, *but*, our opinions or feelings or responses must all be contextualized through a thorough socio-political analyses. *Some* opinions or feelings or responses may be rooted in violent ideologies, may perpetuate structures that oppress and violate and threaten entire populations and their existences. *Some* opinions and feelings and responses are historically and presently granted with power attached to them, giving them more weight, while others are ignored, silenced, and ignored altogether. What these tests did, rather than complicating understandings of history, was to perpetuate the basis of colorblindness and shallow multiculturalism: the assumption of a level playing field. This notion is consistently used to refuse race-based approaches to addressing inequality and deny the

existence of present day racism, thus effectively perpetuating racial power and its deadly consequences.

In addition, I found another pattern in this line of questioning that shares the function of telling “both sides of the story.” This pattern presents sources that combine two seemingly ‘conflicting’ testimonies within the same box, to then be analyzed together, drawing out similarities or differences. These ‘conflicting’ testimonies were most often that of a Black person and that of a white person, and their experiences of apartheid. I lay out three examples of this pattern, which are also included in full in Appendix B, to demonstrate the way that the ever present power differentials of racialized experiences are minimized or ignored by the side-by-side placement of these narratives. I then move into a more full discussion of implications.

The first example is located in Paper One of 2012, the year I wrote my twelfth grade examinations, which presented a side-by-side pairing of testimony in the context of apartheid. The larger question sought to make connections between the ideology of Black Consciousness and the Soweto Uprising of 1976, in which police opened fire and killed hundreds of Black students as they protested the implementation of Afrikaans as the primary language of instruction. The testimonies of a white policeman, Colonel Kleingeld, and a Black leader, Jon-Jon Mkhonza, of the protest are grouped together. Kleingeld tells a story of supposed aggressive, dangerous students and threatened policemen exerting violence only in self-defense. Mkhonza, contrastingly, tells a story in which students refused to abandon and disperse from a peaceful protest and were met with the chaos of police brutality that resulted in the murder of thirteen year old Hector Pieterse, who later became an icon in the anti-apartheid struggle.

The first question about the testimonies asked whether, according to Kleingeld's testimony, the use of violence against students were justified. And the memorandum allowed students to answer that violence *was* justified, offering several potential responses as to why: "students endangered the lives of policemen... policemen had to protect the property of the government... [and] students were violent and displayed unpatriotic tendencies" (Memorandum Paper Two, 2012, p. 29). The next question asks students to recite the circumstances under which Hector Pieterse was shot as described by Mkhonza. And the last one asks how *both* the accounts were "useful" in researching the Soweto Uprising. Potential answers regarding the use of Kleingeld's testimony in the grading memorandum included that he was a "respected policeman" and that he "was trying to maintain law and order" (Memorandum Paper Two, 2012, p. 30). Before I engage with the ways that the pairing of these texts equate the validity of testimonies from two *very* differentially situated men, I must acknowledge the dangerous, and quite frankly, scary normalization and justification of state violence. That the memorandum does not deter students from warranting the murder of Black people and children, let alone penalize them for it, sets precedents for the acceptance of oppressive and violent responses. Not only do they tell students that these attitudes are reasonable, they tell teachers that they are too, and thereby *allow* for the kinds of biased and racist accounts of history.

In the second question, about the Truth and Reconciliation Committee, a source includes the narratives of two victims who have come to trial to find answers (Addendum Paper Two, 2014). In the first perspective, a Black widow goes to the TRC to find out what happened to her husband, a Black anti-apartheid activist. He was persecuted and murdered by the police force of the apartheid regime. The second perspective is that of a white businessman who was working

when he was injured by a bomb of the ANC's armed resistance. He says he just wants people to confess who ordered the bomb, to take responsibility for what they had done to him and many others who were injured that day. The students are asked then to identify the perpetrators from each perspective, as though the crimes were the same, as though the perpetrators were the same — a tension picked up in the final example below.

In the last example, the responses to the issues and shortcomings of the Truth and Reconciliation Committee from the Conservative Party (a white supremacist, Afrikaans Nationalist organization) and a Black ANC member were paired together under the same source (Addendum Paper Two, 2013). Ferdi Hartzenberg, a representative of the Conservative Party (CP) contended that the TRC was biased and out to destroy Afrikaners altogether. The Black ANC member, Matthews Phosa, also articulated a frustration with the TRC, that of its tendency to “equate the struggle against apartheid with those who enforced it” (Question Paper Two, 2013, p. 15).

Students were asked to determine the extent to which the statements of Phosa could be regarded as “one-sided,” and then asked whether Hartzenberg was fair in saying the TRC was out to destroy Afrikaners. Lastly, students were made to talk to the *similarities* between the two texts. Potential answers included that both extracts blamed the TRC, highlighted the idea that it was controversial, and that they were *both* biased toward it.

These three examples reflect that the “both sides of the story” framing extended into one of the most important and widely encountered educational material: the National Senior Certificate examinations. Using the “both sides of the story” framework, contrasting examples, choices, experiences, feelings, and even critiques are equated and positioned on a level playing

ground. The assumption of such a playing field is “fallacious and insidious” and fully buys into the neoliberal rationality, refusing to see and acknowledge asymmetrical power relations (Hantzopoulos, 2011, p. 31). Teeger, who documented the use of the “both sides of the story” frame within classrooms, describes how the frame

Presents an individualized story... but it obscures an understanding of the benefits and disadvantages that accrued (and continue to accrue) to individuals as a result of their racial group membership. In so doing, the narrative hinders students’ abilities to make race-based assumptions about the legacies of apartheid and to articulate the effects of racism on their everyday lives (2015, p. 1176).

By reducing apartheid to interpersonal and physical forms of violence, by reducing systems to choices and actions, students are left unable to comprehend the relations of power that were ultimately left in place after the election of the ANC. Essentially, the “both sides of the story” frame limits the ways that we can understand racism, confining it to an interpersonal action or a difference in equally valid opinions, and in doing so perpetuates the violent and oppressive status quo.

This is what shallow multiculturalism is all about: emphasizing individuality, personal responsibility, forgiveness, and superficial attempts to empathize, instead of critically examining culture, race, and identity within historical and socio-political analyses. While the law grants us formal equality in the New South Africa, this equality is not met by the concrete realities of our lives, nor our relations to the systems of power at work. We may strive toward equality, we may seek to see every person *as* equal human beings. This does not mean that our actions or decisions or feelings or ideas are equal, however, for their causes and consequences differ vastly according to the ways in which we are situated. Or, as Megan Boler writes, “While we may desire a principle of equality that applies in exactly the same way to every citizen, in a society where

equality is not guaranteed, we require historically sensitive principles that may appear to contradict the ideal of ‘equality’” (2000, p. 322). This sentiment is echoed by Professor of Education Maria Hantzopoulos (2011), who argues that any education that purports itself to the goals of peace *must* recognize its socio-political and historical situatedness. Education for peace then cannot avoid discomfort or conflict if it is genuinely oriented toward transformative peace, that which seeks to transform the very foundations of society as we know it: racism, capitalism, class exploitation, and heteropatriarchy. Further, Hantzopoulos draws attention to the possibility that unless there is some sort of ‘justice’ in *material* conditions, ‘peace’ education only serves to the interests of the dominant.

Conclusion

This chapter displayed tensions between ideology and practice, between what is thought of in curriculum development processes and what happens in the classroom. Through an interrogation of CAPS, I argue that its emphasis on ‘broad’ histories and flexible guidelines have lead to differing accounts of history — some of which were explicitly racist and violent — as well as simplified pedagogies and content. These simplified methods and narratives erase the structural forces behind history and thus risk students’ abilities to draw connections between the past and present. The standardized examinations of twelfth grade framed content *through* neoliberalism, equating of democracy and capitalism, and embracing a shallow form of multiculturalism that acknowledged ‘difference’ without recognizing the power relations to which it was attached. Ultimately, these tests served as socialization processes by which students acquired the necessary attitudes, outlooks, norms, and behaviors necessitated under neoliberalism.

Conclusion

Neoliberalism has fundamentally limited the transformation of South Africa's racial, spatial, economic, and educational landscapes because it is essentially a re-articulation of the main engine behind apartheid: racial capitalism. This thesis has demonstrated the ways that education is positioned as a distinctly neoliberal project to advance the national economy and its competitiveness within the global market. Schools have thus become the production facilities of workers — developing the technical skills necessitated by the changing demands of the market and the social competencies to function well within it. These social competencies do not so much include critical thinking, consistent questioning, and active challenging of the status quo, but an acceptance and embrace of it. In order to become the most valuable workers they can be, students must learn to support the neoliberal ideals of formal equality, choice, individualism, personal responsibility, and more importantly, to reject concepts of structural power and privilege. The best thing a student can be then, is colorblind. Colorblindness is postured to be the highest realization of anti-racism: to be *so* against racism, that you can't even *see* it. Colorblindness is a product of neoliberalism's incorporation and appropriation of anti-racism. Through the incorporation of anti-racism, and social justice more broadly, neoliberalism fatally limits the possibilities of its realization. For neoliberalism confines justice to abstract ideals and rights, rather than material conditions. As long as 'justice' and 'peace' are made symbolic, they serve to protect, maintain, and further structures of power by disguising and denying their existence.

History education, as I have demonstrated, plays a critical role in developing the social competencies, attitudes, and beliefs necessary to operate productively, and quietly, within the

market. By focusing on the individual acts, events, laws, and experiences of the past, History neglects to educate students on the driving forces and structures behind them. In the context of South Africa, this means foregoing the difficult and uncomfortable discussions of systematic benefits and disadvantages accumulated and that continue to accumulate from the structures of settler-colonialism, white supremacy, exploitative capitalism, and the heteropatriarchy. This severely obstructs students abilities to draw connections between the past and the present, and to make sense of the power that race continues to exert after apartheid. In preventing the status quo from being understood for what it is — racial capitalism — History education protects it from challenge.

Chapter One demonstrated how ‘race’ was constructed, and articulated as a distinct racial order, in order to expand colonization and its violent processes of capital accumulation. In many ways, the roots of uneven development are most deeply embedded in the emergence of the capitalist settler-economy in the nineteenth century. My historical account pushed back against mainstream narratives that isolate racism, segregation, and exploitation to the doings of Afrikaans nationalists under apartheid. Rather than creating something *new*, I argue that apartheid continued and furthered an already existing white supremacist project of capital accumulation. Under strengthening local and global pressure, the success and stability of this project was severely threatened. In order to protect the sustainability of racial capitalism then, and the white privilege that was constituted through it, a new political order would need to be created: one that incorporated enough demands from the resistance as needed to create social and economic stability without fundamentally altering the relations of capital. The neoliberal multiracial democracy fulfilled those conditions — incorporating ideals of anti-racism,

anti-sexism, and social justice without transforming the structures of racial capitalism that prevent their actualization. Chapter One served to provide a much needed historical and socio-political context of South Africa whilst rendering visible the deep connections between capitalism and racism. Ultimately, it is through this connection that pervasive racial inequality persists after the fulfilment of formal racial equality under the law. For neoliberalism subjects racial equality to the abstract instead of the material, that is, to rhetoric and language instead of concrete changes in people's lives.

Chapter Two then located the role that education played within the historical account provided in Chapter One, namely that of (re)production. Critical race theory worked to build upon Marxist theories of reproduction, that posit that schools are organized to serve the exploitative needs of capitalism, by emphasizing the depth to which capitalism and its processes are *racialized*. Thus, schools serving the exploitative needs of capitalism do so by simultaneously reproducing the racial order that makes it profitable. The process of reproduction is twofold, developing technical skills and social norms necessary for the functioning of racial capitalism. This framework guided my analysis of schools through South Africa's past, revealing the ways in which schools contributed toward, disseminated, reproduced, and strengthened racial power in the form of a distinct order. This chapter spoke to the centrality of education in South Africa's past, and in doing so, illuminated why it is central to this thesis and to the country as it plans for its future. But it also demonstrated the immense difficulties of educational change, particularly when symbolic changes are not met with substantive ones on the ground. The implementation of curriculum developments was consistently undermined by the lack of developments on the grounds as teachers remained undertrained and overwhelmed, classrooms

remained overcrowded, and schools remained under-resourced. This chapter ended with the latest iteration of curriculum as embodied by the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS). Its pedagogical philosophies of learner-centeredness, skills-based learning, and critical thinking were put at tension with its increased emphasis on content guidelines, textbook use, and teacher authority. These tensions reflected underlying frictions within neoliberalism as it incorporates ideals of social justice while fatally limiting its potential fulfilment.

Chapter Three then put those tensions on display, showing how the History curriculum's articulated commitment to social transformation lacked real substance in action. Utilizing a methodology of content analysis rooted in critical race theory, I interrogated 25 documents for a total of over 300 pages to render visible the ways in which neoliberal rationality manifested in twelfth grade History. With a broad and vaguely-worded curriculum, teachers were left to their own devices, experiences, and biases to implement it, leading to entirely different accounts of the past from one school to the next. The national exit examination then, comprising 75% of a student's entire grade, provided the most far-reaching means of determining what kinds of histories were encouraged and acceptable. Two threads most clearly embodied the kinds of neoliberal thought I critique in this thesis: first, the equation of democracy with capitalism, and second, a shallow multiculturalism or colorblindness that supposes an equal playing field. Over four year's worth of examinations, communism and socialism were framed as experiments that had conclusively failed, and through their failure, paved the way for democracy in South Africa. The tests explicitly positioned communism as antithetical to freedom and democracy, and in the process, aligned capitalism *with* them. I argued that these messages served to justify and build consent for neoliberalism within South Africa, and further, position it as the best means available

of redressing the wrongs of apartheid. Building consent is an essential task of maintaining neoliberalism and the racialized processes of capital accumulation it makes possible. Racial power is reproduced through the seemingly ‘neutral’ market, establishment of formal equality under the law, and a particular colorblindness that refuses to acknowledge asymmetrical power relations. The shallow multicultural approach to apartheid equated the experiences of *very* differently situated people — a white apartheid policeman and a Black anti-apartheid activist, a white businessman and a Black widow, and an Afrikaner nationalist with a member of the ANC — in order to tell “both sides” of South Africa’s history. Through these individualized equations, the examinations conceal the existence of racism as a *system*, and consequently, obstruct students’ abilities to make sense of racism and its effects after apartheid. Since you cannot challenge what you do not see or understand, these tests function to preserve the status quo: racial capitalism. This chapter ultimately illustrated some of the ways that children are socialized, the ways in which they develop the *social capacities* necessitated by the exploitative needs of capitalism. For the attitudes, behaviors, and norms of participating productively and obediently are of perhaps even more importance than the technical skills in demand, which are always subject to change.

So far, I have spent the majority of my time engaging with what has gone and continues to go wrong after the official demise of apartheid. Here though, in my conclusion, I want to share a potential alternative, a vision and a practice of a substantive social justice education. This what I’ve come to learn as ‘critical multiculturalism’ in some of the most engaging and fulfilling classes I have ever taken.

Critical multiculturalism poses a direct challenge to white supremacy by naming it and facing it head on. Critical multiculturalism (CM) explicitly contextualizes culture within structures of power—racism, imperialism, cis-sexism, queerphobia, and classism—and further, *challenges* those structures. For to do otherwise, to think of culture outside its context is to fragment people’s lives and commit a violence onto their identity and being. Educator and Professor Sonia Nieto (2010) contends that culture is complicated, embedded in context, but also “dynamic... created and socially constructed; learned; and dialectical” (p. 10). Culture then cannot be reduced to sentimental accounts of “holidays and heroes,” foods and dances. It cannot be generalized or fixed, but recognized as ever changing and adapting within a person’s specific socio-political, economic, and historical context.

Education rooted in critical multiculturalism posits that children are not blank canvasses, nor empty vats to fill, but active thinkers who bring their homes, experiences, understandings, opinions, and imaginations into the classroom. Students’ identities and experiences then do not impede them or their classmates from learning, but *contribute* toward a thoughtful and dynamic class. Difference is not merely tolerated but actively affirmed and grounded in teaching.

Difference must be grounded in both content and pedagogy, for critical multiculturalism is a *comprehensive* approach to education. In *Un-Standardizing Curriculum*, Christine Sleeter emphasizes that educators must not “add” these elements to a packaged curriculum, but must embed them throughout curricula, lesson planning, and pedagogy. This means that critical multiculturalism is not an outcome, it is not achieved nor finished, but *ongoing*: a process, an active exercise. It is not a holiday, an event, a policy, or confined in any way; it seeps through every facet of education, through curriculum, content, pedagogy, infrastructure, and policy on

multiple levels. This speaks to part of why critical multiculturalism is so compelling — because it has the potential to be implemented within a school, to make substantive change in immediate terms, while holding the potential to change education on a larger scale and longer term. Critical multiculturalism understands decisions made about education as highly political, rather than neutral; it understands that policies on a local and national scale are intrinsically “tied to the social, political, and economic structures that frame and define our society” (Nieto, 2010, p. 38). Hence, the implementation of critical multiculturalism must too be tied to the structures of our reality. A deep interrogation of such structures prevent the kinds of shallow multiculturalism that Carrim describes, the kind of multiculturalism that reproduces racism through its reduction, stereotyping, and trivialization of ‘culture.’ Rather than seeking only to ‘affirm’ such shallow conceptions of culture, CM actively seeks to confront and challenge relations of power and privileges accrued from them. To ‘affirm’ without a sociopolitical context is ingenuine then, for it does not account for the full complexities of identity. The minds and hearts of all young people matter, but they are not treated equally, and to pretend that they are, is to neglect the full experiences of those students who *do* face structural and interpersonal violence on the bases of the very identities we seek to ‘affirm.’ Language and culture *must* be viewed through a lense of social justice in order for real change, for transformation.

In practice, critical multiculturalism is enhanced by resources — training for teachers, time for lesson planning, smaller class sizes, to name a few. But we cannot ignore nor forget that the experiences and identities of teachers and students are resources in of themselves. In “Teachers as Memory Makers,” Sarah Dryden-Peterson and Rob Siebörger (2006) document the ways in which teachers utilized testimony to teach history, particularly in the most under-funded

schools. Testimonies substituted the roles that textbooks may have played in a more technically “resourced” school and acted as primers for conversations. Through ethnographies, Dryden-Peterson and Siebörger came to see the ways that, specifically Black, teachers “created space through their testimonies for students to ask questions and, with this interactive learning, to come to their own understandings of history... Teacher testimony had, in this way, become an important pedagogic tool in linking the past to the present” (2006, p. 399). What Dryden-Peterson and Siebörger reveal, is that teachers hold some of the greatest resources available: experience, empathy, agency, and creativity. But the responsibility of transforming education cannot fall solely on teachers. As critical multiculturalism explicitly acknowledges: change does not occur in a vacuum, but in socio-political and historical contexts.

Educational change thus demands the transformation of material conditions and the structures of power that cause them — and neoliberalism just won’t cut it. Neoliberalism will never be enough to transform the economic and racial landscape of South Africa from what apartheid and colonization left behind, because it is not supposed to. Instead, it silently builds upon the inequalities cultivated over three hundred years’ worth of explicitly institutionalized white supremacy “while disabling the very categories that would make this racism recognizable” (Rhee, 2013, p. 60). Neoliberalism builds upon *and* increases disparities in South Africa, and the world at large. Under the neoliberal rule, “unemployment, inequality, poverty, and environmental degradation soon reached some of the worst levels in the contemporary world” (Bond, 2015, p. 1). The promise of the Rainbow Nation, of post-apartheid equality, is crumbling as I write this.

While I have been at Vassar College, a number of student movements have brought race, power, inequality, and privilege back into the national discourse. For many, apartheid never ended but merely changed shape — and Black students are making this known. On March 11, 2015, a Black student activist Chumani Maxwele carried human excrement from a porta-pottie in the township in which he lived, to South Africa's most prestigious tertiary institution, University of Cape Town. He threw the excrement at the statue of Cecil Rhodes, an especially violent colonizer, in front of a growing crowd of students, supporters, and press (Bond, 2016). What started as an individual action of resistance against the racial power that remained palpable on UCT's campus grew to a national scale in which people challenged the living legacies both symbolically, as in the statues of colonizers and architects of apartheid, and materially, as in the lack of Black representation amongst university faculty, high levels of unemployment, and unaffordable and inaccessible tertiary education. Movements fighting for affordable university fees (and none at all) and decolonized curricula, movements fighting against discriminatory school policies like restrictions on natural Black hair, are forcing all South Africans to acknowledge, name, and confront raced, classed, and gendered systems of power. What Maxwele demonstrates is the fact that power is never able to control in absolute terms nor achieve what it strives to do (Danaher, Schirato, & Webb, 2000). Even with the pervasiveness of racial power and neoliberal rationality, personal agency and consciousness persists in defiance. And that gives me hope, that reminds me that even in the face of the overwhelming, there is always something to do. It is my ambition then that this thesis can then support this work by contributing to the strong analyses necessary for effective, comprehensive, and transformative change.

Appendix A: Acronyms

ANC: African National Congress

C2005: Curriculum 2005

CAPS: Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement

CRT: Critical Race Theory

DBE: Department of Basic Education

DoE: Department of Education

NSC: National Senior Certificate

OBE: Outcomes Based Education

RNCS: Revised National Curriculum Statement

Appendix B: NSC Examinations

History/P1

13
NSC – Addendum

DBE/November 2012

SOURCE 4C

This source consists of a testimony by Colonel Kleingeld and an account by Jon-Jon Mkhonza regarding the shooting of students during the Soweto Uprising of 1976.

Colonel Kleingeld's Testimony: A policeman stationed at the Orlando Police Station submitted the following testimony to the Cillie Commission. This commission was set up after the 1976 Soweto Uprising and the report was presented to parliament in 1979.

As we came directly opposite the street where they were moving, they immediately started throwing stones and moving towards us. At this stage it was clear to me that they were aggressive ... I deduced that the purpose of the march was to destroy property and to endanger lives ... They were now so close that I was hit on the left thigh. The windscreen of my vehicle was shattered ... I threw three [gas] canisters into the crowd in an attempt to stop their attack and disperse them. The tear gas had no significant effect on the crowd and further stoning was let loose on us ... It was now decided to launch a dog and baton attack to disperse the crowd. The purpose was to push the crowd back until help arrived ... I saw that one of the dogs had been beaten to death. I also saw that we were completely surrounded. Stone throwing came from all directions. The only solution to protect our lives and property was to shoot warning shots in the air ... I did not give an instruction to fire. However, some police were shooting out of desperation. I myself never saw that a person was dead or injured. I later heard that the leader or agitator was indeed dead and removed by a vehicle.

[From: *The Road to Democracy in South Africa, Volume 2 [1970–1980]* edited by B Theron]

Jon-Jon Mkhonza's Account: This focuses on how a number of police vehicles were sent to intimidate students while they were singing 'Morena boloka sechaba Sa Heso' ('God Bless Our Nation'). He led this march during the Soweto Uprising.

'The police told us to disperse. But we refused, saying that, "No, we are not going to intimidate anybody, we are not going to loot, we are not going to do anything wrong. We are just going to march, and demonstrate and sing and then go back home." They again said that we must disperse.

'Police dogs were then released. These vicious, well-trained dogs were grabbed and destroyed,' an eyewitness recalls. 'That was when the police took up position and started shooting teargas. All hell broke loose ...

'Students were scattered, running up and down ... coming back, running ... It was some kind of a game because they were running away; coming back, taking stones, throwing them at the police ... It was chaos. Whenever the police shot teargas, we jumped the wall and then came back and started again. It was during this battle that journalists reported seeing a policeman draw his revolver and, without warning, fire directly into the crowd. Seconds later, several other policemen opened fire. That's when Hector Pieterse was shot,' says Mkhonza.

[From: *Soweto a History* by P Bonner and L Segal]

(Addendum Paper One, 2012, p. 13)

SOURCE 2B

The two testimonies below were presented at the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in Johannesburg on 29 April 1996.

Testimony 1: The following is the testimony of Rokaya Saloojee, wife of slain activist Suluman Saloojee. He was killed by the police force in Johannesburg on 9 September 1964.

The widow of Suluman Saloojee, who died in police custody in 1964, said his death had left her with a lingering (lasting) hatred for some whites. 'If I see a white policeman I hate him, I am sorry to say,' Rokaya Saloojee told the Truth and Reconciliation Commission on the second day of its hearings in Johannesburg.

Suluman Saloojee, a 32-year-old solicitor's (lawyer's) clerk, was active in the Transvaal Indian Congress and the ANC. He was detained by the police on 6 July 1964 and on 9 September allegedly fell to his death from the seventh floor of the police headquarters. The inquest (investigation) into Saloojee's death lasted about five minutes, Rokaya said. The magistrates had not allowed her to ask questions and said 'That is all' when she asked why her husband's clothes were full of blood.

Testimony 2: The following testimony was presented by James Simpson, a survivor of the Church Street bomb in Pretoria on 20 May 1983.

On 20 May 1983 James Simpson was injured by a car bomb in Church Street, Pretoria. The bomb, probably planted by the ANC, killed 19 people. Simpson told the Truth and Reconciliation Commission that he had been working in his office when the car bomb went off. Shards (pieces) of window glass had sprayed across the room, cutting his face and leaving splinters in his eyes. 'When I got to the street, I saw cars burning and injured people lying around. My sympathies are with the injured who have never fully recovered.' In order to forgive the bombers, Simpson said, he needed to know who they were. The two men who planted the bomb were killed in the explosion. Asked by the Commission chairman, Archbishop Tutu, what he wanted for the people who ordered the bombing, Simpson said, 'Simply that they would admit that they gave the orders.'

[From: *The South African Press Association Report on the TRC, 30 April 1996.*
Quoted in C Culpin, *South Africa since 1948*]

(Addendum Paper Two, 2014, p. 13)

SOURCE 4C

This source consists of two extracts.

Extract 1: This extract highlights Matthews Phosa's opinion of why the ANC should not apply for amnesty. Phosa was the premier of Mpumalanga at the time and was speaking at the launch of *Mpumalanga Times* newspaper (date unknown).

'There is an unbecoming tendency developing which seeks to equate the struggle against apartheid with those who enforced it despite the fact that apartheid was declared a crime against humanity by the UN,' he said.

On ANC members applying for amnesty to the TRC, he said: 'I hope not to be misunderstood as this has previously happened.' If the ANC members acted outside the organisation's policies and committed human rights violations, they definitely had to apply for amnesty. Similarly, if the TRC's investigation found any human rights violations then 'we should apply for amnesty', Phosa said. However, the ANC would not apply for amnesty for legitimate acts against apartheid.

Extract 2: This source focuses on the Conservative Party's response to the TRC's refusal to grant amnesty for two of its supporters.

The CP said on Wednesday it was 'shocked' that two right-wing political prisoners, Jean du Plessis and Jean van Wyk, had been refused amnesty. CP leader, Dr Ferdi Hartzenberg, claimed the refusal confirmed the bias of the TRC and that its sole intention was the 'destruction of the Afrikaners'. Hartzenberg said Du Plessis and Van Wyk qualified for amnesty on all criteria but were being refused amnesty by a 'clearly subjective commission'.

The alleged crimes in question occurred in 1991, long before the cut-off date for amnesty. In the case of Mr du Plessis, no one was injured or died in the action. 'This is in stark contrast to, for instance, the happenings at Shell House, in which case the attorney general recently decided that there would be no prosecution,' Hartzenberg said. 'This confirms the total partiality of the so-called TRC and that it has only one objective, namely the destruction of the Afrikaners. This left no doubt that there was no benefit in Afrikaners applying for amnesty and that Afrikaners should lend no credence (credibility) to the Commission,' Hartzenberg said.

[From: http://www.TRC/SAPA_11december1996_CP_shocked_. Accessed on 30 January 2013]

Appendix C: Positionality

I write this thesis as a white wealthy cis-woman who was born and raised in South Africa. I write with the knowledge and acknowledgement of my presence as a settler in land that did not belong to me or my family, in land that was taken and is continuously taken away from Black people. There are limits to my work, there are limits to my experiences because of my identity, because of the mostly white and wealthy South Africa I spent the majority of my life in, and I want to make that clear. This thesis cannot fully encapsulate the devastation of crushing inequality — colonization, white supremacy, racism, classism, sexism, structural violence, are not buzzwords that should be taken lightly. These terms suggest a pervasiveness of violence that saturates interactions, relationships, and institutions; they point to the real-life, material conditions that people face everyday; and they are not thrown around carelessly. But there is also joy and love and laughter and resistance and existence that should be acknowledged — violence is not all-encompassing nor all-defining. And I write this thesis with the goal of honoring the seriousness and complexity of the subject matter that I grapple with.

I also write as someone who cares deeply about and works actively toward social justice, as someone who recognizes a lineage of resistance and empathy before her. I write as a descendant of Eastern European Jews who had to flee their homes for safety; as the grandchild of Valerie and Norman Leslie who broke apartheid laws to build relationships with Black congregation members like the Archbishop Desmond Tutu; as the daughter of a woman who consistently empathizes with those she encounters; as the sister of a Black South African woman who started a three day sit-in at her college to protest anti-Black racism on her campus. I write from an understanding that we are *all* hurt to very different degrees by racism, capitalism, sexism, and intersecting forms of violence. We, white people, dehumanize ourselves in the process of denying humanity to black people. We limit our hearts and minds. We subject ourselves to fear, guilt, and resentment, while we push away love, empathy, and freedom for all. And so, it is our work too, to think about and work toward social justice. It is our work too. And we have to keep making sure that we are always *naming* racism, classism, sexism, and intersecting structures of power so that we can always be working toward their destruction and the construction of an equitable world in which every person's humanity is centered, in which every person has access to what they need physically, mentally, and spiritually, in which love and justice come first. This thesis seeks to contribute to this work.

Reference List

- Adams, B. G., Vijver, F. J., & Bruin, G. P. (2012). Identity In South Africa: Examining Self-descriptions Across Ethnic Groups. *International Journal Of Intercultural Relations*, 36(3), 377-388.
- Alexander, N. (2013). *Thoughts On The New South Africa*. Auckland Park, South Africa: Jacana Media.
- Ansell, A. E. (2006). Casting A Blind Eye: The Ironic Consequences Of Color-blindness in South Africa And The United States. *Critical Sociology*, 32(2), 333-356.
- Arnold, M. (1981). Steve Biko: Black Consciousness in South Africa. *Harvard Educational Review*, 51(1), 200-01.
- Au, W. (2009). *Unequal By Design: High-stakes Testing and the Standardization of Inequality*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ayers, W., Quinn, T., & Stovall, D (Eds.). (2009). *Handbook Of Social Justice In Education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bantwini, B. D., & Letseka, M. (2016). South African Teachers Caught Between Nation Building and Global Demands: Is There a Way Out/Forward? *Educational Studies*, 52(4), 329-345.
- Bellush, J., & Netzer, D (Eds.). (1990). *Urban Politics, New York Style*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.
- Beresford, A. (2014). Nelson Mandela And The Politics Of South Africa's Unfinished Liberation. *Review Of African Political Economy*, 41(140), 297-305.
- Biko, S., & Stubbs, A. (1982). *I Write What I Like*. London: Heinemann.
- Bjork, C. (2016). *High-stakes Schooling: What We Can Learn From Japan's Experiences With Testing, Accountability, And Education Reform*. Chicago: The University Of Chicago Press.
- Bobo, L., & Smith, R. A. (1998). From Jim Crow Racism To Laissez-faire Racism: The Transformation Of Racial Attitudes. *Beyond Pluralism: The Conception Of Groups And Group Identities In America*, 198, 182-220.
- Bond, P. (2004). From Racial To Class Apartheid: South Africa's Frustrating Decade Of Freedom. *The Monthly Review*, 55(10), 45-59.
- Bond, P. (2011). What Is Radical In Neoliberal-Nationalist South Africa? *Review Of Radical Political Economics*, 43(3), 354-360.
- Bond, P. (2014). *Elite Transition: From Apartheid To Neoliberalism In South Africa*. London:

Pluto Press.

- Bond, P. (2015). South Africa: Exploding with Rage, Imploding with Self-doubt but Exuding Socialist Potential. *The Monthly Review*, 67(2). Retrieved from: <https://monthlyreview.org/2015/06/01/south-africa-exploding-with-rage-imploding-with-self-doubt-but-exuding-socialist-potential/>
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *Racism Without Racists: Color-blind Racism And The Persistence Of Racial Inequality In The United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bower, P. R. (1989). *Apartheid is Wrong: A Curriculum for Young People*. Educators Against Apartheid.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America* (Vol. 57). New York: Basic Books.
- Carnevale, A. P., Smith, N., & Strohl, J. (2013). Recovery: Projections of Jobs and Education Requirements through 2020. *Georgetown University: Center on Education and the Workforce*. Retrieved From: https://cew.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Recovery2020.FR_Web_.pdf
- Carrim, N. (1998). Anti-Racism and the ‘New’ South African Educational Order. *Cambridge Journal Of Education*, 28(3), 301-320.
- Carrim, N. H. (2006). *Human Rights And The Construction Of Identities In South African Education*, (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand).
- Chetty, R. (2015). Freirean Principles and Critical Literacy to Counter Retrograde Impulses in the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement: Original Research. *Reading & Writing-Journal of the Reading Association of South Africa*, 6(1), 1-7.
- Chisholm, L., & Leyendecker, R. (2008). Curriculum Reform In Post-1990s Sub-Saharan Africa. *International Journal Of Educational Development*, 28(2), 195-205.
- Chisholm, L. (2015). Curriculum Transition In Germany And South Africa: 1990–2010. *Comparative Education*, 51(3), 401-418.
- Christie, P., & Collins, C. (1982). Bantu Education: Apartheid Ideology or Labour Reproduction?. *Comparative Education*, 18(1), 59-75.
- Christie, P. (1985). *The Right To Learn: The Struggle For Education In South Africa*. Ravan Press of South Africa.
- Clark, N. L., & Worger, W. H. (2016). *South Africa: The Rise And Fall Of Apartheid*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping The Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, And Violence Against Women Of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241.

- Danaher, G., Schirato, T., & Webb, J. M. (2000). *Understanding Foucault*. London: Sage.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. NYU Press.
- Department of Basic Education. (2009). *Report of the Task Team for the Review of the Implementation of the National Curriculum Statement: Final Report*. Pretoria: Government Printers. Retrieved From: <http://www.pmg.org.za/report/20091117-department-basiceducation-task-team-briefing/>
- Department of Basic Education. (2010). *Government Gazette*, 785, (33528). Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Department of Basic Education. (2011). *Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement, History Grade 10-12*. Pretoria: Government Printers. Retrieved from: <http://www.education.gov.za/Portals/0/CD/National%20Curriculum%20Statements%20and%20Vocational/CAPS%20FET%20%20HISTORY%20GR%2010-12%20%20WeB.pdf?ver=2015-01-27-154219-397>
- Department of Basic Education. (2012-2015). National Senior Certificate Question Papers, Addendums, and Memorandums. Retrieved from: [http://www.education.gov.za/Curriculum/NationalSeniorCertificate\(NSC\)Examinations.aspx](http://www.education.gov.za/Curriculum/NationalSeniorCertificate(NSC)Examinations.aspx)
- Department of Education. (1997). *Curriculum 2005: Lifelong Learning for the Twenty-First Century*. Pretoria: Government Printers
- De Villiers, P., & Ntshoe, I. (2014). The Political Economy Of South African Education: From Liberal To Competence And The Outcomes-Based System. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(1), 595.
- Dlamini, S. N. (1990). *Critical Teaching Under the Bantu Education System* (Masters Thesis). Saint Mary's University, Canada.
- Dryden-Peterson, S., & Siebörger, R. (2006). Teachers As Memory Makers: Testimony In The Making Of A New History In South Africa. *International Journal Of Educational Development*, 26(4), 394-403.
- Dubow, S. (1995). *Scientific Racism In Modern South Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Feinberg, W., & Soltis, J. F. (1998). *School and Society*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Finchilescu, G., & Tredoux, C. (2010). The Changing Landscape Of Intergroup Relations In South Africa. *Journal Of Social Issues*, 66(2), 223-236.
- Fiske, E. B., & Ladd, H. F. (2005). *Elusive Equity: Education Reform In Post-apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Fiske, E. B., & Ladd, H. F. (2008). Education Equity In An International Context. *Handbook Of*

- Research In Education Finance And Policy*, 276-292.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy Of The Oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Goldberg, D. T. (2009). *The Threat Of Race: Reflections On Racial Neoliberalism*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Goldin, C. (2015). Human Capital. *Handbook Of Cliometrics*, 55-86.
- Government Gazette. (2011). 555 (34600). Pretoria: Republic of South Africa, 1-6
- Hadfield, L. (2013). Challenging the Status Quo: Young Women and Men in Black Consciousness Community Work, 1970s South Africa. *The Journal of African History*, 54(02), 247-267.
- Hantzopoulos, M. (2011). Encountering Peace: The Politics of Participation When Educating for Co-Existence. *Critical Issues in Peace and Education*, 21-40.
- Harley, K., & Wedekind, V. (2004). Political Change, Curriculum Change And Social Formation, 1990 To 2002. *Changing Class: Education And Social Change In Post-apartheid South Africa*, 195-220.
- Harvey, D. (2011). *A Brief History Of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hoadley, U. (2011). Knowledge, Knowers and Knowing: Curriculum Reform in South Africa. *World Yearbook of Education: Configuring Knowledge, Identities, Work and Politics*. Oxford: Routledge, 143-157.
- Hove, M. L., & Maruma, M. W. (2014). Mediocrity and the Fraud Called Education: the Case of South Africa's Curriculum Statements in English. *International Journal of Education Sciences*, 7(3), 587-593.
- Hues, H. (2011). "Mandela, the Terrorist": Intended and Hidden History Curriculum in South Africa. *Journal of Educational Media, Memory, and Society*, 3(2), 74-95.
- Hunter, M. (2015). The Intimate Politics Of The Education Market: High-stakes Schooling And The Making Of Kinship In Umlazi Township, South Africa. *Journal Of Southern African Studies*, 41(6), 1279-1300.
- Hyslop-Margison, E. J., & Sears, A. M. (2006). *Neo-liberalism, Globalization And Human Capital Learning Reclaiming Education For Democratic Citizenship*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Jansen, J. D. (2013). *Knowledge In The Blood: Confronting Race And The Apartheid Past*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Johnson, A. G. (2018). *Privilege, Power, And Difference*. New York, NY: Mcgraw-Hill Education.

- Kim, C. J. (2003). *Bitter Fruit: The Politics Of Black-Korean Conflict In New York City*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. Sage.
- Kunnie, J. (2000). *Is Apartheid Really Dead?: Pan-Africanist Working-Class Cultural Critical Perspectives*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward A Critical Race Theory Of Education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-67.
- Lam, D., Ardington, C., & Leibbrandt, M. (2011). Schooling As A Lottery: Racial Differences In School Advancement In Urban South Africa. *Journal Of Development Economics*, 95(2), 121-136.
- Lemon, A. (1999). Shifting Inequalities In South Africa's Schools: Some Evidence From The Western Cape. *South African Geographical Journal*, 81(2), 96-105.
- Letseka, M. (2014). The Illusion Of Education In South Africa. *Procedia - Social And Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 4864-4869.
- Levine, D. P. (1995). *Rethinking Schools: An Agenda For Change*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Lipman, P. (2011). *The New Political Economy Of Urban Education: Neoliberalism, Race, And The Right To The City*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Louw, M., Berg, S. V., & Yu, D. (2007). Convergence Of A Kind: Educational Attainment And Intergenerational Social Mobility In South Africa. *The South African Journal Of Economics*, 75(3), 548-571.
- Lowry, S. (1995). A Critique of the History Curriculum in South Africa. *Perspectives in Education*, 16(1), 105-129.
- Macharia, J. (2016, Aug 7). South African's ANC Suffers Worst Election Since Taking Power. *Reuters*. Retrieved from: <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-safrica-election-idUSKCN10G2GA>
- Marais, H. (2011). *South Africa Pushed To The Limit: The Political Economy Of Change*. London: Zed Ltd.
- Mckay, S., & Chick, K. (2001). Positioning Learners In Post-apartheid South African Schools. *Linguistics And Education*, 12(4), 393-408.
- Melamed, J. (2011). *Represent And Destroy Rationalizing Violence In The New Racial Capitalism*. Minneapolis, MI.: Univ. Of Minnesota Press.

- Moodley, G. (2013). Implementation of the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statements: Challenges and Implications for Teaching and Learning (Master's Thesis). University of South Africa, Pretoria.
- Morgan, K. (2010). Scholarly And Values-driven Objectives In Two South African School History Textbooks: An Analysis Of Topics Of Race And Racism. *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung*, 35(3), 299-322.
- Murphy, E. J. (1972). Schooling for Servitude, Some Aspects of South Africa's Bantu Education System. *Storrs, CT: Connecticut University*, 1-38.
- Narsiah, S. (2002). Neoliberalism And Privatisation In South Africa. *Geojournal*, 57(1/2), 3-13.
- Ndimande, B. S. (2013). From Bantu Education to the Fight for Socially Just Education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 46(1), 20-35.
- Nieto, S. (2010). *Language, Culture, And Teaching*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Nkabinde, Z. P. (1997). *An Analysis Of Educational Challenges In The New South Africa*. Lanham, MD: University Press Of America.
- Nokwe, D. (1955). Bantu Education in Action. *South African History Online, DISA Archive*. Retrieved From <http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/bantu-education-action>
- Oliver, M. L., & Shapiro, T. M. (2006). *Black Wealth/White Wealth: A New Perspective On Racial Inequality*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2015). *Racial Formation In The United States*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Peck, J., & Tickell, A. (2002). Neoliberalizing Space. *Antipode*, 34(3), 380-404.
- Pells, E. G. (1970). *Three-Hundred Years Of Education In South Africa*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Rhee, J. (2013). The Neoliberal Racial Project: The Tiger Mother And Governmentality. *Educational Theory*, 63(6), 561-580.
- Robinson, C. J. (2010). *Forgeries Of Memory And Meaning: Blacks And The Regimes Of Race In American Theater And Film Before World War II*. Sydney: Accessible Publishing Systems.
- Seloda, H., & Zenoub, Y. (2003). Private Versus Public Schools In Post-Apartheid South African Cities: Theory And Policy Implications. *Journal Of Development Economics*, 71(2), 351-394.
- Selwyn, D., & Maher, J. (2003). *History In The Present Tense: Engaging Students Through Inquiry And Action*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Seroto, J. (2011). Indigenous Education During the Pre-Colonial Period in Southern Africa. *Indilinga African Journal of Indigenous Knowledge Systems*, 10(1), 77-88.
- Shenk, T. (2015, April 2). What Exactly is Neoliberalism? *Dissent Magazine*. Retrieved From: <https://www.dissentmagazine.org/blog/booked-3-what-exactly-is-neoliberalism-wendy-br own-undoing-the-demos>
- Siebörger, Rob. (2000) History And The Emerging Nation: The South African Experience. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*, 1(1), 39-48.
- Spaull, N. (2013). Poverty & Privilege: Primary School Inequality In South Africa. *International Journal Of Educational Development*, 33(5), 436-447.
- Spreen, C. A., & Vally, S. (2006). Education Rights, Education Policies And Inequality In South Africa. *International Journal Of Educational Development*, 26(4), 352-362.
- Steyn, M. E. (2001). *Whiteness Just Isn't What It Used To Be: White Identity In A Changing South Africa*. Albany, NY: State Univ. Of New York Press.
- Stromquist, N. P. (2005). *Education In A Globalized World: The Connectivity Of Economic Power, Technology, And Knowledge*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Subreenduth, S. (2013). Theorizing Social Justice Ambiguities In An Era Of Neoliberalism: The Case Of Postapartheid South Africa. *Educational Theory*, 63(6), 581-600.
- Tabulawa, R. (2003). International Aid agencies, Learner-Centred Pedagogy and Political Democratisation: A Critique. *Comparative Education*, 39(1), 7-26.
- Teeger, C. (2015). "Both Sides of the Story": History Education in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *American Sociological Review*, 80(6), 1175-1200.
- Tikly, L., & Barrett, A. M. (2011). Social Justice, Capabilities And The Quality Of Education In Low Income Countries. *International Journal Of Educational Development*, 31(1), 3-14.
- Tikly, L. (2004). Education And The New Imperialism. *Comparative Education*, 40(2), 173-198.
- Tikly, L. (2011). A Roadblock To Social Justice? An Analysis And Critique Of The South African Education Roadmap. *International Journal Of Educational Development*, 31(1), 86-94.
- Tomlinson, C. A., & Mctighe, J. (2006). *Integrating Differentiated Instruction And Understanding By Design: Connecting Content And Kids*. Alexandria, VA: Association For Supervision And Curriculum Development.
- Vally, S. (2007). From People's Education to Neo-liberalism in South Africa. *Review of African Political Economy*, 34(111), 39-56.
- Vandeyar, S., & Killen, R. (2006). Teacher–Student Interactions In Desegregated Classrooms In

- South Africa. *International Journal Of Educational Development*, 26(4), 382-393.
- Van Wyk, B. (2010). The Affirmative Action Debate: A Critical Reflection. *South African Journal Of Higher Education*, 24(2), 358-66.
- Watson, V. (2007). Engaging With Difference: Understanding The Limits Of Multiculturalism In Planning In The South African Context. *Desire Lines: Space, Memory And Identity In The Post-apartheid City*. London: Routledge.
- Welsh, D. (2009). *The Rise And Fall Of Apartheid*. Charlottesville: University Of Virginia Press.
- White, M. D., & Marsh, E. E. (2006). Content Analysis: A Flexible Methodology. *Library Trends*, 55(1), 22-45.
- Zamudio, M., Russell, C., Rios, F., Bridgeman, J. L. (2011). *Critical Race Theory Matters: Education And Ideology*. New York, NY: Routledge.